Acerca de este libro

Esta es una copia digital de un libro que, durante generaciones, se ha conservado en las estanterías de una biblioteca, hasta que Google ha decidido escanearlo como parte de un proyecto que pretende que sea posible descubrir en línea libros de todo el mundo.

Ha sobrevivido tantos años como para que los derechos de autor hayan expirado y el libro pase a ser de dominio público. El que un libro sea de dominio público significa que nunca ha estado protegido por derechos de autor, o bien que el período legal de estos derechos ya ha expirado. Es posible que una misma obra sea de dominio público en unos países y, sin embargo, no lo sea en otros. Los libros de dominio público son nuestras puertas hacia el pasado, suponen un patrimonio histórico, cultural y de conocimientos que, a menudo, resulta difícil de descubrir.

Todas las anotaciones, marcas y otras señales en los márgenes que estén presentes en el volumen original aparecerán también en este archivo como testimonio del largo viaje que el libro ha recorrido desde el editor hasta la biblioteca y, finalmente, hasta usted.

Normas de uso

Google se enorgullece de poder colaborar con distintas bibliotecas para digitalizar los materiales de dominio público a fin de hacerlos accesibles a todo el mundo. Los libros de dominio público son patrimonio de todos, nosotros somos sus humildes guardianes. No obstante, se trata de un trabajo caro. Por este motivo, y para poder ofrecer este recurso, hemos tomado medidas para evitar que se produzca un abuso por parte de terceros con fines comerciales, y hemos incluido restricciones técnicas sobre las solicitudes automatizadas.

Asimismo, le pedimos que:

+ *Haga un uso exclusivamente no comercial de estos archivos* Hemos diseñado la Búsqueda de libros de Google para el uso de particulares; como tal, le pedimos que utilice estos archivos con fines personales, y no comerciales.

+ *No envíe solicitudes automatizadas* Por favor, no envíe solicitudes automatizadas de ningún tipo al sistema de Google. Si está llevando a cabo una investigación sobre traducción automática, reconocimiento óptico de caracteres u otros campos para los que resulte útil disfrutar de acceso a una gran cantidad de texto, por favor, envíenos un mensaje. Fomentamos el uso de materiales de dominio público con estos propósitos y seguro que podremos ayudarle.

+ *Conserve la atribución* La filigrana de Google que verá en todos los archivos es fundamental para informar a los usuarios sobre este proyecto y ayudarles a encontrar materiales adicionales en la Búsqueda de libros de Google. Por favor, no la elimine.

+ *Manténgase siempre dentro de la legalidad* Sea cual sea el uso que haga de estos materiales, recuerde que es responsable de asegurarse de que todo lo que hace es legal. No dé por sentado que, por el hecho de que una obra se considere de dominio público para los usuarios de los Estados Unidos, lo será también para los usuarios de otros países. La legislación sobre derechos de autor varía de un país a otro, y no podemos facilitar información sobre si está permitido un uso específico de algún libro. Por favor, no suponga que la aparición de un libro en nuestro programa significa que se puede utilizar de igual manera en todo el mundo. La responsabilidad ante la infracción de los derechos de autor puede ser muy grave.

Acerca de la Búsqueda de libros de Google

El objetivo de Google consiste en organizar información procedente de todo el mundo y hacerla accesible y útil de forma universal. El programa de Búsqueda de libros de Google ayuda a los lectores a descubrir los libros de todo el mundo a la vez que ayuda a autores y editores a llegar a nuevas audiencias. Podrá realizar búsquedas en el texto completo de este libro en la web, en la página `http://books.google.com`

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

OK

Appendix

Tribute to the Siskin Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am always pleased when I read a new editorial tribute to the Siskin brothers, Mose and Garrison, of Chattanooga, Tenn.

For years, the Siskin brothers have been literally giving away their fortune to help their fellow men. As Garrison Siskin says, "We invest in people—we invest in miracles."

Recently there was opened in Chattanooga a new $4 million rehabilitation center which the Siskins built and to which the general public has been given the opportunity to contribute through Operations Crossroads. I had the pleasure of attending the dedication of this fine new institution a few months ago.

On July 29, the Nashville Tennessean magazine published an excellent article about the Siskin brothers and their good works, and I ask unanimous consent that the article, by George Barker, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BROTHERS SISKIN

(By George Barker)

"For goodness sake," Garrison Siskin said, "how much money does a man need, anyway?"

Siskin was being pressed to explain his bizarre attitude toward money. He and his brother, Mose, give it away—so far about $3 million worth.

"Look at it this way," he explained. "Some people with more money than they need pour it into yachts and airplanes and big homes. Or they invest it in other businesses to make still more money.

"Mose and I, we don't see it that way. We live well and our families are taken care of—but we invest the rest in people—we invest in miracles."

The brothers Siskin are a couple of plain-clothed, unpretentious steel dealers who worked their way up from the poverty of Chattanooga's West Side.

Most of their miracles happen within a crisp and gleaming new $4 million rehabilitation center the Siskins built in the heart of Chattanooga's hospital district.

There, abetted by sophisticated medical care, love, and the most modern therapeutic devices the Siskin money could buy, the lame learn to walk. The mute are made to talk. The blind learn to "see" and the deaf to hear.

Patients are carried to the place from farms and cities within a 50-mile radius of Chattanooga. Most are referred there by doctors or public health nurses. Some just up and come.

They pay what they can. There are no bills. Last year the Siskins picked up the tab for about 70 percent of the overhead.

"Look at that little doll, there," Garrison cooed, nodding at a 5-year-old blond who looks like Shirley Temple used to, except that her legs seemed too small and withered. "That little angel—she was headed for the scrap heap. But not now, by golly, not now."

Garrison's allusion to scrap is more than poetry. He and Mose started as junk dealers. Today they sell scrap steel to the big steel mills and structural steel to southern contractors.

In 1942, when the business was just starting to show profit, Garrison was critically hurt while riding on a train to New York. A big steel grid that covers the steps on railroad passenger cars crashed down on his right leg. A blood clot formed, like the one that had caused his father's death. Surgeons told him they would have to amputate and gave him only a 50–50 chance of recovery.

Garrison doesn't like to talk about it now. He's afraid that what followed the accident sounds too melodramatic.

"Well, I prayed," he says. "I promised God if I recovered I would devote the rest of my life to helping people. I consider this a contract."

Garrison spent a long, trying year in a wheelchair. And as he recovered he talked with Mose about the contract he had made. Mose decided ("since I'm my brother's partner") to get in on the deal.

It started simply enough.

He would hear about somebody in trouble and he would help.

A family dispossessed by fire. A sick child. A repentant drunk who wanted a fresh start. Inmates at State prison who needed someone to sponsor their parole. Strangers in town living in a car. Hunger. Anguish. Loneliness.

He gave wheelchairs to the crippled and paid to have ramps built at their homes and at certain public buildings downtown.

"It got so anytime we ran a story about tough luck Garrison would call," says Marion Peck, reporter for the Chattanooga Times. "He would say, 'Is that family really in trouble? Would you give them something from me?'

"I would stop by the junkyard and Garrison would give me a plain white envelope with money inside. I had to promise not to tell who the sender was."

One December the brothers heard of a war bride with an unemployed husband and four children, one of whom was blind. They were being helped but Garrison worried about what sort of Christmas the kids would have. He gave Miss Peck $350. The only stipulation was that each child would get whatever Christmas present he most desired.

The mother stared at the envelope and cried, "Why is he doing this?"

On another day Garrison happened to be in the courthouse during the bankruptcy auction of a hardware store. He won it with a bid of $40,000. The owner, who had worked long and unsuccessfully to make the store pay, approached Garrison.

"I'm just curious," he said bitterly. "What do you intend to do with that store?"

"I don't intend to do anything with it. But I intend for you to get back in that store and start running it right. I'll help you. You've got to succeed this time. You owe me 40,000 bucks."

Strange thing was, Garrison didn't have the $40,000 when he made the bid. But he knew where he could borrow it.

"We inherited two things from our parents more valuable than money," says Mose, who at age 63 is slightly the older of the brothers. "They gave us an understanding of human values and a good name."

Their parents, Robert and Anna Trumpehofsky Siskin, came to Chattanooga from Russia in 1890.

The elder Siskin was a tall, strong redhead who started his life in America as a pack peddler. He would shoulder a load of household supplies and set off, walking, across the countryside, sleeping in fields and haylofts.

After a few years of this Papa Siskin bought a horse and wagon and went into the junk business. Mose and Garrison helped by building a rickety wagon which they used to collect junk after school. They also sold milk, cheese and eggs produced by the two cows and a flock of chickens their mother kept in the backyard.

The old man is still remembered by Chattanooga oldtimers for his stringent sense of honesty. Banks never asked for endorsers when he borrowed money. When he was hit by a taxi in 1926 (and when he died a few months later following the amputation of his leg) Papa Siskin didn't have much money. But he didn't owe a dime.

Mose and Garrison took over the junkyard.

Today, about half of their 100 or so employees are people whom the brothers "helped out" during a critical period.

Most notable of these is a pretty 24-year-old woman, Joyce Rominger, who runs the switchboard. The switchboard is keyed to Braille system because Joyce is blind. When the brothers installed the switchboard it was the second one of its type in the country.

"Talk about courage," Garrison says, referring to Joyce, "she lost one eye in an accident, but always hoped she would someday regain use of the other one. Well, doctors finally decided the second eye would have to be removed. I was asked to break the news to her.

"When I told her, Joyce was quiet for a minute. Then she said, 'They make artificial eyes in blue, don't they? I'll take 'em. I always wanted to be blue eyed, anyway.'"

A big part of the Siskin office and sales force is made up of men whose drinking days are behind them. The brothers found most of them in Chattanooga gutters.

For all their good deeds there is nothing monastic or patronizing in the way the brothers look, talk or act. Mose, who spends most of his working hours in the yard, seldom wears a tie, always wears a worn, floppy hat.

Garrison is a low-voiced, fast talker—sort of hard to understand under normal circumstances. His speech grows in emphasis and volume when he is aroused. When confronted by heartlessness he is easily aroused.

Recently, after repeated attempts to have a railroad worker transferred to another city where he could be closer to his son who was hospitalized there, Garrison's patience gave out. He called the president of the line and chewed him out. It worked.

Both brothers are married; each has two grown children and a burgeoning crop of grandchildren. They are devout Orthodox Jews and start each day (at 5 a.m.) with prayer.

They get to work at 5:30 and try to get most of their business done by noon, so as to allow the rest of the day for work at the rehab center.

For kicks, they play a poor game of golf, semiregularly. Garrison sings an enthusiastic baritone with any barbershop quartet he can find and plays a kazoo at parties.

In recognition of his interest in music and his rehabilitation of former convicts, a prison vocal group called the "The Prisonaires" headed by Songwriter Johnny Bragg recently recorded a song for Garrison. It's a calypso thing called "Meestah Siskin."

Until a few years ago, the brothers managed to keep their philanthropy anonymous in accordance with the scriptural demand to "give silently."

Their efforts were forced into public attention, however, when in 1955 they became aware of the plight of Chattanooga's Orange Grove School for mentally retarded children. The school, operated mainly by the parents, was in severe financial trouble and patrons were struggling to patch up and enlarge a decrepit old building the school occupied.

The situation sent Garrison's blood pressure up.

He and Mose provided steel, wheedled other building material from companies with which they do business, supplied engineering supervision, and helped talk the Chattanooga building trades unions into providing free labor. Today, the Orange Grove School is recognized as the best school of its type in the State.

The Siskin Foundation and the rehabilitation center actually got started as a brick, steel, and chrome reality in 1955 after Garrison visited the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Speech and Hearing Center. The place was inadequate, the Siskins agreed. They went to work.

Three new buildings now occupy adjacent sites near Oak and Vine Streets near downtown Chattanooga. They are referred to as the Siskin Center, although Garrison has dubbed the complex "Operation Crossroad."

One building, the smallest, is a chapel dedicated to the memory of their parents. It is nondenominational, open 7 days a week.

Next to it stands the 3-story education building; it houses a 300-seat auditorium and smaller meeting rooms which civic, educational, cultural, and religious groups use without charge. Provided, too, is free permanent office space for such organizations as Big Brothers, the Chattanooga Adult Education Council, the Chattanooga Literacy Movement, and other groups which aid sufferers of muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, blindness, speech and hearing defects, and other mental and physical handicaps.

But the heart of the Siskin Center is the big, three-story rehabilitation building, completed 3 years ago.

This is where last year some 1,100 children and adults who had serious speech or hearing problems were treated and, in most cases, helped. Where 500 children and old folks, crippled by birth, age or accident, were put back "on their feet." Where some 100 preschool children with mental and emotional problems were treated toward achieving for them as nearly a normal life as possible.

This is where 52 volunteer dentists made more than 2,000 appointments for needy persons in need of dental care. Where last year 105 amputees were treated and fitted with artificial arms or hands, legs and feet.

Garry gets damp eyed as he walks through the center, watching the work done by his physical therapists and by the scores of volunteers who have flocked to help out.

"The wonderful thing here is the fact that so much can be done under one roof," he says. "So often children born with a handicap do not have just one. Other places might treat the speech problem and send the parents somewhere else to treat the lack of coordination. We do not send anybody anywhere else. We take everybody in trouble * * *."

The Siskins have a board of medical advisers to help formulate medical policy, and a full-time rehabilitation center administrator, Miss Gladys E. Post.

The five-man board of trustees includes Bill Spears, former Vanderbilt football great who is now an attorney in Chattanooga.

But all practices must fall within broad policy laid down by Mose and Garrison: No one shall be turned away for lack of funds; whisky and partisan political discussion are off limits at the community center; Jewish dietary laws are observed in the rehabilitation center kitchen and it is closed on Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath.

But the brothers, themselves, operate within another restriction, slowly becoming more apparent. It involves money.

The Siskin Center includes about $4 million worth of real estate and equipment. Of this amount the brothers have contributed almost $3 million in cash, endowment insurance, and stock in the Siskin Steel & Supply Co. Another million or so has been donated.

But the brothers' openhandedness has become the despair of their accountants and attorneys who insist the money is pouring out almost as fast as the Siskins can earn it.

"Actually, we could stand pat with what we are doing and there would be no problem," Garrison says. "But we want to take more patients—and we want to make sure this place will be helping people long after we're gone."

To help solve both problems, the foundation recently launched a drive for funds. It's called the "365 Club" and asks for a "penny a day."

The campaign, while going well, has met resistance in some quarters. For one thing, some leaders of Chattanooga's United Fund have long insisted that the Siskin money would be more properly spent if it were donated to the United Fund and spent through United Fund channels.

Then, too, a certain amount of anti-Semitism has hurt the drive.

"There is a very small minority in this town who has worked against the Siskin Center because of the brothers' religion," says one Baptist minister, who was treated for a partial paralysis. "I say the spirit of Christ is more evident here than in most places I know of."

Garrison is reluctant to discuss religious prejudice. He says, "We do the very best we can. If others want to downgrade the work being done here because of our religion, there's little more we can do about it."

The Siskins turned down a chance to get a half-million dollars of Government funds a few years back because they didn't want "Government restrictions" involved in the operation of the center.

"Most centers of this type have to operate within a set of restrictions that would make your head swim," Garrison says. "Some won't take you if you have no money—others won't take people with too much money. Some have age requirements. Others say they can't attempt to educate any retarded child with an IQ less than 75.

"I guess they have to do what they do. But I can't go along. That contract I made didn't specify age or ability to pay or IQ.

"I just promised to help everyone I could. That's the way it is."

Creating Jobs: Federal Role Should Be To Smooth Way for Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following study from the Wall Street Journal of July 30 is an extremely well done commentary on the role of the Federal Government in creating jobs. It is by Mr. Harley L. Lutz, professor emeritus of public finance at Princeton University:

CREATING JOBS: FEDERAL ROLE SHOULD BE TO SMOOTH WAY FOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By Harley L. Lutz)

The persistence in recent years of a substantial amount of unemployment, whether measured in absolute terms or as a percentage of the civilian labor force, should have demonstrated, by this time, the error of the typical political diagnosis and prescription. The diagnosis is that demand is not sufficient to absorb the goods that the unemployed might have produced had they been at work and the prescription is that more Government spending will overcome the deficiency of demand and thus provide jobs.

In its report of January 1962 the Council of Economic Advisers stated that inadequate demand had been in recent years a major cause of unemployment and excess capacity. This report strongly supported the President's request for standby authority to inaugurate a $2 billion public works program when a specified increase of unemployment had occurred. It also endorsed the proposals to extend and strengthen the unemployment compensation system and to permit the President to order a temporary reduction of personal income tax rates. The Depressed Area Act of 1961, which provided for $400 million of loans and grants, was followed, this year, by a bill to authorize an additional $600 million of public works in these areas.

Underlying these spending plans is the theory that more Government spending will automatically cause those now unemployed to be put to work. This theory ignores both the true nature of the problem and the proper remedial action.

There are wide differences in the relative amount of unemployment, depending on age, sex, race, education, occupation, degree of previously acquired skill and geography. Despite these differences, all unemployed persons have one thing in common, which is that no employer has, or is willing to provide, a place for them in his establishment and on his payroll.

This is not because of prejudice or hardheartedness on his part. Rather, it is the outcome of two elementary but fundamental factors in our economic system of things. These are: The value of the worker's product in relation to the wage which the employer must pay; and, the amount of capital available for putting people to work. What we define as unemployment could be quickly ended by putting on the public payroll all who now have no job—provided that Government were to waive the wage-value of service test. However, if that test were applied, Government would encounter the same barrier as now confronts private employers.

Product value and wage cost: Any employer who expects to stay in business must continue to realize a return that covers both his out-of-pocket costs and a yield on the capital invested sufficient to induce investors to keep their money in the business and to provide additional funds as needed. The costs are determined not only by the employer's direct expenditure for wages, but also by the costs of those who supply his materials, plant, equipment, and the like. These "upstream" costs are in turn determined by the wages and other expenses incurred by the suppliers.

At any given stage in the productive process, wage levels involving production costs higher than can be recovered in the price of the product lead to unemployment of those whose productivity falls below their wage cost. At the bottom, this wage cost is set by the Federal minimum wage law and at top it is set by union wage scales plus fringe benefits. At both ends of the employment scale job opportunities are squeezed by these arbitrary rules relating to the "price of labor." A considerable, though statistically indeterminate, amount of unemployment is caused by this pricing of labor out of the market.

Capital and unemployment: The need for more capital in the private economy is obvious, first to avoid capital dilution and lower productivity per worker as the labor force increases and second, to permit increased productivity per worker by utilizing the improved quality of capital which comes about with technological advance. Increasing productivity per worker is the only economically justifiable basis for wage increases. The appropriate measure of productivity would be the overall national average rather than the particular industry or plant result. Also, in the long run, wage increases should be held somewhat below even the national average productivity in the interest of all consumers and to keep the prices of export products effectively competitive in foreign markets.

The flow of new capital and the combination of labor and capital in private productive operations are alike dependent on the prospect of profit. The health of the economy requires that new capital funds be provided from the savings of individuals as well as from the retained earnings of operations that are already profitable. There must be many new business ventures and not solely an increase of business size through internal financing, however useful and important this course may be.

The frequent references to excess plant capacity in recent discussions have been taken to imply that there is no present need for more capital since we are not making full use of what we have. Unused capital and unused labor have at times been linked together, the idea being, apparently, that both excess capacity and unemployment would disappear if the unemployed were moved into the excess capacity plants and put to work.

This overlooks the fact that many of the unemployed are in that situation because the value of their product would not cover the wage demanded, whether by reason of Federal law or union wage scales. While this condition prevailed, they could not get jobs even if there were idle plants.

Moreover, the concept of excess capacity is hazy and indefinite. The standard of measurement is never clear. It varies depending on whether it relates to one, two, or three shifts, or to comparatively obsolete plant and equipment that could be put into service if needed, or to given plant and equipment in a declining industry. Even if there could be general agreement on the meaning of excess capacity, its existence would not necessarily indicate a defective allocation of resources.

On the contrary, the economy needs some margin of capacity to meet variable or emergency needs and to permit flexible adaptation of output to the market. If there were absolutely no excess capacity in the economy, it would not be possible to meet a sudden, increased demand for defense material, or medical, housing, or education facilities. It would not even be possible to supply additional quantities of the materials that would be required for the sudden implementation of a public works program without diverting them from existing construction projects.

Demand and unemployment: A popular explanation of unemployment, endorsed by the Council of Economic Advisers, is that overall demand is insufficient.

It is beyond dispute that business cannot continue without sales, including both consumer goods and the tools and materials used in further production. Too often, in this phase of the discussion, there is inadequate consideration of the source of the income which makes demand effective in the market. Obviously, this income must be generated, initially, through production. The benefits paid to retired or unemployed persons, known as transfer payments, are derived from income siphoned off in various ways from the productive factors.

The unemployed can contribute to total demand only by spending income paid to them for productive services. But this brings us back again to the basic fact that no employer can afford to pay a wage in excess of the value of the worker's product. Here is the fundamental imbalance which must be corrected if those now unemployed are to receive income and thus contribute their quota to the total demand for goods and services.

The lines of remedial action have been indicated above. They involve: Measures affecting the unemployed as persons not presently employable, and measures affecting the economic climate.

Improving worker skills: If a person cannot get or hold a job because of low productivity, the obvious course is, if possible, to make him more productive. New or improved worker skills are always required to keep up with changing methods of production and the different kinds of equipment made available by general progress as well as technological advance. From the standpoint of these ever-changing requirements, those counted as unemployed fall into two groups:

Persons capable through training to become eligible for employment under the new conditions.

Persons so lacking in mental capacity, dexterity, emotional stability or determination as to be incapable of acquiring the proficiency through training to hold a job at good wages. Some, perhaps many, of these are kept out of jobs which they could perform because neither special skill nor intensive training is required, by the Federal minimum wage law.

The training, or retraining, of workers in the new skills and occupations requires extensive collaborative action but it does not call for Federal programing or underwriting. It must begin with those individuals who are energetic and ambitious enough to want such improvement. Collaborative action includes industry cooperation such as is now being provided on an increasing scale, because inplant training is no doubt the most efficient way of inculcating new or different skills.

Non-Federal collaboration requires, also, educational programs which offer sound vocational guidance and training for those who do not want to enter college, and some of the brightest high school graduates do not. State and community employment services must be so organized and managed as to establish the best possible contacts between those seeking work and those employers needing more workers.

In all this there is no real, constructive place for Federal action. It would be more costly than beneficial. The unemployed are individuals, people living in specific communities, not statistical units in a total. Most of them must find jobs in or near their home communities since, for many reasons, wholesale migrations to and from across the country are neither feasible nor functional. The local businesses and industries, the local schools, and the local employment services are best equipped to discover the facts and are more competent than a Federal bureau to deal with them effectively.

A better economic climate: Neither a bird nor an airplane can fly on one wing. The most highly skilled workers would be out of a job if there were no tools to work with, and no amount of retraining will put people into jobs if capital is lacking. There must be, also, a prospect of profitable use of capital. Basically, therefore, there must be a better climate for the profit motive, which is the main driving force in a private enterprise economy.

This is what the Employment Act of 1946 intends as the Government's role. It is not for the Government to provide employment and prosperity, but to promote the conditions under which the free private enterprise system can best achieve the objectives of high-level production, employment and income. The efforts to realize profit or avoid loss—since ours is a profit and loss economy—lead to new products, new plants, new processes and new jobs. The quest for profit and the need to avoid loss, in combination, allocate the available productive resources of the Nation into the channels where these results appear to be most fully attainable.

Areas for action: The principal areas in which Government policy can do most to improve the economic climate are taxation, labor, the budget, and business regulation.

The most sensible approach to tax rate reform and to the correction of other features of the Federal tax system is not to "tax Peter to subsidize Paul," as the pending bill does, but rather to reduce tax burdens for all taxpayers, both individual and corporate. Bills to accomplish this result are before the tax-writing committees of both House and Senate. They should be considered and approved as a substitute for the administration's tax program.

Federal labor policy permits actions by unions which, if engaged in by employers, would be subject to prosecution as conspiracies in restraint of trade. Collective bargaining, as now generally practiced, is not an effort by both sides to ascertain what wages would be in a free labor market, but rather a process of pressuring employers to choose between union demands and an industrywide strike.

Federal budget policy has been characterized, especially in recent years, by a steady increase of spending for purposes not connected with national defense. This policy has carried the expenditure estimates for 1963 to the third highest level in our history, being exceeded only by the war years 1944 and 1945. The justifications offered for the expansion of nondefense spending are that we can afford it and that urgent needs require it—such as, in this case, the unemployed.

The doctrine underlying social-benefit spending is that Government spending induces economic growth. The argument runs: Public spending increases demand for economic product and the greater the demand, the greater the product; and to complete the circle, the greater the product, the more we can afford to spend.

The fallacy of this lies in equating demand with the wherewithal for the creation of product. Government spending in itself is demand spending; it is a kind of consumption expenditure. As such it comprises the acquisition of goods and services produced in the private economy. Government purchase orders could not be filled unless there existed, somewhere, plant, equipment, inventory, and personnel capable of producing the goods specified. Thus, Government spending is dependent upon already created capital; it does not generate new capital. And further, the taxes required to support a highlevel budget prevent the private saving and investment essential to the creation of more private enterprise capital.

The constitutional authorization to regulate interstate commerce and the common law doctrine that monopoly is inimical to the public interest have been expanded from their proper scope into a policy of "governmental business" which has already had a chilling effect on management initiative. Unless this trend is reversed, the time is not far distant when no important business decision can be made without first getting the consent of some Federal official.

The private economy is the source of jobs for the people and income for the Government. The growth of Government through ever-expanding activities and spending does not promote, but rather impedes, the capacity of the private economy to support the people and the Government. The road to greater economic growth is not greater Government consumption of resources but greater private application of resources to profitable use.

Mr. Thoreau: May He Rest in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it appears that it is not sufficient for this administration to continually harass business but they seem to want to harass individuals. For years a number of permittees have built cabins and enjoyed their vacations at Pinecrest in the High Sierras.

Now the Government comes along and wants to recover all of this land and force the permittees to tear down their cabins when, as a matter of fact, the Government owns thousands of acres which they could very well use as public campsites.

Recently Art Hoppe, of the San Francisco Chronicle, wrote an article on this matter which appeared in the July 30 issue of the Chronicle and which is reproduced here:

MR. THOREAU: MAY HE REST IN PEACE

(By Art Hoppe)

I don't wish to bore you with an account of my vacation. But it looks as though I've got to. You see, the reason I took a vacation was much the same as everybody else's: I wanted to get away from it all.

What I wanted to get away from, naturally, was politics, wrangling, redtape, bureaucracy and all the ills that arise from overwhelming Government. Like Thoreau, I said, I will return to unspoiled nature. So I rented a little cabin made of hand-hewn logs on the shores of a small blue lake 5,500 feet up in the High Sierra and miles from nowhere. There, like Thoreau at Walden Pond, I would meditate in peace on the essential realities, forgotten for once by the omnipresent forces of a busybody Government.

So on my very first day at the lake, we had a mass meeting to pass a resolution registering our strong protest, objection and opposition to the inequitable and confiscatory policies of our Federal bureaucracy. I thought of shooting myself.

The meeting was held in a clearing among the fir, pine and cedar. Several hundred were present—all members of the Pinecrest Permittees Association, "permittees" being what our Government calls those who own cabins around the lake.

It turns out the lake and the land around it is all owned by our Federal Government, which I should have thought of in the first place. Some 40 years ago, the Government, seeing it wasn't using the land for anything, invited people to come build cabins along the lake's shores. Because of technicalities, the Government couldn't sell the people the land. But, it explained, it would give each cabin builder an indefinite lease.

So, in what seems to me a remnant of the old pioneer spirit, those with initiative and foresight came and built their cabins. They bulldozed their own roads, installed their own water system, paid their own water system, paid their leasehold fees and their taxes and were left pretty much alone.

At one end of the lake, for the benefit of those without either the initiative, the cash or the desire to build cabins, the Government provided a large campgrounds with community toilets, water taps and little numbered stalls for each camper. The campers strung old blankets and sheets from between the trees for a modicum of privacy and the whole thing, if you ask me, looks like a well-organized slum. But the campers like it and it's good it's there. So, all in all, everybody was happy.

But then the U.S. Forest Service which runs the land, remembered its motto: "The Greatest Good for the Greatest Number." Which sounds nice. And it announced plans to tear down anywhere from 10 to several hundred of the cabins. Because it could get two numbered camping stalls on each cabin site. And eventually, it said happily, it might be able to squeeze 40,000 people into the little lake.

Of course, the Government won't pay the cabin owners a nickel for the homes they built, maintained, and improved over the years. In fact, the cabin owners will have to tear down their cabins and cart them to the dump at their own expense. That's in the terms of the lease. In the fine print.

So this confiscation is all perfectly legal. But you can see why I've been pretty busy attending mass protest meetings during my vacation. Well, I will say it was nice to have them in the open air for a change.

But I begin to wonder whether the proper function of Government is "the greatest good for the greatest number." Or whether it's to leave everybody alone as much as possible. The two aren't compatible. This seems to be the burning domestic issue of our times. I'd give you my opinion only I can't make up my mind. I think I could if I could get a little peace and quiet somewhere.

That Thoreau, he's lucky he's dead.

Profit Plateau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article from the Wall Street Journal of today entitled "Profit Plateau—Earnings Hold Near Peacetime Record, Rise 15 Percent From 1961 Quarter."

I wish to quote a few sentences from the article. It relates to a survey made by the Wall Street Journal all over the country. The articles states, in part:

> The results are those of the first 478 companies to report for the second quarter. They show net profits after taxes aggregating $2,719,344,000, a gain of 15.5 percent over the profits of the same companies in the second 3 months of 1961.

In the opening paragraph of the article it is stated:

> Corporate profits in the second quarter held close to the record peacetime rate achieved in the two preceding quarters and seem likely to remain close to the same rate in the current 3 months.

The facts and figures set forth are quite pertinent in connection with all the discussion at the present time of lowered profit margins, the need for income tax reduction, and indications which seem to predict a recession. A part of the article consists of a very interesting table. I ask that it also be included.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFIT PLATEAU—EARNINGS HOLD NEAR PEACETIME RECORD, RISE 15 PERCENT FROM 1961 QUARTER—MOST FIRMS EXPECT TO RETAIN GAINS IN CURRENT PERIOD—EXCEPTIONS: STEEL, DRUGS—HOW 478 CORPORATIONS FARED

Corporate profits in the second quarter held close to the record peacetime rate achieved in the two preceding quarters, and seem likely to remain close to the same rate in the current 3 months.

These are the conclusions from the Wall Street Journal's quarterly survey of earnings results and prospects.

The results are those of the first 478 companies to report for the second quarter. They show net profits after taxes aggregating $2,719,344,000, a gain of 15.5 percent over the profits of the same companies in the second 3 months of 1961. (See table accompanying the end of this story.)

If this gain approximates that of all corporations in the United States, as has been the case in previous quarters, the Nation's total corporate profits for the quarter would be at an annual rate of $26.2 billion. This would compare with a rate of $25.9 billion estimated by the Government for the first quarter of this year, and with a rate of $26.5 billion in the final 3 months of 1961. That late 1961 figure was the largest on record except for that of one quarter early in the Korean war, when the annual net rose above $27 billion; and the average rate for 6 months to March 31, at $26.2 billion, was the largest for any peacetime half year.

THIRD-QUARTER GAIN INDICATED

The expectation that profits will remain somewhere around the $26 billion a year rate in the third quarter is based on the prospect that a majority of important industries will again earn more than they did in the corresponding 1961 quarter. The gain for all industries together may not be up to the 15.5-percent improvement shown in the second quarter, because a few industries are likely to show substantial declines. But the annual rate estimated by the Government for last year's third quarter was $23.8 billion. A year-to-year increase of only 10 percent would be needed to produce a rate of $26 billion in the current quarter.

The second-quarter gain of 15.5 percent for 478 companies was not as large as the 28.3 percent gain from 1961 turned in by a similar group of 472 companies in the first quarter. But that was merely because this year's first quarter was compared with the 3 months when the 1960–61 general business recession was at its deepest. The Government put the rate of profits in that period at only $20 billion a year.

The second-quarter gains reflected general increases in sales. A second compilation, covering 146 companies which reported sales as well as earnings, shows profits up 17 percent—not far different from the results of the 478—and sales up 11.6 percent.

GAINS WIDESPREAD

Most industries shared in the second-quarter betterment over 1961. Out of 37 industries or groups into which the 478 companies may be divided, only 6 reported declines, and only 3 of these showed declines exceeding 5 percent.

These three were the moving picture group, with earnings down 7.6 percent because the new pictures of some companies attracted the public in smaller numbers than did last year's releases; the tobacco group, with net profits down 5.5 percent as a result of the expense of introducing new cigarettes by two producers; and the steel group, with earnings down 19.6 percent because of cost increases large enough to overcome the benefits of larger sales.

The steel mills may show an even greater decline from 1961 in the current quarter. An important factor in the second quarter's reduced earnings from a year earlier was a wage increase effective October 1. On top of that, further increases in costs as a result of this year's new labor contract took effect July 1. Thus, labor costs in the current 3 months will reflect a double increase over those of a year ago.

In addition, shipments of steel to customers probably will be lower, around 16 to 16.5 million tons as against 17.3 million in the 1961 third quarter. "If shipments are down, you can expect that earnings will be down too," says Alfred S. Glossbrenner, president of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. By contrast, second-quarter shipments were up a bit from a year earlier, between 17.5 and 18 million tons against 17.3 million.

Other industries which see the possibility of lower earnings in the current quarter than a year ago include building materials makers and drug producers. On the other hand, gains are indicated for automakers, chemical companies, oil companies, and makers of electrical and farm equipment, among others. Expectations for some of these and for additional industries are set forth below:

All five auto producers reported better earnings for the second quarter than a year earlier, principally because retail sales of cars for the quarter were up 22 percent. Makers of automobile equipment naturally shared in the prosperity, and the two groups combined reported net income up a wide 42.9 percent. Another big gain is likely for the group as a whole in the present quarter, with the car manufacturers planning unit sales to dealers for the quarter as follows:

	1962	*1961*
General Motors	650,000	370,000
Ford	425,000	374,000
Chrysler	110,000	123,000
American Motors	70,000	68,000
Studebaker	12,000	16,000

Suppliers of building materials reported earnings up 11.6 percent from a year earlier in the second quarter, mainly as a result of a higher level of construction activity. Officials of most companies, however, are cautious for the current quarter. They foresee a tapering of home building from the second quarter rate, which would bring such activity down to or below that of a year ago. And they also are worried by weakness of materials prices because productive capacity exceeds demand. "Demand is there but people are giving products away," complains D. C. Fabiani, president of Crane Co., maker of plumbing ware.

The chemical group had increased sales and reported a 9.9-percent gain in earnings in the quarter. And it expects similar gains in the present quarter. Volume of business being done is greater than last year and, while the prices of some chemicals show weakness, others are strong. Allied Chemical, for example, recently raised the price of some grades of polyethylene, a big-volume plastic used in such things as squeeze bottles and utility wastebaskets.

Makers of drugs, which reported second-quarter earnings down 2.9 percent from 1961, say there's little reason for expecting gains in the current quarter. A special factor in the second quarter was that currencies of some countries where drugs are sold in large volume, principally Argentina and Brazil, were devalued. This action reduced the dollar worth of profits and bank deposits there. The makers also complain of recent price weakness in antibiotics, increased foreign competition and a dearth of major new drugs. The companies depend heavily on bringing out new drugs to keep their sales rising. One executive says: "Like most companies, we're now awaiting Food and Drug Administration approval of an important new drug, but we can't be sure it will come in the third quarter."

Electrical manufacturers reported a combined increase of 25.2 percent in earnings for the second quarter, and seem likely to show an increase this quarter also, though it may not be as big in percentage because business strengthened substantially in the third quarter last year. Ralph J. Cordiner, chairman of General Electric Co., said recently the company "expects 1962 to continue to be a good business year."

Producers of aluminum earned 36.7 percent more in the second quarter than a year earlier and, with production up from a year ago and still rising, seem likely to show another wide gain in the current quarter. At the start of this quarter the primary aluminum industry was operating at 87 percent of capacity against 78 percent a year earlier, and Aluminum Co. of America is planning to start up a new production line, which would raise the industry's rate to 89 percent. The one possibility of trouble in sight at present is that Alcoa and Reynolds Aluminum are negotiating with the Aluminum Workers International Union, but the companies have already signed agreements with the United Steel workers, representing a larger number of employees.

The outlook for the domestic oil industry is for somewhat higher earnings during the third quarter than in the like period of 1961, if prices for refined products hold fairly steady. If prices decline, as they did last summer in some areas, earnings gains would be reduced or eliminated. Demand for petroleum products in the second quarter was 3 percent higher than a year earlier, and this pace is being maintained. The outlook for international oil companies with large marketing facilities abroad is even better, with demand abroad strong and prices firm. Earnings of the oil group as a whole in the second quarter were up 4.5 percent from 1961.

In the paper and paperboard industry second-quarter earnings were up 12.5 percent. Alexander Calder, Jr., president of Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp., attributes his company's second-quarter gain to "generally better prices and improved product mix," that is, good demand for high-profit items. The third quarter he expects to be "substantially improved" over the 1961 period.

Rubber companies reported a gain of 2.4 percent from 1961 in second quarter earnings. Foreign currency devaluations were costly to some of the group. In the third quarter, earnings are expected to be above those of last year, benefiting, as in the second quarter, from demand for tires on the larger number of new cars that will be produced.

Profits of 478 firms in second quarter rose 15.5 percent from those of the 1961 period. The columns below show earnings for the second quarter of 1962 as compared with those of 1961, with percentage increases or declines by groups. Where individual company reports cover 3-month periods other than calendar quarters, the nearest comparable periods have been used:

	2d quarter 1962	2d quarter 1961	Change from year ago
9 aircraft makers	$20,506,000	$17,072,000	+20.1
22 autos and equipment	595,367,000	416,629,000	+42.9
18 building materials	45,350,000	40,643,000	+11.6
10 building supplies	27,047,000	24,527,000	+10.3
8 cement companies	18,303,000	16,116,000	+13.6
12 chain stores	41,683,000	40,566,000	+2.8
4 apparel and clothing	9,399,000	7,789,000	+20.7
8 chain grocers	32,284,000	32,777,000	−1.5
22 chemicals	249,610,000	227,047,000	+9.9
16 department stores	50,172,000	38,808,000	+29.3
5 distillers	16,434,000	16,109,000	+2.0
13 drug manufacturers	37,255,000	38,383,000	−2.9
23 electrical equipment-electronics	114,352,000	91,334,000	+25.2
11 broad-line companies	106,175,000	84,246,000	+26.0
12 specialty companies	8,177,000	7,088,000	+15.4
8 farm equipment	59,767,000	55,439,000	+7.8
18 food products	59,185,000	56,517,000	+4.7
5 bakery products	10,287,000	10,305,000	−.2
3 dairy products	5,146,000	4,928,000	+4.4
10 general food products	43,752,000	41,284,000	+6.0
11 mining and metals	46,205,000	36,095,000	+28.0
3 aluminum companies	33,899,000	24,802,000	+36.7
8 copper and other metals	12,306,000	11,293,000	+9.0
8 movies and movie theaters	8,928,000	9,663,000	−7.6
12 office equipment	67,450,000	56,351,000	+19.7
14 petroleum products	601,374,000	575,328,000	+4.5
5 publishing companies	4,140,000	3,706,000	+11.7
23 pulp and paper products	62,721,000	55,753,000	+12.5
7 railway equipment	9,210,000	7,661,000	+20.2
6 rubber companies	24,604,000	24,026,000	+2.4
18 steel manufacturers	71,107,000	88,400,000	−19.6
10 textiles	30,405,000	19,694,000	+54.4
7 tobaccos	64,334,000	67,971,000	−5.4
23 tools and machinery	28,810,000	26,401,000	+9.1
124 other companies	228,454,000	192,832,000	+18.5
Total (434 industrials)	2,537,423,000	2,202,428,000	+15.2
21 railroads	49,331,000	21,537,000	+79.1
23 utilities	132,590,000	124,301,000	+6.7
Total (478 concerns)	**2,719,344,000**	**2,354,266,000**	**+15.5**

Talented Author and Columnist, Sam T. Mallison, Offers Enlightened and Entertaining Comment on the Subject of Dinners

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the pressures and responsibilities of public office are a constant challenge to every Member of Congress, and become especially evident as we attempt to complete our official business and to reach adjournment.

It is appropriate, therefore, that the attention of my colleagues should periodically be drawn to matters which offer a pleasant relaxation.

If anyone can provide such a respite with his words of wit and meaning it is Sam T. Mallison, the noted and joyfully read author and columnist.

In the late twenties it was my privilege as a cub reporter to serve under Mr. Mallison's experienced tutelage when he was city editor of the Clarksburg (W. Va.) Daily Telegram. He has also acted as secretary to the late Governor of West Virginia, Hon. Howard M. Gore, and is a past State auditor. Throughout the years he has been a keen student of people and events, and has acquired an apparently endless supply of anecdotes and stories guaranteed to amuse, entertain, and inspire through his writing and lecturing.

A frequent contributor to newspapers and author of a number of magazine articles, he has also written two books "The Great Wildcatter," and "Let's Set a Spell," the latter being a collection of West Virginia yarns.

Typical of his work is a story appearing in a recent issue of the Rocky Mount, N.C., Evening Telegram, a newspaper for which Sam covered the sporting scene in days gone by. It is a pertinent and all-too-familiar situation that he describes, and in reading the article I am confident that each of my colleagues will call to mind a similar experience from his own past.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "On the Subject of Dinners," written by Sam T. Mallison, and appearing in the Rocky Mount Evening Telegram, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON SUBJECT OF DINNERS

(By an old reporter)

If and when I should ever become sufficiently wealthy and otherwise have the excuse or opportunity, I shall indulge myself a luxury which has been a dream of mine for many years. I shall put on a dinner, at which the guests will be seated and the food served at precisely the announced hour (those who aren't seated will get no food): and the oratory will be strictly confined to the speaker of the evening. These dinners have been one of the banes of my existence. In the course of my work as a public relations adviser, it has been my obligation but certainly not my pleasure to attend hundreds of dinners, and I can count upon the fingers of my two hands the number that have departed from the same moronic pattern.

The invitation says that the dinner is to be in the Colonial Room at 7 p.m., and you are sufficiently idiotic to believe that it means what it says. So you go to the named hotel or club at the appointed hour and you are dismayed to find the Colonial Room completely deserted save for a few bus boys, who, in between small talk about their romantic adventures, lazily engage themselves in placing the china and silverware on the tables. Through experience you will learn that one-half the guests have not yet begun to dress at their respective homes, while the other half is scattered in various rooms at the club or hotel, attending predinner cocktail parties.

It is always 7:30 to 7:45 before the first stragglers put in appearance in the dining hall and generally, it is 8:15 before the waiters begin serving the food. That part is endurable, but only those possessed of a Buddhic serenity can endure what follows.

First, when the dinner is over, the chairman of the program committee raps his gavel and talks for 10 minutes in introducing Charlie Whoosit, who, in turn, will introduce the master of ceremonies, and that simpleton can always be depended upon to present each of the two dozen moochers at the speaker's table; and, not content with that, he never fails also to introduce each of the members of the banquet committee "who did a remarkable job of arranging this magnificent dinner," when actually nine-tenths of them never knew until their names were called that they had been members of this or any other committee; and of course, Mrs. Busybody, who was chairman of the decorations committee, has to be recognized, and she, in turn, necessarily must pay tribute to her associates on that committee.

You would think this would dispose of the preliminaries, but the old boy with the gavel is just getting warmed up. He never fails to note the presence of "good old Danny," who he describes, as the modest, humble fellow who is really the backbone of the organization and who is always giving his very best for dear old Rutgers. And, of course, Danny has to pretend to be surprised and then deliver a few words of appreciation which he prepared a week in advance and committed to memory. Of course, Danny does not have to say anything, but it is not of record that any Danny ever failed to respond.

It is now 9:30 and certainly we are ready for the speaker of the evening, Senator Clapsaddle, who has been expectantly and hopefully straightening his tie for half an hour. But, no, our genial master of ceremonies has some things up his sleeve. It would never, never, never do for him to introduce the speaker. And, besides, he must first present "our able and distinguished chairman, who has a delightful task to perform." It turns out that the chairman is to present a plaque or certificate to Eddie Noteshaver in recognition of the latter's boundless charity and community leadership. Of course, Eddie takes the floor and makes one of his rare departures from falsehood by protesting that he doesn't deserve the award "because there are so many others here tonight who are far more deserving."

We are now ready for the principal speaker. Or are we? Don't be silly. The toastmaster must first present the chairman of the committee on prehistoric mounds, who, in turn, introduces the organization's "silvery-tongued orator," whose pleasant assignment it is to present Senator Clapsaddle. All this with the result that it is nigh onto 11 o'clock before the weary Senator strides to the podium to read a 17-page thesis of doubletalk.

There are main reasons why I had a great affection for the late Matthew Mansfield Neely, of West Virginia, who served that State for 50 years as Congressman, Senator, and Governor, but the one thing that locked him in my heart was his performance at a dinner of the kind I have described. He was Governor at the time, and was scheduled to be the only speaker at a large dinner scheduled for 7 p.m. In view of the importance of the occasion, he had spent a great deal of time and effort in the preparation of his speech. Although knowing from experience of the inevitable preliminaries, he was an incorrigible optimist and somehow had the idea that at this particular affair he would get the floor not later than 8:30.

But Neely failed to reckon with the talents of the master of ceremonies, who introduced almost half these in attendance with flattering remarks about each, before presenting the fellow who was to introduce the Governor. This worthy was a local windbag, who undoubtedly aspired to some appointment at the hands of the Governor, because he delivered a 30-minute peroration, in which he compared Neely not unfavorably with Caesar, Napoleon, Aristotle, and St. Francis.

The result was that it was 10:40 when he finally wound up with an eloquent flourish. Neely, tightlipped and boiling inwardly, stepped to the microphone. "Ladies and gentlemen," he said, "according to the program I am now expected to give you my address, and I shall do so. My address is 1701 Kanawha Boulevard, Charleston, W. Va." Whereupon, to my delight and the consternation of the others, he strode out of the room.

It is my profound conviction that when Neely arrived at the Pearly Gates, 4 years ago, St. Peter, remembering this historic occasion, spread the red carpet for his entrance.

S.T.M.

Castro Has a New Weapon—Dope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, a most significant article by Jack Anderson appeared in the July 29, 1962, issue of Parade magazine, one of America's leading weekly periodicals. This article again points up one of the main reasons for the increase in the illegal narcotics traffic in the United States. The smuggling of narcotics with the consequent ruination of many of our youth and their families is but another facet of the Communist attack on our democracy. The cooperation between Red China and Communist Cuba in this nefarious conspiracy is a disgrace to the civilized world. The article follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Fidel Castro is trying to give Uncle Sam the needle. Not merely sharp words—but a hypodermic needle. His aim is to insert it into the body of American society and to inject demoralizing drugs: cocaine from his native Cuba and opium from Red China.

By dealing in dope, Castro is grabbing up dollars which he sorely needs to bolster the Cuban economy. He is also encouraging drug addiction among Cuban refugees in the United States to discredit them in the eyes of their hosts. But most of all, perhaps, he hopes to undermine the character of the American people themselves.

From Government files opened for the first time and from sources both official and unofficial, Parade has been able to secure exclusive and undeniable evidence of this insidious racket in slow death. It is a story of back-alley smuggling that ranges from the poppyfields of Burma and China through the wide-open ports of Hong Kong and Macao, thence to Havana, Miami, and New York. It is also a story of undercover agents and gunplay.

Most shocking fact of all is Castro's cynical disregard of appeals to clamp down on the drug traffic, which is as harmful to his own people as to those he is trying to subvert.

Only 12 days after Castro seized power, Commissioner Harry Anslinger, the blunt boss of the U.S. Narcotics Bureau, sent one of his top agents, Charles Siragusa, to Cuba to seek cooperation in the worldwide fight against narcotics. Siragusa went straight to the rebel leader and delivered a secret, 18-page report entitled "Illicit Narcotics, Traffic in Cuba."

It pulled no punches, listed 32 international and 25 Cuban gangsters deeply involved in drug smuggling. Additional names and details were furnished to the Cuban authorities on January 16, January 20, January 21, and February 2, 1959. To make it easier for Castro's police, the Narcotics Bureau included the Havana addresses and telephone numbers of most mobsters on the list.

But nothing happened. From the Bureau's battered, eighth-floor headquarters here came audible grumbling from the impatient Anslinger.

Stung by Anslinger's criticism, Castro on March 17, 1959, replied: "We are disposed not only to deport the gangsters but to shoot them. Send us that list and you will see how we will capture them and send them away."

The Cuban dictator ignored the fact that his police had been in possession of the list since January 12. Anslinger wearily provided Castro with another copy on April 7. Shamed into action, Castro grudgingly rounded up five gangsters on the list.

DEPORTATION URGED

The Narcotics Bureau continued to urge Castro to crack down on all drug violators and to deport the interntaional mobsters. The Cuban authorities finally got rid of a few big-name racketeers but did nothing to halt the drug traffic. Sadly Siragusa reported to his chief:

"Some months ago I prepared descriptive sheets on known and suspected gangsters who were prominent in Cuban gambling and narcotics trafficking. Our purpose was to provide these sheets to the new Cuban regime toward the prosecution or expulsion from Cuba of American, Italian, French, and Canadian gangsters. Subsequent developments indicated the lack of cooperation by Cuban authorities, and we stopped supplying the sheets to Cuba."

The lack of cooperation was no ordinary government "fix." Agents, working under cover at the risk of their lives, began to learn the real reason the Castro government was doing nothing about the illegal drug traffic. It had gone into the smuggling business itself.

Castro can claim his police arrested two American racketeers, Frank Cammarata and an accomplice, for possessing cocaine. But their real crime was smuggling drugs as a private enterprise without giving the Cuban Government a cut.

FBI files contain a fantastic account of how Castro tried to take over Cammarata's smuggling operations. He used two renegade American hoodlums to try to trick Cammarata into disclosing where he got his drugs and how he disposed of them in the United States. One of the hoodlums actually was planted in Cammarata's cell to win his confidence. But the wily Cammarata kept his mouth shut.

Next, the renegades were encouraged to make their own contacts for peddling Castro's drugs in the United States. They set up a Havana import-export company as a front, then got in touch with an underworld contact in Rochester, N.Y.

Eventually, a shady character known only as "Nicky" showed up in Havana. He was taken aboard a 70-foot yacht and reportedly was shown 500 pounds of marihuana, plus some 200 pounds of cocaine.

The renegades worked for a time under Juan Feranadez de Castro of the Cuban National Revolutionary Police. When he defected last October, he confirmed many details of the FBI report.

Meanwhile, narcotics agents began keeping close watch on drug smugglers posing as Cuban refugees. In New York City's Harlem, an undercover man won the confidence of Pablo Guerra, who showed him a sample of cocaine and arranged to sell him some last January. As Guerra was about to make delivery, agents closed in on him.

He whipped out a loaded revolver. But before he could get off a shot, Agent George Rahas jumped him, stunned him with a blow from his own gun and disarmed him. They found Guerra's apartment decked with pictures of Castro and the Cuban flag.

In Florida, the Narcotics Bureau used a Cuban defector to infiltrate a smuggling ring. This significant report was submitted to headquarters by the Miami agent in charge:

DEFECTOR'S EVIDENCE

"An interesting sidelight to this investigation is information received from several sources. These sources, including the special employee the undercover defector, allege that the four defendants are actually agents of the Castro government in Cuba and their sales of cocaine are not primarily for their own monetary gain but (1) to obtain money for the Castro regime, and (2) to induce Cuban refugees in the Miami area and elsewhere to use cocaine and discredit those refugees in the eyes of the American people."

Charles Siragusa personally took charge of the case, and on March 14, five Cubans were arrested. The ringleader, a man named Rodriguez, had 40 grams of cocaine. But far more significant, a search also produced a half a pound of opium from Red China's Yunnan Province, probably the produce of poppyfields along the Burmese border.

In a private report to the Treasury Department, the Narcotics Bureau declared: "Rodriguez stated at the time of his arrest that the opium seized from him had been obtained from the Red Chinese in Havana and transported by him to the United States. The flow of cocaine from Cuba to the United States has increased tremendously over the past few years. However, this was the first investigation which established that opium of Communist China origin was also being smuggled from Cuba to the United States."

But perhaps the strangest story of all goes back to Castro's visit to the United Nations. After he and his party had stormed out of their New York hotel, where they had plucked and cooked chickens in their rooms, agents found among the debris empty gelatin capsules—the kind used to hold vitamins.

Had the capsules contained only vitamins, they should have been swallowed whole; for the gelatin dissolves in the stomach. The suspicion; They may have contained either heroin or cocaine which cannot be taken in such large doses. Could it be that some members of Castro's own entourage were drug addicts?

The crackdown on Cuban smugglers has brought an official protest, delivered by the Czech Embassy, that the Cuban Government is not engaged in drug smuggling. The State Department, in rejecting the note, pointed out that no such accusation had ever been officially made by our Government.

However, Castro would not be the first to convict himself in the public mind by protesting too much.

Tribute to the Late Dr. Conrad A. Elvehjem, President of the University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation, on July 27, lost one of its great scientists and educators, Dr. Conrad A. Elvehjem, president of the University of Wisconsin.

The world—particularly, my home State of Wisconsin, of which he was a native son—suffers the great loss.

During his lifetime of dedicated service to humanity, Dr. Elvehjem graduated—step by step, honor by honor—from a farm boy to becoming one of the Nation's great educators and internationally known biochemists.

The sorrow of his passing can only be moderated by deep gratification for the contribution which he made to bettering human life.

As scientist, educator, outstanding citizen, warmly loved human being, he leaves to his fellow men—whom he served continuously—and to the Nation, and the world, an invaluable legacy.

From Wisconsin's great outflow of respect, esteem, and love for Dr. Elvehjem, I ask unanimous consent to have articles from the Milwaukee Journal and the Wisconsin State Journal—reflecting upon his dedicated, creative life—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

CONRAD A. ELVEHJEM

The University of Wisconsin has suffered a severe loss in the death of Dr. Conrad A. Elvehjem, its president. So have the people of Wisconsin. So has the field of science.

It was as a biochemist and nutritionist that Dr. Elvehjem was most widely known and honored. His research findings in the use of niacin to cure pellagra were by themselves enough to win worldwide acclaim.

Distinction upon international distinction was heaped on him for achievements in the nutritional field. Quite as significant, he won the lasting respect and confidence of his fellow faculty members at Madison. As dean of the graduate school and then as president, since 1958, this has stood him in excellent stead.

Dr. Elvehjem tackled duties of the demanding office of university president with characteristic determination and energy. He realized the magnitude of his responsibilities. He established the reputation, in his brief term, of a strong-minded, indefatigible and absolutely fair, conscientious administrator.

He faced up to great problems in connection with the rapid expansion of the university. No University of Wisconsin president has faced greater. He had to deal with vexatious, embarrassing internal eruptions involving university staff in which any decision would be severely criticized. There was never the slightest suspicion that he would substitute the easy course for what he believed to be the proper one.

Dr. Elvehjem was Wisconsin born, Wisconsin trained. The University of Wisconsin was his life. He never doubted its high destiny and his contributions to its achievement are beyond present measure.

Wisconsin will forever be in his debt.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal]

Conrad A. Elvehjem

Wisconsin and its university were proud to call Conrad A. Elvehjem one of their own, and this native son who rose to head a great university made the pride a mutual thing.

Today the Nation and the world share Wisconsin's sense of loss at his sudden death.

The scientific world owed him much for the discoveries that studded his greatest research years as a young teacher and later the chairman of a famed biochemistry department.

Untold thousands who never knew his name escaped one of man's ancient scourges because Connie Elvehjem had probed pellagra's secrets and pointed to a cure.

And two generations of students, from all the States and every walk of life, will remember him not only as a great teacher but as a warm friend and adviser.

The academic world has many fine researchers these days, and Conrad Elvehjem was one of the great ones. More important, his restless curiosity and his dedication to knowledge were matched by a burning desire to help others learn.

Under his encouragement as instructor, chairman, dean of the graduate school, even as a busy president, young men and women here never could ignore his demand for excellence. It was his own standard and he made it contagious.

"We shouldn't ask for more," said a Wisconsin Governor in 1958 as Dr. Elvehjem was inaugurated, citing his long service to the university and to learning. "But we must."

Connie Elvehjem plunged into his new job at the speed he felt its many-sided problems demanded. There was so much to do, with enrollments rising as fast as the breathtaking pace of new discovery.

He was everywhere: a new lab's opening, a student function, faculty and staff meetings, budget hearings, the mounting load of administrative detail.

And wherever he went or spoke, always he spread the message of excellence coupled with size. Early in his administration he said, "I do not tolerate the inference that size must mean mediocrity."

Hard work he found a delight and a challenge.

"Give us, then, the hills to climb and the strength to climb them," he said as he took on the presidency.

Conrad Elvehjem's strength gave out this week. His years and example have left others the strength to carry on.

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

The Student Who Became Prexy—Death of Conrad A. Elvehjem Recalls His Rise From a Wisconsin Farm Boy to Head of State University; Friends Remember His Modesty, Humor, and Love of Democracy

(This profile, written by Robert Eskew, appeared in the September 1961 issue of Let's See magazine.)

When he was a boy jouncing aboard a one row cultivator in the cornfields of his father's farm in McFarland, Wis., he began to develop what he now describes as his "endless fascination for living, growing things."

Later, in the coiled-glass labyrinth of the University of Wisconsin's now famed biochemistry department, he transformed this fascination into a personal reputation as one of the giants in the field of human nutrition.

Now, as president of that same university, Dr. Conrad A. Elvehjem can view from the high windows of his expansive office in Bascom Hall much of the heart of the 250-acre main campus, or walk beneath its forest of maples, oaks, and elms among the nearly 20,000 students who graze the greening "hill," feeling more than ever before that same "endless fascination for living, growing things."

And this he does—7 days a week—as he begins his fourth year as executive administrator of one of the Nation's leading universities.

Dr. Elvehjem, a lean, pokerfaced Norwegian, is an easy man to meet although not a particularly easy man to know. His handshake is reserved. His voice is low, resonant, vaguely warm, yet his rock-chinned face is a mask of dead seriousness. He stands erect, near the 6-foot mark, but not rigidly, for there is composure and a natural grace to his manner. From his straight, neatly trimmed hair down to his two-toned summer shoes he is dressed entirely in shades of gray; even the wide-set, shadowed eyes are gray by midafternoon office light.

You sit opposite him as he sits poised, waiting for your questions. There is no small talk. To vital statistic-type inquiries his answers form bare equations: Where were you born?—McFarland, Wis. When?—May 27, 1901. Or he might formulate: "With the exception of 1 year which I spent in England, all of my academic life has been lived at the university." Or, "I received all three of my degrees at Wisconsin, beginning with my bachelor's in 1923."

TALK OF VITAMINS STRIKES A SPARK

Pure statements of fact which might mislead anyone to believe that the rise from farm boy to internationally eminent biochemist to university president in 57 years amounts to anything more than a half column of "Who's Who" statistics. This then was the rarified scientist speaking and at the first mention of his field his talk began to warm noticeably, its pace quickened.

Initially, though, he described his specialty during his long career as a biochemist as simply "vitamins." Did he discover them? "No, no—certainly not," he exclaimed, and as he spoke a sudden, incandescent smile shattered the dour mask, then vanished quickly as he hastened to explain that prior to his research in the field there had been positive development regarding vitamins; however, up to that time there had been no isolation or identification of specific vitamins.

Reluctant as Dr. Elvehjem is to discuss his personal accomplishments, the world-famous nutritionist has sharp comments to offer on several timely subjects:

On modern nutrition: "We're overnourished in America today. We're simply overeating. Too many rich foods. Too much fat, cholesterol. Too much heart disease, hypertension. Too much food, that's it."

On his taking vitamins: "Every time I eat, yes—but never out of a bottle." A rare share of that unpredictable smile lighted his face again as he said this.

On the status of higher education:

"I think there has been a remarkable increase in public awareness and interest at this level," he answered, shifting smoothly into academic gear.

"And never has education been in a more favored position. The only handicap is that nobody wants to pay for it. Parents want the best for their children but it becomes more and more difficult to translate this desire into dollars. The public seems willing enough to build new high schools and grade schools because of a pressing local need. But higher education is so much more remote. It suffers more as a result.

"The odd thing, though, is that in recent years a reverse has taken place in the way private and public institutions derive much of their financing. Private schools are coming to depend more on Federal assistance while the public ones receive more and more private gifts. But either way, there's never enough."

BALANCED EDUCATION WAS HIS GOAL

"I believe in a strict emphasis on balance in all areas of education. I just can't get excited about science versus the humanities. We're all human beings and we all have the same broad needs in our education as we do in our everyday lives. I've tried to deemphasize this conflict and push for as liberal an education as possible.

"Of course, specialization is necessary. But ideally undergraduate work should involve liberal arts only, with specialization beginning at the graduate level. This might never be fully realized but at least some of the sciences and professions are tending to lean more heavily in this direction."

As for the proper role of athletics in higher education, he says, "I never was an athlete myself [he later confessed to a dribble or two of basketball during high school, a splash of swimming, and a broken-oared attempt to crew for the university] but I enjoy athletics. I definitely feel they have their place in university life, but again this must be balanced. I think we achieve it here. Our boys are students first, athletes second. Only students with good academic records achieved on their own ever make a Wisconsin team."

With typical understatement Dr. Elvehjem explained that the "biggest single factor in the role of a college president is variety. So many things happen at the same time."

A typical working day would go something like this—in at 8 a.m. to read mail until 9; then a cabinet meeting with the vice-presidents of academics and finance, plus the special budget consultant, for an hour and a half; then back to his desk for dictation (he answers 50 to 100 letters per week) mixed with visitations from faculty members and various other callers until lunchtime.

The afternoon is devoted to a meeting with one of the many university committees for an hour or two, then back to the mail, phone calls, a cursory reading of field journals (his only reading other than newspapers), visitors again, or perhaps one of the many speeches he is called upon to make throughout the year. (He speaks to at least 10 student groups and as many alumni chapters each school year, as well to numerous outside organizations.)

He is usually out of his office and on his way home by 6 p.m. But the clincher is this—he occupies that office 7 days a week most of the year, a habit he developed during his research years when a day never happened that there wasn't something to observe or attend to "down at the lab."

It has been said that work flows across Dr. Elvehjem's desk like a wild spring thaw, or as one associate put it, "There can't possibly be enough hours in the day for the man." Yet despite his overwhelming workload, he is visibly a relaxed individual. His only detectable nervous habits (if they can be called that) are a sometimes frequent clearing of the throat and an unconscious jingling of pocket change whenever he is called upon to speak in the rough.

His secret, according to Mrs. Elvehjem, is that he can slip to sleep in 5 seconds, any time, any place, and often does. Rumor runs that he once dozed during a dean's meeting, said she, adding that fortunately no one was awake to prove it.

It is this immense capacity for work without strain, this "grace under pressure" that everyone mentions when they begin to speak of him. As a president he is already considered by many to have proved himself one of the best the school has ever had.

He is widely praised as "a man who knows what he wants and knows how to get things done." As one associate expressed it, "He runs a tight ship. He's damned exacting. But this makes it easier for the rest of us because we always know what is expected of us." He is praised, too, for his thoroughness, his fairness, his sympathetic understanding of other people's problems, and his humility. Dozens of illustrations of his "down to earthness" cropped up during conversations with friends and associates, such as this typical example.

HE WANTED NO SPECIAL PRIVILEGES

It was a football Saturday in Madison, and University Avenue was filled with traffic churling its way toward turnoffs for the huge Camp Randall stadium. Sardined in the swarm was President Elvehjem inching his way along in the family Pontiac. Just as he reached a desirable exit the reigning traffic cop decided to give this particular avenue a respite, so unknowingly ordered the president's car to move along. Now, a quiet word or two whispered into the dutiful constable's ear by Dr. Elvehjem and it would have been as Moses before the Red Sea. But the president chose instead to move along with the herd and take his due as an ordinary citizen. "He wouldn't have had it any other way," a friend insisted.

This incident reveals why Dr. Elvehjem thoroughly understands and is dedicated to the democratic system as practiced at the University of Wisconsin.

About his sense of humor, a colleague explained it this way: "There are two kinds, you know. One has to do with gags and wisecracks and joke telling. The other is a deeper, more natural thing. It has to do with a balanced, considerate view of life. That's the kind of sense of humor Connie has."

Much emphasis is also placed on Connie's fondness for his home life, his pride in his wife and two children, all of whom, like himself, are graduates of the university. Daughter Peggy is now married and living in Minneapolis and son Robert is completing a stint in the Army, so President and Mrs. Elvehjem now live alone in the imposing four-story gabled brick president's home up on Prospect Hill.

CREATIVE AND PROGRESSIVE

Dr. Elvehjem excused himself and Mrs. Elvehjem remained to talk for a moment about her husband of 34 years. He is a fiercely punctual man, she confirmed, part of his drive toward self-discipline, and he is deeply emotional, although he mostly keeps it in check. "He's also very creative," she went on, "and very progressive. Once he found a student putting his foot into fresh cement and he just couldn't understand the impulse behind it. He's appalled by anything destructive."

She was silent a moment, then continued. "Is he happy as president? Yes—I think he is definitely happy. I'm sure he misses his research, still he never mentions it. But then he'd be the one to answer that one."

Dr. Elvehjem's answer was this: "Yes, I miss it constantly. This was one of the hardest decisions I ever had to make—to give up research. But I made it and I've since come to see that administrative work itself is an endless process of study and research. You're always searching for better, more intelligent ways to realize the significance of life. It's all important, no matter how you approach it."

We Can See Now How Billie Sol Estes Got Away With It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the very able editor of the Rock County Star Herald, of Luverne, Minn., is properly disturbed by the apparent lack of action involving evidences of irregularities in the purchase by the Department of Agriculture of Federal grain bin aeration duct assemblies. Particularly upsetting to the editor, Alan C. McIntosh, is the lack of action in the Government departments many months after it was called to their attention.

A well-documented story describes the situation in such thorough fashion that I am sending copies to the Attorney General and the Secretary of Agriculture, requesting reports from them. Meanwhile, under unanimous consent request, I include Mr. McIntosh's editorial on the subject in the Record.

The editorial follows:

We Can See Now How Billie Sol Estes Got Away With It

One of our close friends of our college days period in life accidentally got into the trucking business soon after his graduation.

It wasn't too long before this two-fisted, rugged individualist had made his first million. He has made a number of them since before selling out for a fabulous figure.

A few years ago he achieved the dubious distinction, of being charged by the State of Illinois with a gross violation—one of his trucks was found to be the heaviest overloaded truck in the history of law enforcement.

The fine was a big one. It didn't bother our friend one bit.

"We got caught on that one but think of the thousands that got through without a fine," he said.

That, unfortunately, seems to be the attitude of some business executives today.

Over a year ago A. R. Wood Manufacturing Co., bid on some aeration duct assemblies for Government grain bins.

The Luverne firm didn't get the contract which would have meant more jobs for more Luverne men during the slack period of the year.

Wood's were 46 cents higher per unit than Gate City Steel of Omaha who had the low bid.

Management here couldn't understand how they could have been high by that much.

Anybody can make money if he overloads a truck, if he is a trucker, or if he doesn't follow specifications if he is a manufacturer.

We had the belief that maybe lighter gage steel had been used on these assemblies by the Omaha manufacturer.

A check by inspectors showed that of the grain bins checked 60 percent of the assemblies were made of lighter gage steel than called for in the Government specifications and contract.

We think this was a fraud against the taxpayers. It was an injustice to other firms who bid on this contract in good faith and who planned to follow specifications.

The Star-Herald did not want to approach this on a political basis even though we do not have any personal regard for Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. We disagree bitterly with Senator Humphrey but like him personally and respect his integrity.

So—we wrote Senator Humphrey and told him the situation and said we didn't want to make political capital out of this matter but we wanted Humphrey to have the information and give Secretary Freeman a chance to put his house in order. (In the light of the dawdling, the coverups, and the bluffing done by Secretary Freeman in the Billie Sol Estes case we would have done the citizenry a favor in airing this matter nearly a year ago.)

The Senator secured the information and according to information given him the matter had been turned over to the authorities for quick disposition of the case.

What disturbed us greatly was a conversation we had with one of the Midwest's leading businessmen at the end of 1961. We told him about how the Omaha firm had substituted lighter gage steel and ventured the opinion that they might get into difficulty.

"They have too much political influence in Washington," said our friend dismissing the possibility that anything harmful to Gate City might come out of the matter.

We think he was right.

Pretty soon a year will have elapsed.

To the knowledge of the Star-Herald staff not one grain bin in this matter of 3,500 aerators has been repaired or brought up to specification standards.

No bond has been forfeited.

No charges have been brought.

The Department of Justice has brought no action, according to their own admission. (We will make no cracks about the head of the Department and his swimming pool parties and dunkings.)

We are disappointed for several reasons.

1. A Luverne manufacturer lost out on a contract and Luverne workmen lost out on employment.

2. There seemed to be no great alacrity or interest by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Justice to "do anything" about the matter even though taxpayer dollars were involved.

3. There was seemingly no great indignation in Secretary Freeman's Department about the matter even through a newspaper was "blowing the whistle" about a matter that deserved investigation. Which makes one wonder at the indifference of our bureaucratic wasteland. Don't they care any more about the taxpayer getting his money's worth?

About the only conclusion we have reached in the whole matter is this—having watched the tortuous, tortoise slow, meanderings of the Department of Agriculture where it takes a month for a letter to get from one desk to another, we can surely say we now understand how Billie Sol Estes could get away with all he did in Washington.

School-Age Americans Stir Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the days when we read so much about juvenile delinquency, it is refreshing to read more about juvenile decency. The National Education Association report of 1962 has been released by Mr. Ewald Turner, president of the National Education Association. In it, Mr. Turner reported that we have every reason to rejoice over this year's 1,880,000 graduates; he speaks not only about the brightest and most favored children of our society but of all of them.

The Daily Journal, of Elizabeth, N.J., has brought this situation to my attention. I ask unanimous consent to have its July 12 editorial "School-Age Americans Stir Pride" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL-AGE AMERICANS STIR PRIDE

America has 1,880,000 good reasons this summer to feel pride in its present and faith in its future, says Ewald Turner, president of the National Education Association. That's the total of the Nation's 1962 high school graduating class. What this educator has to say further about today's school-age Americans in an open letter to parents is additional cause to feel proud.

Mr. Turner in his travels as NEA president saw boys and girls in action in and out of classrooms all over America last year. He found them completely at home in a complex modern world; he found them more knowledgeable; he found them imbued with a deep respect for intellectual achievement and for the sound value, material and spiritual, of education.

They are working harder—thousands are going to school on Saturdays and in the summer, Mr. Turner says. In Maine boys and girls will spend 10 weeks of summer receiving instruction in anatomy, physiology, psychology and genetics; in a rural California area whose schools do not provide this kind of teaching students are attending Saturday classes in mathematics, foreign languages, art, creative writing and science.

And another heartening aspect is the educator's emphasis that he is not talking about only the brightest and most favored children in our society. In a depressed area of St. Louis where families are large, both parents work and the average family income is about $3,100, boys and girls are turning out school work as good as that produced by more fortunate children because they realize the importance of learning.

One of the Nation's 1,200 merit scholars is a southern boy, son of a laborer who supports four on $2,000 a year. This boy maintained a straight-A average while working on a farm after school and during vacations. Another merit scholar, a girl, who earned all A's in school, lives with a grandmother; the family income is $1,200 a year. "She is the finest all-round student I have known in more than 30 years of teaching," was the accolate of her principal.

In these days of gangs and goons, vandalism, viciousness, and vapidity, the NEA president's report is a refreshing change.

Getting Our Money's Worth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, historically, it has been our responsibility and privilege as Members of the House of Representatives, to serve as guardians of the Federal Treasury and as initiators of appropriations legislation.

In carrying out our constitutional responsibility in this regard, we, each year, consider the appropriation of billions of taxpayer dollars, and I am certain each Member does not need to be reminded of the weight of our duties. But, in dealing with appropriations legislation, at times, we might forget that fiscal responsibility is not our special province but extends also to the executive branch of government and specifically to those agencies for which we now are considering appropriations for fiscal year 1963.

It gave me great pleasure when I recently learned of an example of fiscal responsibility and public service demonstrated by one of our Federal agencies—the Public Housing Administration.

At an out-of-pocket cost of $5, the PHA developed a proven technique for the economical removal of multicoats of paint at potentially vast savings to local housing authorities, which plan, own, and operate the half-million dwellings developed with the assistance of the Federal agency.

I am sure my colleagues will agree that anytime our Government makes a material research contribution at such nominal cost, the Congress is vitally interested. I pursued this matter with officials of the Public Housing Administration and the National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association, which contributed to this project, in order to bring this to the attention of Congress and the public.

A major contribution of this nature, which answers longfelt health and economic needs, certainly requires commendation of Congress, and I believe it appropriate that we recognize this achievement in technical progress and particularly in light of the agency's economical prudence in its development.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the report furnished me by Commissioner Marie C. McGuire, of the Public Housing Administration:

JULY 31, 1962.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. O'KONSKI: As you requested, I am submitting the following report on the progress of the steam paint remover technique developed by our maintenance engineering branch.

As you know, Mr. George A. Erickson, PHA paint engineering technician, worked very closely with Mr. Neil Garlock and Mr. Michael Grasso, of the National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association, in the perfection of this method for the economical and speedy removal of paint, utilizing a joint steam pressure and chemical remover process.

Public health officials of many communities throughout the country had requested research by the association to develop such a technique for several years. At the same time, PHA has foreseen a continuing and growing need for such a method.

We, therefore, realized a public need and service could be met through research in this field, even though in the absence of any research funds, per se, it would have to be accomplished at nominal expenditure and through staff work without drastically affecting the demands of this on-going program.

The fundamentals of the technique are, as with all proven innovations, seemingly quite obvious. It incorporates the application of a water-rinsable paint and varnish remover followed by that of steam under 1 pound of pressure. As you may know, steam application is a widely accepted method for removal of wallpaper, but, to our knowledge, had never before been used as an accelerator for the removal of paint.

Since our basic research, which was successfully proven approximately a year ago, demonstrations have been held at the request of local health officials, housing authorities, paint and chemical manufacturing concerns in Baltimore, New York City, and Philadelphia. Everywhere, it has been enthusiastically acclaimed. In fact, the National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association has recently published a technical circular describing the process and its development.

We, in the Public Housing Administration, feel justifiable pride in our contribution in this achievement, particularly since the cost to us was only $5 and some 100 man-hours of staff work.

I am glad to furnish this information to you. If I can help further, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this method described very effectively and yet clearly by Commissioner McGuire, indicates a substantial potential savings in labor and costs, and I intend to write the Administrator of the General Services Administration, urging that agency to look into the application of this method in its properties.

I am sure my colleagues will be further interested to learn that the Maritime Commission has inquired of PHA as to the potential of this method in removal of the coating used for preservation of our Reserve Fleet.

It is obvious that $5 wisely spent has bought a great deal for the taxpayers, and I warmly commend the PHA for this contribution.

Nike Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., has printed in its July 26, 1962, edition an excellent editorial on the recent Nike-Zeus antimissile success in scoring a kill against an intercontinental ballistic missile.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIKE SUCCESS

Nikita Khrushchev has been boasting that the Russians have an antimissile missile for some time now. American officials have been reluctant to believe it or perhaps they have been publicly disbelieving it, for a purpose.

Be that as it may, we have now succeeded in hitting a missile with an advanced Nike antimissile missile, and this is a significant step forward in the early stages of the development of a defense against missiles. If the development of antimissile missiles continue along the lines of traditional success for defense counterparts to offensive breakthroughs, then the day may come in the years not too far ahead when we have a defense against missile attack.

If an adequate defense against missile attack is ever achieved, the complexion of the war threat which necessarily hangs over the United States today will have changed radically. (It is dubious if ever there will be any foolproof defense against all means of delivery of nuclear weapons.)

The value of the current successful test is both military and psychological. Khrushchev and Russia might be ahead of us in the antimissile race, but at least now we are in the race. And there are signs that we have made some progress in rocket competition, in which we trail also.

All Americans can hope that the announcement of the successful performance of the Nike-Zeus means that we are on the road to perfecting at least some defense against missile attack. It is not a bit too early. In fact, we are perhaps late. But we are at last on the way, and this is heartening. The speed with which we now can utilize our knowledge and the new missile is all important.

An Impractical Pragmatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, much has been written recently about what constitutes the key to economic growth. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of July 30 is as sound and responsible and constructive as anything I have seen:

AN IMPRACTICAL PRAGMATISM

The Kennedy administration is often described as pragmatic rather than theoretical. If so, let us put theories aside for the moment and look at its economic policy in coldly practical terms. How effective is it?

First of all, it is true the policy is an unfinished work, since Congress has neglected to enact parts of it. As one of President Kennedy's closest aids, Theodore Sorenson, expressed it on Howard K. Smith's television show the other night, "We have submitted to the Congress last year and this year an extensive program to stimulate the economy."

The President's legislative program includes farm controls, medicare, depressed areas, manpower retraining, youth employment, and discretionary Presidential authority to boost public works spending.

Mr. Sorenson apparently feels that if Congress had passed every last bit of the program, instead of only parts of it, the economy would now be booming. As it is, the officials regard the economy's blood as so tired that they are seriously thinking of asking Congress for tax cuts to build it up.

Yet if one examines the proposals to date, it is evident they have nothing to do with economic growth. Whatever else may be said of the farm plan that failed, its purpose was to regiment the farmer into producing less, not to stimulate more output. And whatever the pros and cons of medicare on other grounds, not even its advocates could very well claim it was a growth hypodermic.

Aid to depressed areas, unemployed youth, manpower retraining, public works—all these are by definition palliatives designed at most to soothe sore spots. They have no more connection with economic growth than did similar programs in the thirties, when all the considerable efforts of Government, year after year, were unable to significantly alleviate mass unemployment, much less lift the whole economy out of the mire of depression.

So, as a practical matter, blaming Congress for inaction doesn't get the administration far. Anyway, Congress has cooperated handsomely in the higher Federal spending and deficits which appear to be a key part of the administration's "growth" policy.

Spending has gone up many billions, and not just for defense and space, if even all those increases are justified. An imposing deficit was piled up last fiscal year, and another is in store this year. And yet the economy is said to be stagnating.

Since all this Federal medicine hasn't done the trick, the President is being urged to try much more of it, which seems rather curious advice. Outstanding liberal economists like Truman Adviser Leon Keyserling want him to quit temporizing and embark on a truly expansionary program.

That means the greatest possible spending Government officials can conceive, for any purpose anyone can dream up. The whole point, which is not without political overtones, is to spend, so as to put more people to work and put more dollars in people's pockets.

Assuming a willing Congress, such a program would certainly mean Government growth. But it could not mean economic growth because its premise is uneconomic.

A policy with the avowed objective of maximum Federal spending, directed from Washington, must cause a monstrous misallocation of resources. This defect has characterized every so-called planned economy in history and is glaringly plain in every one today from Socialist India to Communist Russia. Inevitably the wrong things are built and produced in the wrong places for the wrong needs.

The free-market economy's success is due above all to its practicality; it is simply the most effective means of channeling resources to productive and prosperous ends. The more its mechanisms are interfered with, the more impractical an economy is.

It would seem, then, that the administration and its advisers in and out of Government are barking up the wrong policy tree. The key to real economic growth lies where it always has, in lifting rather than increasing the burden of Government and so releasing the energies of a free people in a free market.

To figure it all out otherwise requires, we suggest, an extremely peculiar kind of pragmatism.

No Aid for Anti-Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the latest issue of Prevent World War III—No. 60, summer of 1962—contains a forceful editorial dealing with the futility of granting U.S. aid to those countries which have displayed a dedicated hostility toward the United States. This editorial, entitled "Rewards of Anti-Americanism," cites facts and figures which show quite clearly that President Nasser's government in Egypt has received hundreds of millions of dollars worth of U.S. aid while it continues its nefarious practice of inciting hate toward the United States. The editorial also points out that some of our policymakers are under the impression that U.S. aid will mellow President Nasser's belligerent policies. This is sheer illusion. Under no circumstances should our foreign assistance programs be used to strengthen dictators and governments which flout the U.N. Charter and attempt to undermine our prestige.

I introduced an amendment which was approved by the Congress as part of the foreign aid bill, to try to concentrate U.S. aid in countries which share our view of the world crisis and do not divert their own resources to Communist-backed military or propaganda efforts. This editorial is a strong affirmation of that position.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial mentioned above printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REWARDS OF ANTI-AMERICANISM

In February of this year Chester Bowles, the President's adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs, paid a short visit to Egypt. On arrival, he declared that it was his intention to observe developments there and to gain new insight into common problems. As noted by the London Times, February 16, 1962, Bowles' arrival had been immediately preceded by two more solid manifestations of American solicitude. Thus an agreement had been worked out to supply the Cairo Government with 200,000 tons of wheat and 50,000 tons of vegetable oil. The other generous gesture involved a U.S. grant amounting to $40 million for the construction of a system of silos throughout Egypt to store and conserve food supplies. The New York Times correspondent reporting from Cairo (February 12, 1962) asserted that the silo project was regarded by Egyptians (unnamed) as of major consequence for the future of the country's economy.

However, shortly before Mr. Bowles appeared in Egypt President Nasser described American aid in a Swiss television interview as unexceptional. As if to make this point stick in the minds of the Egyptian people, Radio Cairo, February 20, 1962, repeated the same line, stating that aid granted by America to the United Arab Republic is simple, ordinary, and insignificant. Moreover, the broadcast went on to say, U.S. aid serves more as a propaganda issue than a useful program. It should be noted that this gratuitous slur came on the heels of Mr. Bowles' departure from his brief sojourn in the land of the Pharaohs.

How do the facts square with President's Nasser's snide reference to U.S. aid? We shall cite the essentials, not because we have pangs of conscience that American aid has been too little, but rather to alert Americans as to the futility of a policy which strengthens the hand of one of our country's most implacable enemies and dedicated foes.

American aid to the Nasser regime has almost doubled in the last 2 years, from $80 million to $150 million. Since 1959 about $292 million worth of American agricultural commodities have been supplied to Egypt. Total aid to the Cairo Government now approaches the $600 million mark, three-quarters of which have either been loaned or donated in the last 3 years. As one recent report observes, even the total figure is misleading, because this aid has actually cost U.S. taxpayers an additional $200 million. This is due to the two-price system whereby U.S. taxpayers pay American farmers twice as much as Washington charges Nasser.

This is by no means the whole story. For example, whereas Nasser pays the United States virtually nothing, he is obliged to pay in valuable cotton for the military hardware which Egypt currently receives from the Soviet Union. It is also important to bear in mind that while Soviet aid is in the form of funds for the construction of the high Aswan Dam, whose long-range economic benefits are debatable, but serves to bolster Nasser's prestige, American aid literally helps to keep the impoverished Egyptian masses alive. Indeed, without the underpinning of aid from the U.S. imperialists, it is doubtful that Nasser would have been able to take even the first steps in his grandiose socialistic schemes or to foist upon the Egyptian masses the tremendous sacrifices involved in the construction of the highly touted Aswan Dam.

It has been authoritatively stated that 2 out of 5 loaves of the flat brown bread consumed by the Egyptian peasant, are derived from American surpluses which the Nasser regime sells at a good profit. These funds are used for other purposes, including the buildup of high military machine. Consequently, the sorry plight of the Egyptian masses remains a constant. Discussing this point the correspondent for the London Financial Times (Dec. 21, 1961) wrote: "The disparity in living standards between the countryside and the towns is so great that they remain virtually two different worlds. * * *" Under these circumstances Nasser finds U.S. aid indispensable. It prevents the rumblings of unrest and disillusionment from reaching the explosive point, while he continues to peddle his pie-in-the-sky projects.

In view of the foregoing, one can appreciate the caption of a recent press report which read: "U.S. Capitalism Aids Nasser's Socialist Rule" (New York Post, Apr. 10, 1962). Of immediate significance in the citation of facts is that the overwhelming majority of Egyptian masses are completely unaware that Nasser's welfare programs are financed, in a large measure, by the U.S. Treasury. Let it be understood that this is not an accidental failing on the part of the Cairo government, nor does it stem from the lack of public information media to inform the people about the true state of affairs. No, the ignorance of the Egyptian masses in this respect is carefully cultivated by a deliberate news blackout in Cairo's controlled press and radio. Nasser's studied effort to keep the people in the dark over the scope of U.S. aid is but the other side of Nasser's propaganda policy which portrays the United States as a deadly enemy of the Arab peoples.

Obviously Nasser's propaganda pitch would lose its impact if the people were told the truth. Therefore, the Cairo propaganda machine operates on two levels vis-a-vis the United States. On one level it virtually ignores the constant assistance rendered to the Egyptians by our Government over the past 10 years. On the other hand it conducts an unremitting propaganda attack against the West in general, and the United States in particular.

A few days before Mr. Bowles came to Egypt, Nasser's radio network carried a lurid report alleging that the United States and Britain had concocted a master plan to destroy the Arab peoples as a means of getting rid of Abd an-Nasir and the trend he champions. One week following this incendiary charge against the United States, Washington announced the agreement that would make $40 million available for the preservation of Egypt's food supply. Another point of contrast should be noted. Shortly after Mr. Bowles departed from Egypt with an air of optimism, the Cairo Radio made veiled references to the United States as an enemy of the Arab peoples.

Nevertheless, the U.S. decision to salvage Nasser, proceeds full steam ahead. In May, Nasser's Finance Minister Kaissouny came to Washington and had a series of talks with top officials in our Government. According to the press, the results of these talks were most satisfactory. The Christian Science Monitor, May 5, 1962, reported that the World Bank and a consortium of nations led by the United States, would underwrite a $500 million commitment intended to shore up Nasser's sagging socialism. This startling news needed a touch of public relations and so a spate of reports appeared in the press, assuring Americans that Nasser had turned over a new leaf. The discovery was made that the Nasser government, after all, wasn't so bad as their own pronouncements.

One columnist wrote that "Nasser is nobody's 'Yes' man." Another columnist described how Nasser had been able to keep his home-grown Communists under lock and key. Still another columnist whispered that there was evidence that Nasser has "cautioned some African leaders not to get in too deep with the Soviet Union." Another report mentioned that Nasser's propagandists "have gone light on anti-Israel war cries over the past 6 or 8 months." Still another "discovery" was reported, namely that Cairo broadcasts against the West were now in "low key." This rather clumsy attempt to prettify Nasser may admittedly fool the uninformed. However, to those who know the score, it is but another tragic indication of the widening gap between reality and U.S. policy in the Middle East.

It is true that Nasser's propaganda attack against the United States has been toned down, but its venom still persists. Thus, during the very days when Nasser's image was being recast for American consumption, the Cairo Radio attacked the worldwide imperialist objectives of NATO and charged that it was working to undermine the peoples of Africa (Cairo Radio, Apr. 29, 1962).

On May 2, Cairo radio broadcast a vicious attack against President Kennedy's brother, Edward Kennedy, as a Zionist propagandist. The previous day, May 1, Radio Cairo told its African listeners that the West had no other objective but to continue to bleed the African peoples. "The United Arab Republic," the broadcast boasted, "has given material proof that in 5 years the Africans can replace the Europeans, that those whose wealth is gained from stealing the African wealth should go and look for another continent." Another broadcast on May 2, this time to the Arab world, boasted that Nasser's navy "is lying in wait for Israel and its friends."

Whether these and other toned down attacks will assume a more virulent form in the days ahead, does not depend on Washington's projected grants to Cairo, but on Nasser's own evaluations of what tactics suit him best at a given moment.

When Mr. Bowles was in Cairo he told the press (although it was never reported to the Egyptian people), that the United States had given substantial sums to Egypt but that we (the United States) have never asked it (Egypt) to go along with us. This is a true statement but it is incomplete. U.S. aid should never be designed to turn other countries into satellites. But on the other hand, it should not strengthen those who would cut our throats at the first opportunity. That is why the society has consistently stressed the principle that "all recipients of American aid must demonstrate their responsibility and reciprocate our friendship and good will." This principle is simple in concept, but it is a fundamental necessity if U.S. aid is to truly protect the national interest.

The society has wholeheartedly supported American aid programs, but we have insisted that they should not be conditioned by the blackmail of other countries. This is not only good economics, it is prudent politics. Surely the American taxpayers are entitled to at least the same consideration which is shown to regimes which have made anti-Americanism a paying proposition. It is time to call a spade a spade. We can think of no more appropriate place to begin than in Cairo.

Glaser and Workman: Future Leaders in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Kurt Glaser and Bill Workman will be carrying the Republican banner in the 24th Congressional District of Illinois and in the U.S. Senate race in South Carolina respectively in the elections this fall. In reviewing the backgrounds of the aforementioned, it was obvious that the Republican Party is most fortunate to have men of their caliber who have decided to make it their business to do whatever is possible to maintain the traditions of our great Republic.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Glaser received has A.B., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees in government and economics at Harvard.

In addition, Mr. Glaser has worked as a salesman and as a management analyst for Records Engineering, Inc., since 1952. He has conducted a research and consulting business, supplementing his other activities.

As a professional staff member of U.S. military government and later the State Department in Germany, Mr. Glaser acquired detailed knowledge of European politics. He has negotiated with officials in both Communist and friendly governments. After leaving Government service in 1950, Mr. Glaser returned to Europe briefly in 1954 as an investigator for the House Committee on Communist Aggression—Karsten committee.

Mr. Glaser has worked as a news writer and researcher in Germany and in Washington, D.C. He has supervised research on policy conducted by the Governmental Affairs Institute in Washington under Department of the Army subcontract. In March 1962 he was coordinator of an international conference held by the Foundation for Foreign Affairs, Chicago, and the Herder Institute of Germany on Berlin and the Future of Eastern Europe.

From 1956 to 1959, Mr. Glaser taught history and government to American Armed Forces in Europe with the University of Maryland. Since 1959 he has been with Southern Illinois University at Alton, where he is now associate professor of government.

Mr. Speaker, William D. Workman, Jr. is a native South Carolinian, having been born in Greenwood, on August 10, 1914, and reared in Greenville.

Bill attended the public schools of Greenville, and was graduated from Greenville High School in 1931. He was graduated from The Citadel in 1935, after making a distinguished record in academic, military, athletic, and extracurricular activities. During the 1935-36 school year, he worked in Washington, D.C., and attended the George Washington University Law School at night.

In 1936, Bill entered newspaper work as a reporter on the Charleston News and Courier. He lived in Charleston from 1936 until January of 1941, when he was called to active duty as a reserve officer. While in Charleston, he worked both as a newspaperman and as manager of radio station WTMA, then owned by the Charleston newspapers.

He served for 5 years in the Army during World War II, with duty in the United States, England, north Africa, and the Pacific. He has retained his military Reserve status since 1935, and currently is a colonel in the Army Reserve.

At the end of World War II, he established a news and courier bureau in Columbia, and began an extended career as a capital correspondent, covering government, politics, and other significant aspects of South Carolina life. He later became correspondent also for the Greenville News. He has written principally for the Charleston and Greenville papers, although serving other publications on occasion. He has been the South Carolina correspondent for Southern School News since 1954, and for many years represented Newsweek magazine in this State. He has been a news commentator for radio stations in Charleston and Greenville, in addition to regular appearances on WIS and WIS-TV in Columbia.

Bill Workman's book, "The Case for the South," was hailed at its 1960 publication as a definitive statement of the southern position on States rights, constitutional government and racial integrity. He also participated in the writing of three other books during the 1957-60 period: "This Is the South," "With All Deliberate Speed," and "Southern School Progress and Problems."

Beginning in June of 1960, he began a three-times-weekly column for the Hall Syndicate of New York City. The column is published in a number of newspapers throughout the South and East.

Bill Workman's writings have brought him the Distinguished Service Award of the Southern Association of Science and Industry in 1955; a special citation and letter of commendation from the South Carolina Forest Industries Committee in 1956; and a certificate of achievement from the Chief of Civil Affairs, Military Government, U.S. Army, 1956.

He is married to the former Rhea Thomas, of Walterboro. She is a Winthrop graduate, and obtained her master's and Ph. D. degrees from the University of South Carolina. Mrs. Workman has been a teacher for many years in South Carolina schools, and she is currently an associate professor of English at Columbia College, a South Carolina Methodist Church college. The Workmans are charter members of Trenholm Road Methodist Church, and Bill is a member of the official board.

The Workmans have two children. Bill III, is a 1961 graduate of The Citadel, and is currently doing teaching and graduate work at the University of South Carolina. Their daughter, Dee, is a sophomore at Columbia College.

Bill Workman was officially nominated by the South Carolina Republican Party at its March 17, 1962, State convention as its official candidate in the November general election for the U.S. Senate seat now held by Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Bill Workman is a staunch conservative and a dedicated South Carolinian, southerner, and American.

Mr. Speaker, the qualifications of Mr. Glaser and Mr. Workman have not gone unnoticed by the press throughout the country. To point up this fact I include at this time an editorial from the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier, dated July 21, 1962. The article follows:

LEADERS FOR CONGRESS

In the person of W. D. Workman the South Carolina Republican Party has chosen a quality candidate as the standard-bearer for the State's conservatives. But this is not the only State where the GOP is finding the best kind of new political blood for the fall campaign.

Typical of the able, outspoken Republican candidates of 1962 is Prof. Kurt Glaser, candidate for Congress in the 24th District of Illinois. Indeed this candidacy exposes as an untruth the silly charge that conservatives are antiintellectual. Professor Glaser is a scholar of international note. His recent history of Czechoslovakia is considered the outstanding work on that subject.

But Professor Glaser is a scholar who is thoroughly grounded in the political and economic traditions of this country. He is an articulate anti-Communist and defender of national sovereignty. He is one of that brave band of scholars that has battled the orthodoxies of liberalism. His campaign platform includes opposition to the U.N. bonds. If elected, he promises to seek membership on the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Workmans and the Glasers of America are a promise of better days to come in the United States. But they need all-out support from their fellow conservatives.

Interfaith Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the United States has been the leader of the free world in a continuing struggle against tyranny of both the Communist and the Nazi-Fascist varieties. The totalitarian countries do not believe, as we do, in the essential worth of each individual and his right to equality of opportunity with every other individual without regard to race, creed, color or national origin. There are difficulties that we must face up to, but we must demonstrate to the world that we understand the nature of the human problem of prejudice and discrimination, and that we are acting in every conceivable way to solve it.

The interfaith movement, with which I am associated, was organized in New York City 25 years ago to dramatize this effort by the celebration of Interfaith Day on the fourth Sunday of September of each year. My distinguished colleague Senator KEATING has recently been signally honored by this movement. Sidney Z. Searles, president of the interfaith movement, has named Dr. Raphael M. Dansker, vice president of the Investors Funding Corp., of New York, to be the national chairman of Interfaith Day, which occurs this year on September 23.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the announcement of the celebration of Interfaith Day as released on July 31, 1962.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERFAITH DAY

Interfaith Day is celebrated nationally by resolution of the U.S. Senate and proclamations will be issued by the President of the United States as well as the Governors of the various States. In many States where interfaith has established chapters appropriate ceremonies will be held to commemorate this occasion.

The Governor of Virgin Islands, Ralph Paiewonsky, has recently organized an interfaith chapter and has advised that a proclamation will be issued as well as ceremonies on Interfaith Day.

In New York City ceremonies will be held at the Mall in Central Park on Sunday, September 23, starting at 1 p.m. An attendance of 25,000 is expected. On this occasion awards and citations will be presented to 112 high school seniors of the 56 high schools in New York City, who during the 4 years of their attendance at their respective high schools have been selected by their student body and teachers as having done the most to promote mutual respect and understanding.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner is honorary chairman of this celebration and will personally present these awards and citations to the high school students. Invitations have been issued to the Governors of the States, the Mayors of New York State, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Maryland, as well as invitations to members of the House of Representatives, U.S. Senate, Cabinet members, representatives of the United Nations, and other public officials, educators, scientists, etc., who are members of interfaith and who are interested in advancing the cause of interfaith movement.

Dr. Dansker as national chairman of Interfaith Day has formed a committee of 500 prominent people in all walks of life, to serve with him on an honorary committee. Dr. Benjamin Mays, president of Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., will serve as honorary cochairman, representing the field of education.

Chairmen of the various committees appointed by Dr. Dansker are as follows: Coordinating committee, Dr. John J. Theobold, chairman; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Paul Haverty, cochairman. Program committee, Harry Herschfield, chairman. Educators committee, Dr. Herman P. Mantell, chairman; Charles H. Silver, cochairman. Radio and television committee, Ted Cott, chairman; Seymour N. Siegel, cochairman.

Public relations committee, Capt. Maurice M. Witherspoon, chairman. Finance committee, John A. Murphy, chairman. Veterans committee, Lt. Col. Emanuel Targum, chairman. Park arrangements, Hon. Newbold Morris, chairman; Tom Geraghty, cochairman. Labor and management, Hon. Jay Kramer, chairman. Entertainment and music, Harry Hershfield, chairman. Special committee, Hon. Edward R. Dudley, president, borough of Manhattan; Hon. Louis Lefkowitz, attorney general, State of New York; Emil K. Ellis, Dr. O. L. Friedman, Albert Godwin, John O'Reilly. Interfaith Friendship Clubs in the public schools, Dr. Abraham Kroll, chairman. Scholastic awards, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, chairman. Interfaith scholarship committee, Senator Kenneth B. Keating, chairman; Harry Rabinowitz, cochairman. Awards and citations committee, Dr. Raphael M. Dansker, chairman.

The following persons have been selected to be the recipient of the Interfaith Day citations for having rendered distinguished service in the field of human equality, fellowship and brotherhood. All of these people have been invited to appear personally at the Interfaith Day ceremonies in Central Park to receive their awards from the chairman of the award committee, Dr. Dansker and Mayor Wagner.

Religion, fraternal, and the humanities: Francis Cardinal Spellman, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Rt. Rev. Horace B. Donegan, Rev. Billy Graham, and Rabbi William Stern.

Publishing, broadcasting, and communications: Henry Luce, Gardner Cowles, Spyrous Skouras, Buddy Adler, and Edward Bernays.

Music and entertainment: Bing Crosby, Danny Kaye, Frank Sinatra, Marian Anderson, Lucille Ball, Shirley Booth, Joe E. Brown, Mahalia Jackson, and Irving Berlin.

Private enterprise: Jerry Dansker, Jennie Grossinger, Henry Ford II, David Rockefeller, Bernard Baruch, William Benton, Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., Huntington Hartford, Conrad Hilton, Crawford H. Greenewalt, and Elizabeth Arden.

Labor: George Meany, Harry Van Arsdale, Jacob Potofsky, and David Dubinsky.

International affairs: Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senator William Fulbright, Gen. Omar D. Bradley, Mayor Willy Brandt, Gov. Michael Di Salle, Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, Lewis Strauss, James A. Farley, Paul J. Getty, Eric Johnston, Paul Hoffman, Dr. Ralph Bunche, Congressman Emanuel Celler, and Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

Education, judicial, natural science: Judge Felix Frankfurter, Judge Louis Kaplan, Robert Frost, and Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.

NATO Isn't Happy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following comment appearing in the St. Paul Pioneer Press July 27, by Walter T. Ridder, is important to us in the Congress who are concerned about America's future attitude toward our NATO alliance:

NATO Isn't Happy

(By Walter T. Ridder)

Washington.—The recent appointment of Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer as new commander of the American forces in Europe and also as military head of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been received with something less than enthusiasm by our NATO Allies.

Despite official statements to the contrary, the European nations are not happy over the Lemnitzer choice. Reduced to its essence, they think Kennedy fobbed off on them someone whom he didn't like. "If the President thinks he's a second-rater," grumbled one European diplomat, "why does he send him to the most important alliance you've got?"

At his most recent press conference, President Kennedy had a lot of nice words to say about Lemnitzer, but it has long been an open secret in Washington that the President didn't have much use for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The antipathy apparently was rooted somewhere in the different personalities of the men. Lemnitzer is quiet, unostentatious and personally unaggressive. Those who have worked with him say he is brilliant, but that he tends to be self-effacing. The later is not a characteristic notably admired by Kennedy.

Relations between the men, apparently guarded at first, became stiffly strained after the Cuban disaster. The President felt—and in view of the result of that operation perhaps rightly—that he had been the recipient of some pretty bad military advice. He held Lemnitzer responsible. Shortly after the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs, Kennedy installed Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor as his White House military adviser. Taylor watched carefully his lines of authority and didn't make like a substitute Chief of Staff, but in the nature of things his presence was an embarrassment to Lemnitzer and emphasized the President's dissatisfaction with General Lemnitzer.

All of the foregoing was well known here and Kennedy's appointment of Taylor as new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to succeed Lemnitzer merely served to underline his confidence in the former and lack of confidence in the latter.

This is why the Europeans aren't so happy about the whole thing. In the past, they've gotten what they considered the best American military talent. NATO's first military boss was a not-too-obscure American general by the name of Dwight D. Eisenhower. When he left to run for the Presidency, he was succeeded by his close personal friend, Gen. Alfred Gruenther, whose reputation as a military "brain" was exceeded by none. After him came Gen. Lauris Norstad who was regarded as a young man on the way up and who did so outstanding a job that he stayed at his post far longer than anyone had anticipated. Now Norstad is gone and Lemnitzer replaces him.

There is no reason to believe that Lemnitzer will not do a good job. He has had a conspicuously good record throughout his soldiering career. It's just that everyone knows the President doesn't like him and that's why the European members of NATO are inquiring rather petulantly: "What's going on here?"

Defeat Points Way to Final Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, an adaptation of an old expression which appropriately fits the recent medicare vote is that medicare's opponents have won the battle but will lose the war. Such is the belief of the Courier-Post, Camden, N.J., with which I concur.

Their editorial "Defeat Points Way to Final Victory", highlights some of the crucial consequences of the last week's vote. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record and to commend it highly to the attention of the membership of this body.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Defeat Points Way to Final Victory

Death of the compromise bill to provide medical care for the aged through social security is very likely to prove a Pyrrhic victory for those who scuttled the administration's proposal.

Even without one more such victory, the coalition against the plan stands to lose the medicare war. Proponents now can renew the issue with redoubled determination next year and in all probability will succeed.

Elderly citizens, we feel, suffered a worse setback than President Kennedy as a result of the Senate's decision. But it should only be temporary, and the President's earlier prediction should come true that if defeated this year medicare surely will pass next.

An overwhelming majority of Congressmen have acknowledged the need for extending America's program of social insurance to help the aged pay their health bills, and it won't be too long before they hit an acceptable method. The medicare plan holds a wide appeal for millions of persons past 65 and for millions of younger persons weighed downed by the impact on their budgets of heavy hospital and nursing-home charges for ailing parents.

Soaring costs of Blue Cross-financed hospital services, caused by increased use and in some cases misuse, are likely to drive others to support the medicare philosophy.

And people somehow are no longer frightened by the expression "socialized medicine," which the American Medical Association hangs its case on.

The temporary victory over the plan has caused some jubilation among the medical profession, including the Point Pleasant doctor who led the New Jersey revolt recently. He wishes the Government "would realize that any so-called medicare program can only lead to complete socialized medicine in this country."

But the worst fears conjured up years ago about social security itself have been proven unfounded, and it is probable the socialized medicine scare will prove just as unworthy.

The AMA's antediluvian, unswerving opposition to any health plan but one of its own—while changing its own—only serves to discredit the organization and harm the medical profession itself. Fortunately, that attitude isn't representative of every doctor by any manner of means.

President Kennedy's call for what amounts to retaliation at the polls for the plan's current defeat may or may not have any bearing on the outcome of any individual election. It may be noted in this connection that both Senators Case and Williams of New Jersey supported the plan. Williams' vote was cast with most Democrats, while Case was one of only five Republicans who went down the line for medicare.

However, the President is playing partisan politics in blaming the plan's defeat solely on the Republicans. If the Democrats had given him anything like solid support it would have won. They did not; 21 voted against him.

And while it's difficult to assess the President's observation that defeat of the plan was a setback for "every American family," all nevertheless can take cognizance of the British Medical Journal's rap at the AMA's attack against medicare generally.

The Journal, publication of the British Medical Association, blasts the AMA's attempt to depict England's National Health Service as socialized medicine, calling this "vulgar, cheap, and nonsense."

The British dismay is at what the Journal called mushrooming growth of the AMA public relations activities and the colossal sums expended on misrepresentation of what is happening in Britain.

Regardless of the description, the AMA's momentary victory has been costly in both money and prestige and serves to point toward victory for medicare next year.

Activities of Dr. Martin Luther King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Americans have had sufficient opportunity now to witness on television and to read in the various magazines of the agitation antics of Dr. Martin Luther King and his followers in the racial disturbances they have created in Albany, Ga. Dr. King has repeatedly sought to make a martyr of himself even to the extent of having another member of agitation party set free on bail in order to fulfill Dr. King's scheduled appearance on "Meet the Press" last Sunday. He has made a mockery of religion in seeking publicity through use of publicly staged prayers in the manner of the Pharisees who, in the days of Jesus, erroneously thought that public prayer on the street corner for publicity purposes would win a better and quicker response than the sincere, humble prayer uttered in the quiet of a bedroom or other appropriate place.

From the reaction I have noticed, it seems apparent that Dr. King's main support lies with politicians who seek political advantage with Negro voters in pleading for Dr. King through public statements and more recently by a telegram made public by the Governor of New York urging that the Federal Government intervene in the situation in Albany, Ga., to give protection to Dr. King. There has been little indication of any other sympathy for Dr. King's actions in provoking racial disturbances in an area where he is not himself a resident.

I have been pleased to read in the July 30, 1962, issue of the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga., a report of an editorial in the Pittsburgh Courier which in effect renounces the actions of Dr. King. The report of these editorial remarks is contained in an editorial in the Chronicle entitled "'Lunatic Fringe' Is Exposed." I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LUNATIC FRINGE" IS EXPOSED

Dr. Martin Luther King, the Reverend Ralph Abernathy, and others of their ilk, apparently have succeeded in convincing many persons that their actions in Albany speak for a majority of the city's Negro residents. But the Negro editors of one of the Nation's leading Negro newspapers are not deceived. They recognize the Albany agitators for what they really are—representatives of only the "lunatic fringe."

The Pittsburgh Courier, in its Georgia edition of July 28, deplored the tactics of the so-called Negro "leaders" in both Albany and New York City. In a editorial captioned "Midsummer Madness," the newspaper commented:

"Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., released from the Albany (Ga.) jail when some unknown Negro paid his and Rev. Mr. Abernathy's bail, threatens a new drive of mass demonstrations in violation of local ordinances.

"Since there are already some 700 young local Negroes awaiting fines which they cannot pay for previous demonstrations, it would seem to be time to take stock of where we are going and who is going to pay for it.

"The Albany authorities have indicated no disposition to countenance these demonstrations, so it appears that if Dr. King is successful in mobilizing demonstrators to violate the law, there will be many more fines to pay, which will probably impoverish Negro Albany.

"Meanwhile, in New York City the minuscule Negro nationalist movement has launched a picketing campaign against a white man (who employs scores of Negroes outside the black community) who plans to open a steak house in Harlem.

"Because Jackie Robinson denounced this nonsense, he was denounced and the company of which he is vice president had one of its Harlem lunch counters picketed.

"The protestors were offered an opportunity to buy out the white man or to buy into his corporation, but, of course, they did not have the money nor the credit, so nothing happened, except that these fanatics vented their spleen on successful Negroes.

"It is a tragedy that these elements get unwanted publicity as Negro leaders when they represent nobody except the lunatic fringe."

On the same day the Pittsburgh paper was published, the "lunatic fringe" representatives in Albany resumed their violation of city ordinances, and Dr. King got himself jailed again. Thus there is no reason to believe that the Courier's sound advice against further costly lawbreaking will be heeded by the outside agitators and publicity seekers who are fomenting strife and discord among Albany residents.

But the paper's editorial will have served a worthwhile purpose if its only effect is to emphasize the rejection by responsible Negro citizens of the kind of "leadership" offered by King and his band of troublemakers.

Ducks Find a Champion in Reuss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Star of July 22, 1962, by Mr. John McKelway, entitled "Ducks Find a Champion in Reuss."

Having served with my good friend and colleague, the Honorable HENRY REUSS, of Milwaukee, Wis., I can testify not only to his vigor, courage, and integrity but also to his devotion to conservation of all natural resources.

Recently, the House saw the Honorable HENRY REUSS take another licking in his courageous and stubborn endeavors to secure enactment of legislation to restore some commonsense to the wetlands drainage program in the Department of Agriculture.

Persistence and courage, however, saw a still more recent and well-deserved victory by the Honorable HENRY REUSS in regard to this same subject of wetlands drainage. Our colleague's last victory will perhaps go as far to save migratory waterfowl as any other single piece of legislative action here in the Congress and he deserves indeed a real tribute, not only from conservationists but from all citizens, for his courageous and industrious endeavor in this and in many other capacities in the conservation and other legislative fields.

The article referred to follows:

THE HILL PEOPLE—DUCKS FIND A CHAMPION IN REUSS

(By John McKelway)

I saw a duck, a wild duck, and thought of HENRY S. REUSS.

Representative REUSS, a Democrat from Milwaukee, Wis., bears no resemblance to a duck. He is a handsome 50 with a mind that hurries along—usually on the left—and a smile that flashes.

For the last 5 years, Mr. REUSS (pronounced Royce) has been trying to get a comparatively small piece of legislation off the ground. Ducks are deeply involved, mainly mallard but also black ducks and pintail ducks and the teal.

For a variety of reasons—which may or may not be adequately explained herein—Mr. REUSS has been forced to play a sort of chess game with his duck legislation each session of Congress. He is just as adamant as ever about it—even ebullient when he talks about it and for it.

There is in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota what is known as a "duck factory."

This simply means that approximately 3 million ducks are hatched and taught to fly there each year. Only a few years ago, however, the area produced close to 15 million ducks.

The things ducks like about the land are potholes. Potholes, at least in the two Dakotas and Minnesota, are shallow ponds about the size of your living room or the backyard of the White House. Thin reeds and cattails grow at the edges of the potholes and ducks feel comfortable and safe there, resting up for the long trip south, laying eggs and dreaming of that sanctuary in the sky.

LESS POTHOLES AND DUCKS

But lately ducks, as well as Mr. REUSS, have noticed there are fewer and fewer potholes each year. And, of course, there are fewer and fewer ducks.

It's idiotic, said Mr. REUSS, explaining what's been going on. Conservationists, duck hunters, and those who can't understand agriculture programs agree with him.

"If you're a farmer," begins Mr. REUSS, "and you have a pothole on your land, somebody from Agriculture will be around and try to talk you into draining it.

"If you decide to have it drained, Agriculture, free of charge, will handle all the engineering studies, where to drain it and so forth. Then, they will pay 50 percent of the cost of having it drained. Now you can plant, say wheat, on what was once the pothole and get a subsidy on the crop," Mr. Reuss barked.

"In the past 20 years," said the Congressman, as he has said for a number of years, "the indiscriminate drainage of wet lands, spurred by Federal subsidies under the agriculture program, has been responsible for destroying almost 6 million acres of valuable wet land in the Dakotas and Minnesota alone."

There have been cases, Mr. Reuss said, where a farmer has had his pothole drained and then sold the land to the Interior Department which has dammed the pothole back up in hopes of encouraging wildlife to return.

The substance of Mr. Reuss' legislation would put a stop to all this. He would remove the subsidy paid the farmer for the drainage which would, in the opinion of the Interior Department, harm waterfowl.

The Congressman and others have been able to get such a bill through the House. It then sinks in the Senate.

So, each time a farm bill comes along, Mr. Reuss can be found working to slip in his duck amendment. Since, apparently, farm bills must be passed, Mr. Reuss can see a vehicle for his amendment rolling down to the White House.

But, then, the antiduck element knocks out the amendment in conference.

The antiduck people, or the anti-duck-amendment people, are made up of farmers who want to make money, people who make machinery to drain potholes, and Agriculture employees who have the job of going around telling farmers they ought to drain their pothole.

As someone once said, there's much more to a duck than meets the eye. Even, as the thoughtful Mr. Reuss would say, a dead duck.

Prof. Charles S. Collier Holds No Brief for Court's Prayer Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in all the hue and cry surrounding the Supreme Court decision in the Engle against Vitale school prayer case, many pro and con arguments have been offered. I suspect in the years to come we will see many more cases brought before the Supreme Court dealing with the issue of religious practices being unconstitutional.

Therefore a statement by Prof. Charles S. Collier, professor emeritus of law of the George Washington University, is a refreshing and timely—and to my mind, legally sound—argument against the recent Supreme Court decision. It deserves wide attention. I hope no Member of Congress has missed this statement, which appeared in the July 30, 1962, issue of the Evening Star on the editorial page.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the article be included with my remarks today, and I sincerely hope if any Member fails to see it, that some staff member or other reader will see that it is brought to his or her attention.

HOLDS NO BRIEF FOR COURT'S PRAYER RULING

One troublesome aspect of the Supreme Court decision in the school prayer case (*Engle* v. *Vitale*) is the complete disregard therein manifested by the Court of the historic doctrine that parties who seek to obtain judicial restraining orders against the enforcement of legislation, State or National, must establish and demonstrate that they have sustained or will sustain peculiar and substantial harm or injury from the actual enforcement of such legislation.

This pervasive judicial doctrine has been plainly declared and unmistakably acted upon by the Supreme Court itself in many leading decisions.

This vital and practical doctrine applies with particular force to constitutional issues arising under the 14th amendment. Some Supreme Court Justices are fond of quoting the first amendment in cases arising under State or local laws that have been alleged to interfere with freedom of speech or with religious freedom. But the actual relevant language of the first amendment reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof * * *."

It is Congress which is explicitly restrained by this provision. It seems impossible to read this provision as applying of its own force to State legislatures or to the Board of Regents of New York.

The majority opinion in the Engle case gives us no articulate or helpful explanation of this supposed mysterious amalgamation or confluence of the 1st and the 14th amendments. Even if the 14th amendment can be treated as incorporating in some way the principles of the 1st amendment, this incorporation must be on terms that preserve all the essential juristic elements of the 14th amendment itself. The 14th amendment alone is directly operative on the States by its express terms and by its historical origin.

The 14th amendment is actually founded on the conception that the States are thereby prohibited only from actions that actually damage or wrongfully interfere directly with citizens or other persons. The purpose is simply to protect specific legal rights against concrete damage or actual harmful interference.

The central meaning of the 14th amendment lies in the following key passage:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The true prohibitions intended here are exposed in the active verbs that are used in the prohibiting clauses, namely, "abridge," "deprive," "deny."

There is nothing in the 14th amendment equivalent in form or substance to the first amendment language "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion * * *." The prohibitions of the 14th amendment are not defined with reference to the general subject matter or general classification of the laws themselves, that are under examination, but they are aimed against actual abridgment of the privileges of citizens; against actual deprivation of liberty such as violates due process of law, and against the actual denial of equal protection of the laws.

Now in the New York school prayer case, what harm or injury was done or threatened to anyone? Who was deprived of liberty or property in any substantial or realistic sense? Who was really denied the equal protection of the laws? What privileges or immunities that belong to citizens of the United States as such were abridged? In answering these questions it must be constantly kept in mind that no school child was required under the New York rules to repeat the prayer recommended by the board of regents, or even to be present at all on the occasion thereof.

The opinion of the trial judge in New York in this case well illustrated and described the precautions taken by the New York administrative authorities in this matter of possible wrongful pressure on school pupils or others. This opinion by the judge, who heard all the evidence at first hand and who could himself interrogate the witnesses states:

"It is enough on this score, however, that regulations such as were adopted by New York City's Board of Education in connection with its released time program be adopted (elsewhere), making clear that neither teachers nor any other school authority may comment on participation or non-participation in the exercise nor suggest or require that any posture or language be used or dress be worn or be not used or worn. Non-participation may take the form either of remaining silent during the exercise, or if the parent or child so desires, of being execused entirely from its exercise. Such regulations must also make provision for those non-participants who are to be excused from the prayer exercise. The exact provision to be made is a matter for decision by the board rather than the court, within the framework of constitutional requirements."

All of this conscientious and sensitive preparation and intelligent study by the New York administrative authorities and by the New York courts, is held to be for naught by the Supreme Court majority which proceeds toward its monolithic and exaggerated conclusions in this historic decision with proud defiance of the actual key facts.

God save the United States and this Honorable Court.

CHARLES S. COLLIER,
Professor Emeritus of Law, George Washington University.

Farm Safety Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation has observed Farm Safety Week, July 22–28. Generally, the Nation is surging forward toward ever-better living for our people. Unfortunately, however, we are also crashing toward ever-greater tolls of accidents, damage to property, and, yes, to human life.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to discuss some ideas which—if adopted—would, I believe, reduce the tragic toll of accidents.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WILEY URGES MORE EFFECTIVE SAFETY PROGRAM

Friends, the Nation has just observed Farm Safety Week, July 22–28.

For rural—as all America—safety should be a byword: On the farm, in the home, on the roadways, everywhere people work, play, and live.

As a nation, surging forward toward ever-better living for our people, we are also crashing toward ever-greater tolls of accidents, damage to property, and, yes, to human life.

Annually, the National Safety Council estimates the loss of life at about 91,500 resulting from car accidents, drownings, falls, fires, and other causes. The property losses of over $14½ billion exceed U.S. annual expenditures for: private education and research; religious and welfare activities; and other constructive purposes.

Now, what can be done?

SAFETY AROUND THE FARM

Briefly, now, let's look at the need for safety in working around the farm. To prevent accidents, there is a need for:

Greater care in operating tractors and other machinery;

Good judgment in handling farm animals;

Cautious use of chemicals for weedkilling and other purposes; and

Skillful use of electrical tools, and other safety measures.

SAFETY IN THE HOME

In the home, the following things should be done:

Extreme care in guarding limb and life of all members of the family;

Care in handling firearms;

Careful use and storage of medicines, insecticides, and other chemicals (particularly in keeping them out of the reach of youngsters);

Caution in utilizing electrical, or heating systems; and

Be sure that ladders, stairways, and similar things that may cause dangerous falls are in good shape.

CAUTION ON THE HIGHWAYS

Now, what about on the highways?

In operating any kind of vehicle—car, tractor, bicycle, or any other conveyance—there is a great need to observe the two "C's": carefulness and courtesy.

Among other things, this means:

Careful observance of caution, directional, and speed signs;

Courtesy to other drivers;

Watchfulness for pedestrians; and

If farm vehicles, such as tractors, are used on the roadways, great care is necessary in having them properly equipped with front lights, and rear lights or reflectors in case of after-dark travel.

All cars should be kept in tip-top shape—including good lights and brakes. Also, all drivers should assure that they are mentally alert. As the old adage says, the most dangerous part of a vehicle—car or tractor—can be a careless "nut" behind a steering-wheel.

To help promote greater safety, our Nation is constructing and attempting to control traffic by safer super-highways, realistic speed limits, safer curve-grading and directional-and-caution signs. In addition, States and local communities are making greater efforts to enact and enforce measures to promote greater safety on rural and farm-to-city roads—as well as other roadways.

CONCLUSION

In Wisconsin and across the country, splendid efforts by radio, television, newspapers, government, farm, or fraternal and other groups, and many other civicly oriented individuals and organizations, have been made to create a greater safety consciousness among our citizens. This is a most commendable public service.

However, greater safety is a target not just for a week, but all year round.

The watchwords should be: "Work safely, play safely, live safely." If we all do this, thousands of folks will enjoy longer, happiers lives.

Delaware Is an Ideal Location for Defense and Other Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the business community in Delaware—leaders of the large corporations and owners of the hundreds of small businesses in the First State—linking efforts with Delaware's State officials, its congressional delegation, and organized labor, can, with the united support of all of its citizens, play a major role in stimulating and raising the economic level of Delaware and Delawareans.

This step is vitally necessary, since the Defense Department, in carrying out recommendations of the Eisenhower administration, has declared several Delaware military installations, including the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del.—a plant which used the output of scores of factories in many States—excess to the defense needs of the United States.

The deactivation of these military installations and production facilities in Delaware has adversely affected the State's economy and has created difficult problems for Delaware in maintaining high employment for the State's expanding population. The loss of millions of dollars in defense contracts has meant necessarily the loss of thousands of jobs for Delawareans.

It is clear that a new and concentrated drive must be made now by Delaware's political and industrial leaders to bring to the attention of the Federal Government, President Kennedy, and to industry in general that Delaware is an ideal location for industries which could concentrate on the manufacture of essential components of the new weapons of defense and of space exploration.

Delaware possesses an exceptional pool of highly skilled technicians and an excellent labor force, abundant water supplies, cheap transportation and power, and corporate hospitality, and tax economy.

The New York Times, in its Delaware supplement of May 7, 1961, pointed out that:

> Tax economy is, of course, one of the most attractive features of all. There is no corporation income tax in Delaware for companies not doing business in Delaware. There is no taxation upon shares of stock held by nonresidents and no inheritance tax upon nonresident holders. The organization and annual franchise taxes are comparatively low, being based upon authorized capital and not upon income. There is no State stamp tax on stock issues or transfers and the constitution of the State guarantees continuance of the exemption from taxation of shares of capital stock of a Delaware corporation held by persons and corporations outside the State. Clearly, a warm Delaware welcome awaits the young corporation and its stockholders seeking a friendly tax climate.

I include as part of my remarks an editorial published in the Delaware State News, Dover, Del., July 26, 1962, entitled "The Time To Act Is Now" which enlarges on my remarks. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

(By Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., U.S. Representative-at-Large, Delaware)

The business community in Delaware—leaders of the large corporations and owners of the hundreds of small businesses in the First State—linking its efforts with political leaders in Congress and in the State, organized labor, and citizens as well, can play a major role in stimulating and raising the economic level of Delaware and Delawareans. The time to act is now.

In the last 18 months, the Defense Department has declared several Delaware military installations, including the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del., excess to the defense needs of the United States. The deactivation of these various military installations and production facilities in Delaware has adversely affected the State's economy and has created difficult problems for Delaware in maintaining high employment for the State's expanding population.

The Secretary of Defense recently published an interesting analysis which pointed to the changing patterns of defense procurement. This study clearly reveals the vast changes which have taken place in the past 20 years, both in the nature of items purchased by the Department of Defense, and in the States and regions where prime contracts have been placed—and displaced. While the Secretary's report is limited to a picture of military prime contracts, which are generally placed with the manufacturing giants, it is known that about half of all hard goods prime contract funds are subcontracted to other suppliers, many of which are part of the country's 4.5 million small businesses.

The most dramatic geographic adjustments of the past 10 years are found in the heavy prime contract losses of States in the Northeast and Middle Atlantic areas and in the large net gains of West Coast and Mountain States. It is difficult to translate dollar prime contract awards into employment figures, but it is plainly evident that the drop in annual prime awards in Delaware from $541 million during the Korean conflict (1951–53) to $71 million in fiscal 1961 has had a depressing economic impact on the Delaware economy. Under any translation, the loss of millions per year in defense contracts has meant the loss of thousands of jobs for Delawareans.

The rapid rise in missiles and electronics is reflected in the 1962 defense contracts. The Department of Defense has shown a strong tendency to concentrate these contracts in California and with suppliers located along the coastal strip from Boston to Washington, D.C., as well as in certain Mountain and Southern States. Certainly, Delaware is situated in the main stream of this great research and development effort but unfortunately, the Defense Department has been inclined, by and large, to ignore the first State where defense contracts are concerned.

It is my strong feeling that Delaware's industrial leaders, those representing large corporations and those representing small businesses, should seriously consider entering the new and expanding field of defense procurement. The first State possesses an exceptional pool of highly skilled technicians and an excellent labor force, abundant water supplies, cheap transportation and power and corporate hospitality. The spacecraft and other missile systems launched from Cape Canaveral, Fla., are the products of men and machines located in several large States along the eastern seaboard. In the intermediate fabrication of these missile and space systems, Delaware is in an ideal location for industries which could concentrate on the manufacture of specific components which are essential to the proper functioning of these systems. To this end, a new and concentrated drive must be made now by Delaware's political and industrial leaders. It is high time that the factors favoring Delaware for a part in the country's defense effort be forcefully called to the attention of high defense officials in Washington.

There is no question that local initiative in Delaware, which seeks not only defense business, but domestic and foreign markets as well, must direct itself vigorously to the exacting needs of the so-called space age. Communities which fail to energize and mobilize their institutions to adjust to this new age cannot reasonably anticipate playing a major role in our domestic economy and foreign markets.

Several weeks ago, I wrote to Administrator John Horne of the Small Business Administration urging him to consider establishing a small branch office in Delaware so that small business concerns in the State could receive immediate counsel on their financial, management, production, and distribution problems and to assist Delaware firms in obtaining a fair share of contracts and orders for both supplies and services used by the Federal Government. The Small Business Administration could also be effective in fostering the entry of small business in the foreign trade field, a field largely neglected by small firms in the past. Moreover, the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 which was enacted to encourage new industry to establish, and existing industry to expand, should be examined and perhaps implemented by the appropriate State agencies, both in the industrial areas of the State which have high unemployment and in underdeveloped rural and nonurban areas which require a better balance of industry and agriculture. The resources and technical assistance which are available to other communities in the Nation must be open to Delawareans to enable them to plan their economic development intelligently and to explore methods of expanding their industrial resources.

I will continue to vigorously work for all programs, including a fair share of defense contracts, which will advance the industrial development of the Diamond State.

The National Lottery of Paraguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of this House the national lottery of a nation that makes the gambling urge work for the benefit of health and social welfare—Paraguay.

Paraguay is a small and impoverished nation of less than 2 million people. Revenue sources are few and far between, but public needs are great. Luckily, Paraguay is smart enough to take advantage of a national lottery. Gross receipts in 1961 came to almost a million dollars, and the profit to the Government was earmarked for the mother-child care plan of the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare.

Paraguay is not an affluent nation, but they make what they have go a long way. It is most unfortunate that we in the United States have not yet seen to it that we receive the benefits of a national lottery.

Mr. Speaker, if we took advantage of a national lottery in the United States we could raise over $10 billion a year in added income which could be used for tax relief and reduction of our national debt.

Broadened Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, July 11, 1962, served as a double victory for those interested in better television. First, Telstar was orbited; this event has unfortunately eclipsed the second victory: President Kennedy's signature on a bill which enacts into law a provision requiring television set builders to put 82 channels, instead of 12, on their new machines. The second victory is important in terms of ultimate programing. It affords almost unlimited horizons for new and creative ideas in the TV media; it affords great opportunity for educational TV; and it affords tremendous growth potential.

The Jersey Journal of July 13 has commented on this historic act and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADENED TELEVISION

The dazzling accomplishments of the Telstar satellite have eclipsed another major development in television, perhaps one which will have even greater impact on the viewing habits of the world.

President Kennedy signed the bill which makes set builders put 82 channels instead of 12 into their machines. To the very high frequency channels which are best known, must now be added receiving facilities for the 70 ultrahigh frequency channels. Thus, the bottleneck in television's expansion is broken. There were only 12 channels in broad use solely because most machines would receive but 12 of the 82.

Thus, the way is opened for many more networks and even specialized channels. The tight network control over programing will be dissipated as it was in radio by the extension to frequency modulation. The hope is that there now will be more channels than cowboy pictures, more channels than dreary tableaux of pitcher-batter-catcher-ump. Now, perhaps, the educational features will be available at times more civilized than 6 in the morning.

July 11, 1962, may become a red letter day in television quite as much for the bill the President signed as for Telstar's first, and brilliantly successful, broadcast, of a live program from England and a taped one from France.

Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 Called Realistic as Well as Helpful—Newark Evening News Praises Emphasis on Rehabilitation Contained in Act Recently Signed by President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is gratifying to note the degree of approval and public acceptance of the new Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 which became public law when signed by the President last week.

It was especially satisfying to read in an editorial in the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Saturday, July 28, 1962, the comment that "for the first time since the Federal-State-local system of relief was enacted in 1935, the Nation has a new approach to welfare that promises to be realistic as well as helpful."

In West Virginia, where the rate of chronic unemployment—particularly among men over 40 years of age—has been inordinately high, we are especially gratified that the useful program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents has been extended 5 years. It is helpful, too, that the Congress passed and the President approved the legislation authorizing community work and training under the ADCU program.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Welfare's New Look," which appeared in the July 28 issue of the Newark Evening News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELFARE'S NEW LOOK

The welfare reform bill signed by President Kennedy received little public notice as it passed quietly through Congress. Practically all the attention was centered on an amendment, the administration's medicare program, which went down in crashing defeat.

Nonetheless, the new law marks what Mr. Kennedy called a "real turning point" in the Nation's effort to cope with a problem that threatened to get out of hand. For the first time since the Federal-State-local system of relief was enacted in 1935, the Nation has a new approach to welfare that promises to be realistic as well as helpful.

The new law emphasizes rehabilitation of the destitute, thereby removing as many persons as possible from relief rolls; it stresses services rather than support, and training for useful work instead of perpetuating dependency.

A major innovation in the law, which embodies most of the administration's recommendations, provides Federal grants to help local communities establish care centers for children of working mothers. Other provisions would allow relief officials to withhold welfare checks from able-bodied men who refuse to work on community projects and also from irresponsible parents. In the latter case, relief checks would be given to a third party to provide for the children.

While former Welfare Secretary Ribicoff criticized the manner in which Newburgh, N.Y., handled its welfare problems as "ruthless and demagogic," events there undoubtedly spurred congressional action.

Yet even before Newburgh, it was quite clear that legislators at all levels of government were dissatisfied with relief frauds, wasted funds, and the general drift in welfare administration. It is little wonder, then, that the White House had much less trouble in Congress with welfare than with other major Kennedy legislation.

Views on the School-Prayer Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letters from my friend, Judge Henry Hirschberg, of Newburgh, are of interest at this time.

Judge Hirschberg in his letter to me points out that I do not agree with his thinking on the first amendment or on the Supreme Court's recent decision. The judge does me the honor of saying that while he disagrees with me on this matter he respects my opinion. May I say that I reciprocate this sentiment 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a part of my reply to Judge Hirschberg's letter:

NEWBURGH, N.Y., *July 27, 1962.*

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: You and I agree on so many things that I assume we can differ with reference to the recent so-called prayer decision of the Supreme Court of the United States with mutual respect as to each other's position.

I noted from the papers that you intend to introduce a proposed constitutional amendment and when and if that occurs I would be interested in having a copy.

Being interested I started cutting out and reading all of the various comments of the Members of Congress and their constituents published in the appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When I realized from said reading how widespread and almost universal among your associates was (1) complete lack of knowledge with reference to the organization of our Government and the establishment of its Constitution, and, (2) apparently very little knowledge with reference to the history and evolution of Christianity, I became naturally depressed and threw the accumulated pages in the wastebasket.

Possibly, however, that a little light may burn in the Appendix, I am enclosing two of my letters with the expressed hope that you may stick them and this letter into the Appendix, of course accompanied by a statement upon your part that you disapprove completely of the sentiments expressed.

In 1797 the U.S. Government entered into a treaty with Tripoli and a paragraph in the text of said treaty read as follows:

"The Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion."

That treaty was confirmed by the Senate. Jefferson, as pointed out, was an unbeliever in Christianity and what was in his day called a Deist, and I believe he went so far as to refuse to issue a thanks proclamation.

Those things, of course, are in the past and now apparently the question of amending the Constitution is under consideration.

I note from the Appendix that one of your fellow representatives, Hon. J. FLOYD BREEDING (A5369), has introduced such an amendment as far back as February 17, 1961. The first section states that the Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, and so forth. The second and third sections seem to attempt to destroy any authority given the Government by the first section by stating it shall not be interpreted as establishing any particular ecclesiastical organization or destroying the right of free speech, and that Congress shall have the power to provide different and suitable form of oath or affirmation for us citizens without the law.

The thought that occurs to me is the following: If the state should be granted the power to recognize and enforce any particular religion, then it has the power and authority to do the opposite and declare against any and all religions as the Russian Government has done. I think once you put in the Constitution a recognition of any religion you are going to open the door for every other religion and every free thinker, atheist, or agnostic societies trying to get their particular position in the Constitution. Personally, of course, it probably makes very little difference because no matter what our Constitution may say about this subject matter and no matter what the Russian Government may say, the individuals are not going to change their viewpoint and are going to govern their lives with supreme indifference to the constitutional provision or any law that is passed.

In conclusion, however, I would suggest that any of your associates in Congress who desire knowledge with reference to the present position of advanced scholarship in connection with religion might buy and study the following works. (1) "Ancient Medieval and Modern Christianity," by Charles Guignebert, who was for 31 years lecturer at the Sorbonne on the history of Christianity. Also a book by the same professor entitled "Jesus" and another entitled "The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus." I would also recommend for study a work entitled "Origins of Christianity," by Frederick C. Conybeare, M.A.

These books are published by University Books, Inc., New Hyde Park, N.Y. I have no commission for their sale.

So far as the legal proposition is concerned and the amending of our Constitution and the reason for not changing it, I can only recommend that most of your associates arrange to take some course in the subject of our constitutional history and the record of what has happened in past history when church and state have been united, such course to be either under the guidance of some competent teacher or by an adequate course of reading.

With best wishes for you and for the continuing survival of our Republic, I am

Yours very truly,
HENRY HIRSCHBERG.

HIRSCHBERG FAVORS COURT DECISIONS

Here is another note in favor of the recent U.S. Supreme Court discussion on the New York school prayer.

The Founding Fathers of our Government established a purely secular government, perhaps the first in human history.

They did not rely upon or place in the Constitution any god, goddess, or religious sanction. Their reason was the long previous history of intolerance and persecution by any religious sect when it had obtained power and the role of government.

May our Government continue entirely secular. May the various other present nonsecular expressions on our coins, in our pledge to the flag, etc., be eliminated.

In conclusion, I think President Kennedy has in his recent press conference made one of the best comments on the situation; namely, that this prayer business and religion is the private affair of the citizens in the home, church, etc., and no business of the Government.

HENRY HIRSCHBERG.
NEWBURGH.

HIRSCHBERG CITES PLEDGE CHANGE AS MOVE TOWARD CHURCH, STATE

TO THE EDITOR:

Regarding the letter of Mrs. Rhuback on the U.S. Supreme Court school prayer decision:

If she is to be appalled, it should be not at me, but at those who drew and adopted our Constitution creating a completely secular government.

The reason they adopted such a Constitution was to protect minority opinion groups, including atheistic, agnostic and unbelievers. The majority needs no constitutional protection.

The fact that the Founding Fathers sang hymns, that the poets used the word "God," does not make our present constitutional Government a religious government. I assume the majority were Protestant Christians; and, anyway, logic is not one of mankind's strong points.

Incidentally, deism was also a widespread belief at that time. It was a denial of the truth of the Christian and Jewish faiths and of revelation, but a belief in some God or power, creator of the universe and provable by a study of nature. Thomas Paine was of that faith (see his Age of Reason, purchasable from Thomas Paine Foundation, Inc., 370 West 35th Street, New York City).

Some historians claim Jefferson was a deist and used the term "God" in that sense in the Declaration of Independence.

This subject is too extensive to be covered in any letter. If the believers in the majority religion desire a religious government, their method should be by constitutional amendment. Indirectly, however, they are having much success.

Take, for instance, the so-called "Pledge to the Flag." They have made that a religious pledge which no self-respecting unbeliever, atheist, or agnostic can now take or join in.

The danger of a union of religion and state is shown in the Dreyfus case, where in France certain religious and political powers joined to save the religious criminals by "framing" the Jew, Dreyfus. After the exposure, France separated church and state.

I respect Mrs. Rhuback and her fair and frank expression of opinion and intend no personal criticism. It would be better if we expressed our real views more often on this important subject.

HENRY HIRSCHBERG.
NEWBURGH.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1962.

Hon. HENRY HIRSCHBERG,
Newburgh, N.Y.

DEAR JUDGE HIRSCHBERG: Thank you for your good letter of July 27. You are quite right in taking for granted my respect for your opinion. As you know, I have always admired your great legal knowledge and talents.

On June 29, I introduced House Joint Resolution 790, a copy of which I enclose as per your request. You will note that this resolution has nothing to do with religion and that the word is not even mentioned.

I will admit, however, that the introduction of this amendment was prompted by the recent Supreme Court decision. In discussing this matter in my newsletter I made the following statement: "A great deal of indignation has been aroused by the Supreme Court decision on the question of prayer in the public schools. The prayer in question is a very simple nonsectarian petition to the Almighty and it seems as though even an atheist would not object to it. Again the Warren court seems to be making mountains of legal sophistry over the first amendment to the Constitution: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof * * *.' Of course, this in no way establishes a religion because it is nonsectarian. The fact is that it seems more as though it were 'prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' The amendment I have introduced is simple and reads as follows: 'The Congress shall have power, by resolution passed by two-thirds of each House of Congress, to override any decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.' The reasoning behind it is that the three branches of Government are coequal and that if the Congress can override a Presidential veto, thereby curbing the Executive, there is no reason why they should not also have the power to curb the Supreme Court."

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the May–June 1962 issue of Audubon magazine, published by the National Audubon Society, cites examples of the "tyranny" that is occurring when disregard and apathy supply the criteria for roadbuilding through some of the Nation's most scenic preserves.

My bill, S. 2767, which I introduced on January 30, 1962, would necessitate taking into consideration destruction to our natural resource and help to check the "tyranny" of which the Audubon magazine speaks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an editorial entitled "Highway High-Handedness," from the May–June 1962 issue of Audubon magazine.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The New York Times recently carried an editorial entitled "The Tyranny of Roads." The Times editor deplored a threat to beautiful pioneer buildings in Sacramento, Calif., and asked why highway planners must bulldoze their routes through irreplaceable parks, scenic preserves, and archeological treasures.

In New York the State department of public works insists on building a superhighway down the narrow valley of the Beaverkill, which is perhaps the most storied trout stream in America.

Such examples of "tyranny" are occurring, in many places. With vast sums of Federal money to distribute, and emboldened by the economic and political leverage that accompanies such spending authority, the highway agencies have assumed an arrogant posture. But public concern is growing.

Retirement of the Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1962, I introduced legislation providing that a percentage of the net budget receipts of the United States shall be devoted exclusively to the retirement of the public debt. In this connection I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter received from Mr. Wellington J. Griffith, Jr., 102 Burns Avenue, Cinicinnati 15, Ohio, who has organized a citizens' Committee for a Balanced Budget, the purpose of which is to petition the Congress to maintain a balanced budget and to provide for a systematic reduction of our national debt. Mr. Griffith's letter follows:

JUNE 14, 1962.

Hon. DONALD D. CLANCY,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLANCY: We are alarmed that the present Congress a few short weeks ago approved an increase in the interest-bearing debt from $298 to $300 billion and that there is now before the Congress a bill to authorize by June 30, 1962, a further increase from $300 to $308 billion. Thus, it is proposed to increase the interest-bearing debt by $10 billion in a few short weeks.

We have today transmitted to your Cincinnati office more than 2,000 petitions requesting the Congress to authorize no further increases in the national debt and to definitely budget an amount each year to reduce the present $300 billion debt. We shall submit further petitions from time to time. In submitting these petitions I think that we should give you a short history of the inception and use of the petition.

In the elections last November, voters across the Nation generally refused to approve bond issues for many and various purposes. As recently as a few weeks ago the voters in Chicago turned down several bond issues. Taken as a whole, the voters are disapproving deficit spending when the issue is presented to them. However, in the case of the Federal Government the citizens never have an opportunity to register approval or disapproval of financial measures. In order to give the voters the opportunity of expressing their opinion on national finances, a few months ago we drafted the petition which we have forwarded to you. After the petition had been drafted, Mrs. Griffith and I had several thousand printed and gave them to a few friends of ours for the purpose of securing signatures from their friends. Though the majority of the petitioners reside in this area, they have been sending petitions to friends across the Nation and we are receiving signed petitions from many places, together with requests for blank petitions. This is truly a grassroots movement, or, if you prefer, a voter-to-voter movement.

Those of us who have discussed the petition with our friends and neighbors are amazed at the interest of the average citizen in the finances of this National Government and his desire for the preservation and strengthening of our form of government. We find that this is true among all classes of our society, with the blue collar and the white collar joining together in the mandate to the Congress to effect economy wherever possible in any fields which will not jeopardize our military or economic strength. While the citizens do not expect any curtailment of spending for military and space programs, they definitely want these programs to be carried on in a prudent manner and without waste.

By means of these petitions the signers are telling you and through you the Congress of the United States that the United States of America must be invincible in arms, solvent in its finances, and invincible in spirit.

In closing, we once more express to you our admiration of the wisdom which prompted this bill and we assure you that we will do everything possible to back your forthright and realistic stand.

We are prepared to forward blank petitions to interested citizens across the Nation.

With the fervent hope that a majority of the Congress will join in enacting your bill, I am,

Sincerely,
WELLINGTON J. GRIFFITH, Jr.,
Cochairman.
PAULINE F. GRIFFITH,
Cochairman.

Distinguished Son of Distinguished Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Monday, July 30, 1962, published an editorial on the late Bruce Bedford, who died last Saturday in Princeton, N.J. He was a native of my hometown of Wilkes-Barre and a member of a most distinguished family. Mr. Bedford had an outstanding career as a manufacturer, banker, railroad executive and civic leader. He was the brother of one of the most outstanding lawyers in my congressional district, Attorney Paul Bedford.

As part of my remarks today, I include the aforementioned editorial from last Monday's Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader:

DISTINGUISHED SON OF DISTINGUISHED FAMILY

Bruce Bedford, who died Saturday in Princeton, N.J., constituted, with his brother, Attorney Paul Bedford, Wilkes-Barre, the fourth generation of his family in Wyoming Valley.

Of old English stock, the Bedfords settled in New Jersey and later moved to Ulster County, N.Y., where they were residing at the time of the Revolution.

Jacob Bedford, son of Stephen Bedford, joined the struggle for independence at the age of 14 and in 1792 came here to carve a career as a public official and launch a family that was to play a prominent role in the community for 170 years.

Andrew Bedford, son of Jacob Bedford, became a doctor of medicine, but, like his father, who held the office of sheriff among others, he went in for public service and became prothonotary of Luzerne County.

George Reynolds Bedford, the sixth child of Dr. Bedford, was the third generation of the family to serve his community and country with distinction. A Civil War veteran, banker, churchman, and civic leader, he was a lawyer by profession, and his clients included railroads, coal companies, and utilities. Among the distinctions that came to him was the presidency of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

Such was the heritage of Bruce Bedford when he first saw the light of day in Wilkes-Barre in 1876 as a son of George Reynolds Bedford. Reared in this city, he launched his business career here before transferring to Trenton, N.J., where he became widely known as a manufacturer, banker, rail executive, and civic leader. During the past decade he made his home at Princeton, not far from his old alma mater to which he was so devoted.

Bruce Bedford's success was easy to understand on the basis of character, ability, and personality. The president and most popular man in his class at Princeton, as well as the manager of the university's baseball team, he applied similar techniques to the game of life with comparable results. A respected figure, he had friends everywhere.

That he had a warm spot for his birthplace which he visited frequently was attested by the fact that his manufacturing business in Trenton was named the Luzerne Rubber Co. It was one of many links this outstanding native son had with the past.

Middle-of-the-Road Congress: Rejects Kennedy's Welfare Measures but Backs His Foreign Policy Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following article, appearing in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., July 30, makes more sense than most recent analyses of the Congress:

MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD CONGRESS: REJECTS KENNEDY'S WELFARE MEASURES BUT BACKS HIS FOREIGN POLICY IDEAS

Two more really big legislative decisions—and two only—may be expected of this Congress no matter how late into the fall its session may struggle on.

Congress will decide whether the economic outlook justifies a tax cut to stimulate business. And Congress will complete action on the historic bill to grant President Kennedy unexampled authority to lower tariffs in order to associate this Nation with the new world of trade arising from the European Common Market.

It is curiously fitting that the remaining real program of this Congress as it draws toward the close should be confined to such hard practicalities. From the beginning the tone of the session has been to grant the President most of what he has wanted in foreign policy, and to some extent in economic policy, but to deny to him most of what he has asked in the field of welfare legislation.

And that tone is being maintained to the end. Dead, for illustration, are the President's requests for a Federal Department of Urban Affairs, for a new medical plan, and for large-scale Federal aid to public education.

Very much alive, however, is his foreign aid program, and very much alive is his world trade program. Congress has just sent to the White House a very good foreign aid bill which will strengthen the President's hand in the cold war. And the House has already approved—with Senate approval still to come—a strong world trade measure which involves perhaps the most important legislative achievement since the Second World War.

It is against all this background that this Congress must be measured. Has it really been an unexpectedly obstructive and difficult Congress, as some of the President's liberal advisers keep insisting, in their disappointment at the rejection of welfarist measures? No. Instead, it has really been just the kind of Congress that should have been foreseen all along.

It has been moderate-minded, middle-of-the-road in political complexion and cooperative toward the President on the great survival issues but on little else.

If Congress has very often checked the President on proposed domestic innovations, it has—to the great credit of the minority Republicans—given him high bipartisan support on cold war matters.

The only puzzling thing is why anybody ever supposed that it would be any other kind of Congress than it has been. Mr. Kennedy himself, after all, ran an essentially moderate campaign in 1960. It was not wildly "liberal" any more than Richard Nixon's was wildly "conservative."

The people, in narrowly electing Mr. Kennedy, spoke in tones of moderation. For in choosing him, as only a moderately liberal man, they chose a Congress which was moderately conservative.

Nothing in that election and nothing since has suggested that the people want domestic reforms and innovations so much as they want strong leadership against the Soviet menace.

This Congress—both the Democratic and Republican sides of it—has helped to give them that leadership by its bipartisan support, in this area, of the President.

There never was the slightest reason to suppose that Congress would come charging in here to duplicate the New Deal of the 1930's in a decade, the 1960's, where the true national problem is not depression but rather the oppressive danger of international communism.

And those who lament the failure of this or that reform measure in Congress should comfort themselves a bit. The time has not been ripe for them. For this is an hour in history in which Congress had preferred, and rightly so, to do what is absolutely necessary at the expense of what is not really necessary but rather only desirable—and even desirable only in a debatable way.

National Foundation for Neuromuscular Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, "A Force for the Forgotten" is the rallying cry of the National Foundation for Neuromuscular Diseases, Inc.

A few days ago I had the privilege of attending a gathering of the Essex County chapter of this eleemosynary organization, and observed there first hand that there is truly a force in action for the forgotten sufferers of neuromuscular diseases.

The Essex County chapter is in existence for one major purpose—to help wipe out neuromuscular diseases—which run the gamut from muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, muscular atrophy to little-known but also fatal diseases like myasthenia gravis.

Seventy percent of any money that the Essex County chapter raises goes to the national organization who invests it in research programs at places like the Children's Hospital Center in Boston, Rutgers-New Brunswick, Oxford University in England, Cornell University Medical College, and so on.

The remaining 30 percent of the funds that the Essex County chapter raise go to afflicted patients.

I have observed the work of this fine organization, and the relief they have brought to the agonized and afflicted patients. I urge all, who wish to help mankind, to contribute generously to this cause in hopes that someday neuromuscular diseases and the terrible aftermath of those who are forgotten may be eradicated.

Seattle World's Fair Sensational Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues in the House voted for Federal participation in the Seattle World's Fair, now more than 3 months in progress.

So that my colleagues may know that their favorable votes were justified, I include the following comments on the fair, describing its sensational success to date, by the well-known columnist, Marquis Childs:

(By Marquis Childs)

SEATTLE, WASH., July 30.—With an average of more than 60,000 visitors daily, Seattle's Century 21 Exposition is already in the black only a few days past the halfway mark. It is the principal reason the Pacific Northwest is booming, with department store sales up 20 percent as compared to 3 to 4 percent in most of the country.

There is no evidence that the stock market jolt and the uncertainty over the growth of the economy have had any effect on the big show Seattle is putting on. Attendance is running slightly ahead of expectation and the fair management has just repaid $4,500,000 advanced by Seattle business firms.

Under a brilliant sun that has finally provided perfect exposition weather after a long cloudy, rainy siege, this is the affluent society in full bloom. In every shape, form and age and every variety of costume, from the shortest shorts to the dressiest costume with full parure of costume jewelry, traveling America is milling over the fair's 74 acres. And if anyone doubted the population explosion, it is manifest in the legion of children swarming everywhere—children sound asleep in strollers, children fastened in strings to their parents, children guzzling tons of hot dogs, ice cream and soft drinks.

The chief criticism of the fair derives in fact from its very success. Long lines must wait patiently to get into the most popular features, which are the U.S. science exhibit, the Ford Co.'s pavilion with its simulated space trip, the coliseum with a free water skiing show, and the 606-feet-high space needle with its restaurant on top.

Beginning from the moment the gates open until 10:30 or 11 at night, 15,000 people on the average wait in line through the day for one of the elevators that look like big yellow bugs hustling up the steel spine of the needle. They pay $1 a head, and the private firm that financed the needle is well on the way to amortizing its investment.

On a clear night, the view from the dining and observation platforms, which make one complete revolution every hour, is superb. To the west the Olympic Range of mountains is etched against the setting sun. On the opposite horizon is the brooding presence of the great white cone of 14,000-foot Mount Rainier. In the northern distance is Mount Baker.

The atmosphere of the fair is closely related to the scenic splendors of this Northwest country. The feeling is strong that this coastal slope, with its mild climate, is in for the same kind of growth that California is seeing. It will be part of the new empire of the West that is regarded jealously by other regions. While the booster spirit, epitomized by Ewen C. Dingwall, general manager and chief promoter of the exposition through 5 difficult years, may lag in long-settled parts of the country, it flourishes here.

With full capacity of 2,000 passengers each, two Canadian Pacific ferries make the day's round trip to Victoria, British Columbia, passing among the beautiful, relatively untouched San Juan de Fuca Islands. Half a day's motor trip away is Olympic National Park and its unique rain forest, where 100 inches of rainfall a year produce a fantastic range of vegetation. On the slopes of Mount Baker an important ski meet, drawing contestants from a wide area, is held on July 4.

Local pride in the achievement of the fair, and in the conviction that the glories of this region have not been sufficiently appreciated, is strong. Dingwall speaks warmly of the fact that the designer of the U.S. science pavilion, the only really distinguished building in the exposition, was Minoru Yamasaki, born and brought up here.

When Alistair Cooke came here shortly after the opening of the fair and wrote in the Manchester (England) Guardian a persnickety article, saying that the exposition was really a trade fair overlaid with Coney Island, Seattle seethed with indignation.

No such thing, the newspaper said, pointing to the high quality of the scientific exhibits and the instructive value of such displays as the pavilion put up by the European Economic Community where, with remarkable ingenuity in pictures and recordings, the story of the development of the Common Market and what it can mean for Europe and the world is told.

It may be significant that the only phase of the fair not doing well is the girlie show and honky tonk section. The fair visitors seem for the most part to be serious searchers after knowledge with a characteristically American thirst to find out what makes it run—whether a new computer or the universe—and why.

(By Marquis Childs)

SEATTLE, WASH.—Among the 4,753,817 people who have visited the Seattle Century 21 Exposition in the first half of its life have been delegations from a half dozen cities planning future world's fairs. They hope to learn what to do and what not to do in the light of Seattle's success.

New York has scarcely a year and a half to go before opening a fair that is to cover a space nearly 10 times the 74 acres of the Seattle exposition. One criticism here has been the crowding of the site, the lack of spacious vistas that characterized the Brussels fair of 4 years ago covering more than 500 acres.

Atlanta is planning a fair in 1967, and the city hopes to obtain the seal of approval of the Bureau of International Expositions. Seattle got that seal while New York was denied it because its exposition was to come too soon after Century 21.

Philadelphia has sent emissaries here in contemplation of an exposition in 1976 commemorating the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. And Chicago, whose Century of Progress in 1933–34 was the last fair to make money, is thinking of another exposition.

One lesson from Seattle may be the economy of size. Another equally important is the fact that the core of the exposition was built as a permanent cultural and sports center for the city, including an art gallery, opera and concert halls, and sports stadium.

City and State together put up nearly $26 million. Congress appropriated $9 million for the science pavilion, and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency came through with another million for a special space exhibit. The capsule in which John Glenn made his three orbits of the earth will shortly be flown here and included in the display.

It is a measure of the up-and-coming spirit of this region that the intention is to maintain the science pavilion after the fair closes as what Ewen C. Dingwall, general manager of the exposition, calls a "kind of west coast Smithsonian Institution." The idea is to join with the University of Washington and other centers to foster research that will, in turn, mean the development of industries in new fields such as electronics and space.

Foreign governments, private exhibitors and others put in about $30 million. Thus of the $100 million which the exposition cost, more than two-thirds was paid for from sources outside of the bookkeeping of profit and loss.

While the theme of the space age is incidental and even irrelevant to much of what goes on in this exposition's teeming 74 acres, a high-and-mighty theme is essential to any self-respecting and successful World's Fair. It is a cloak of good intent covering everything from the strippers to the Uday Shankar dancers from India. The space needle, which will be a permanent feature of the Seattle skyline, comparable to the Eiffel Tower in Paris that came out of another fair, might just as well have been called by any other name.

An essential ingredient in the recipe for an exposition that attracts the customers is an art exhibit. Seattle scores conspicuously in this department. The show is divided into three sections, Masterpieces of Art, Art after 1950, and Northwest Coast Indian Art, with a small corollary exhibit of oriental art. Gallaries all over the world have loaned art objects.

The Pacific Northwest exhibit is unique. The sculptured masks and the ceremonial figures compare favorably with the best of the African sculpture that had such a vogue. Some of the objects loaned by museums in London and Berlin were acquired in the middle of the 18th century when Captain Cook and his expedition came to these shores. For the first time in more than 150 years they have been returned to their place of origin, although to a setting somewhat changed in the intervening century and a half.

But when all is said and done, painstaking, persistent promotion had a lot to do with Seattle's success. As early as last Christmas a drive was put on to sell regular $2 admission tickets in advance at a discount price of $1.60. Advance tickets to amusement rides and other fair attractions were also sold.

And regional pride has been the spur. When visitors write glowing letters to the papers praising the fair and the splendors of the Northwest countryside, the sense of reward for the citizen is as great as his satisfaction in knowing that the project is paying off in dollars and cents.

A Noted Leader of Delaware's Polish-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a noted leader of Polish-Americans in Delaware died recently, and his passing was mourned by all who knew him.

Mr. Vincent J. Kowalewski was a citizen of Wilmington, Del., for 50 years. He spent his life developing Americanism among Polish immigrants, fighting communism, heading patriotic and civic causes for Polish-American residents in the city, and nurturing Polish culture and folkways.

As the Wilmington Morning News recently pointed out, more than 600 persons attended a testimonial given in his honor last November at the Hotel Du Pont. Mr. Kowalewski was presented with a plaque during the ceremonies which put into words the love Delawareans had for him. The plaque read:

> This testimonial award is presented to Vincent J. Kowalewski in recognition of his zeal in augmenting the Polish spirit by keeping the torch high and the flame alive.

Mr. Kowalewski served as president and secretary of the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs of Delaware, and he was a national director of the Polish-American Congress. He was a member of the Polish National Alliance, the Kosciuszko Foundation, the Men of Malvern, the Polish Falcons of America, the Polish American Civic Association, and he was chairman of the Polish War Relief Committee.

Mr. Kowalewski served as director of the Delaware chapter of the American Red Cross and as chairman of fund-raising drives for the Cancer Society, retarded children, heart fund, and others.

I include the following article from the Wilmington Morning News of July 20, 1962.

POLISH-AMERICAN CHAMPION VINCENT KOWALEWSKI DIES

A noted leader of Polish-Americans in the Wilmington area, Vincent J. Kowalewski, died yesterday at his home, 1205 Beech Street. He was 68.

Mr. Kowalewski, born in Chester County, Pa., spent 50 years in Wilmington developing Americanism among Polish immigrants, fighting communism, heading patriotic and civic causes for Polish-American residents in the city and nurturing the continuation of Polish folkways in Delaware.

He attended St. Hedwig's Parochial School and was graduated from Goldey College in 1913.

More than 600 persons attended a testimonial given in his honor last November at the Hotel Du Pont's Gold Ballroom.

Mr. Kowalewski was presented with a plaque during the ceremonies which bore the message:

"This testimonial award is presented to Vincent J. Kowalewski in recognition of his zeal in augmenting the Polish spirit by keeping the torch high and the flame alive."

Solemn requiem Mass will be offered in St. Hedwig's Catholic Church Tuesday at 10:30 a.m. Interment will be in Cathedral

Cemetery. Friends may call at the Karpinski Funeral Home, 741 South Broom Street, Monday evening.

He served as president and secretary of the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs of Delaware. He was a national director of the Polish-American Congress.

Mr. Kowalewski served as director of the Delaware chapter of the American Red Cross and as chairman of fundraising drives for the Cancer Society, retarded children, heart fund and others.

He organized the Polish Cultural Society and more recently was instrumental in organizing a room at Fort Delaware honoring a Polish commander of the fort.

Mr. Kowalewski had been a chairman of the Polish War Relief Committee. He was a member of the Polish National Alliance, the Kosciuszko Foundation, the Men of Malvern, the Polish Falcons of America and the Polish American Civic Association.

Until his illness, he was a Polish radio announcer for station WTUX. He had served as editor and publisher of the now defunct Polish newspaper, Wiadomosci.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Josephine S. Kowalewski; six daughters, Mrs. Florence McCorkle, Mrs. Felecia Talarowski, Mrs. Joanne Taylor, Sister Mary Vincent, OSFS, Misses Christine and Theodosia Kowalewski; two sons, the Reverend Vincent J. Kowalewski, Jr., OSFS, and John Kowalewski, all of Wilmington.

Also surviving are eight grandchildren; two brothers, John and Anthony Kowalewski, Wilmington, and four sisters, Miss Stella Kowalewski and Mrs. Loretta Jaworowski, both of Wilmington, Mrs. Josephine Stecki, Camden, N.J., and Mrs. Carrie Hopkins, New Castle.

Address by District of Columbia Commissioner Duncan at Democratic Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an address by Hon. John B. Duncan, Commissioner of District of Columbia, delivered at a Democratic rally on Monday, June 25.

Commissioner Duncan has summarized the record and achievements of the Kennedy administration and the Democratic Party in these past 18 months. His speech represents a basic outline of the progress of the New Frontier.

Commissioner John Duncan has earned the respect and admiration of the people of the District of Columbia by his dedication to the needs of the District and his outstanding record of public service.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, when requested to speak to you tonight, I was given just about the widest latitude that any speaker could be given by your chairman of this assembly. While that degree of latitude may or may not be necessary, I do want to commend your chairman for his kindness, his cooperation, and his consideration. I suppose I should also admit that when given numerous subjects for a discussion, it is also difficult to choose the best one. Fortunately, one of the questions that ran through each of the suggested topics was "What can we do?"

I would like, therefore, to talk about two things that we can do here in the District of Columbia. One pertains to individual effort to organize and the other pertains to the creation of a correct image of the Democratic Party.

With regard to the matter of individual effort, I might hasten to say that I believe that all of our friends and ourselves will find it necessary to put forth greater individual effort to fully organize and build our party in this city. Now, let no one conclude that this is a criticism, for it isn't. The fact is, that regardless of the organization or its purposes, the people of the District of Columbia never really rally around any group or idea unless there is a red hot issue of one kind or another. I am not therefore discouraged or disappointed by any apparent slow pace with which people have rallied around our party or any other party. On the other hand, this is probably the earliest period during which we can now expect to persuade people (more easily) to become active and interested in the Democratic Party. And I think this will be the case from this day on and until the 1964 elections are over. Even here, we should realize that in the absence of real and meaningful home rule, it will not be as easy to attract people as may be the case in other cities where the people have a mayor and city council of their own choice. It is important therefore that we understand our city so that we will not become discouraged by the difference between the obvious interest and activity of our citizens as compared to other cities who have good reasons to be active.

Nevertheless, we must obviously make the best of what we do have; and to that end, we must devise a means of reaching more and more people through the effort of every individual commited to the principles of the Democratic Party. From a practical point of view, and specifically, I mean that each of us (at every opportunity) must meet with very small groups across the city and discuss the potential of the Democratic Party (its worth, its progress, and its successes). This would envision no great expense and no great formalities. In fact, the smaller the groups the greater the warmth and therefore the greater the success in the end.

Now, this is not the only approach to increasing our numbers. My colleagues and I on the Board of Commissioners can, and are I believe, directing our attention to several things that we must do. For example, meeting with small groups is one thing we can do. Another is focusing greater and greater attention on new and additional personalities to assume civic responsibility with the city government on boards, councils and commissioners—and I include those commissions that pay various sums for attendance at meetings.

A third thing that we can do, is to help raise funds that will be sorely needed in the 1964 campaign. While I do not propose the specifics for this, I believe that a contribution can be made toward raising such funds. In any event, now would seem to be the time to start.

Now, with regard to the matter of creating a correct image of the Democratic Party, I think I see an organized effort by the opposition to discredit this administration at every turn of the road. And the sad part about all of this is that Democrats have always been so completely honest that sometimes they quite unintentionally and unwittingly add fuel to a fire actually started by the opposition.

The fact is, that this administration has fought and is fighting for the most forward looking programs this country has ever known. I challenge anyone to pick the field of endeavor and there you will find every conceivable effort of this administration to render that which is good for the masses of people of America. I challenge anyone to choose any office of the President's Cabinet, for there he will find the greatest of effort behind programs from which America as a whole can profit so very much. It may be Labor, and there you will find one of the greatest and most effective men of our time in Secretary Goldberg. Look to Commerce and you will find Secretary Hodges at work 16 to 18 hours per day and demonstrating foresight, dedication, and imagination. Look to HEW, and you will find the same dedication, foresight and imagination. Look to State and you will see a kind of cooperation and building of international good will as never before witnessed in America. Yes; look then to Agriculture, to Interior, or to any of the scores of agencies of this Government today and you will see the New Frontiersmen at work.

Look at the social reforms which our President is fighting so hard to inaugurate these days, and you will find that in spite of the dogged opposition there is still great hope and accomplishment.

And let me not omit the progress made in the field of civil rights, for this, too, will greatly influence the vote in the District of Columbia in 1964. Here, too, the image must be correctly created. The only correct image is the image of great progress and success. So great is that progress and success that we are now witnessing the greatest change that we have seen for 100 years. In spite of any misfortunes of our past as a Nation, I see an obviously changing America; an America now facing up to its greatest challenge—an America looking back on its history, yet looking forward—forward to the future for its role among the freedom-loving peoples of this new world.

This is to become a new day of good will among men everywhere. This is the beginning of the era of emancipation of all peoples everywhere; and certainly emancipation for Americans—emancipation in the sense that it is full freedom from bias, and from prejudice, both of which we believe, basically, to be un-American. Certainly, this is the hope of our largest minority group.

To be more specific, I venture to say, for example, that the greatest success that we have experienced in the field of civil rights has resulted from the effort of the President and his administration in the field of equal job opportunity; and most of this has occurred with the two biggest employers in the Nation, namely, private industry and the Federal Government.

In fact, no clearer example of progress in private industry need be mentioned than that made by Western Electric. And following them, there are others in private industry for whom this corporation has set the example. As you may know, on the side of private industry, as distinguished from Government, the nine largest Government contractors, with 800,000 workers, have long ago signed detailed agreements to equalize Negro job opportunities. As a specific example, the Lockheed Co., has opened its apprentice program, in Marietta, Ga., to Negroes; and it picked 1,000 Negroes out of 5,000 new employees hired in Burbank, Calif.

A similarly aggressive policy has been followed as to Government employment. Those agencies that are shown in surveys to have but few or no Negro employees have been ordered to recruit some. And they are doing it.

A classic example of this progress in Government is found in the experience of the U.S. Post Office Department where, during each and every month since March of 1961 numerous steps have been taken to guarantee equal job opportunity; for example, in March 1961 a Negro was appointed Deputy

Assistant Postmaster General (Bureau of Transportation), the highest post ever held by a member of his race in the postal service. Add to this the Department's new promotion policy prohibiting discrimination because of race, color, creed, or national origin.

In April, the Department appointed a compliance officer on civil rights; in May, Richard J. Murphy, Assistant Postmaster General was designated the Department's employment policy officer, and in each of the months of June, July, August, September, and October, numerous and similar steps were taken to provide equal job opportunity throughout the U.S. Post Office Department. To guarantee the success of its policies on equal opportunity, the Post Office Department placed several Negroes in policy-making positions and countless ones were promoted to positions commensurate with their abilities. For example, among the policymakers are such as: a Deputy Assistant Postmaster General; a Regional Personnel Manager in Chicago; an Assistant General Superintendent of Mails in Detroit; a postmaster at Magazine, Ala.; an acting postmaster in California; an employee relations officer in the District of Columbia; a superintendent in Memphis, Tenn., and a station superintendent and his assistant in the same city, with other assistant station superintendents in the city of Nashville; and let me add that in your National Capital City, we have an assistant postmaster.

I repeat, therefore, that a classic example of real progress in Government is found in the U.S. Post Office Department. Parenthetically, I might also say that irrespective of any individual employment problem, and however overpublicized an individual case may become, the record of the Post Office Department stands on its own. In fact, I suggest that in all our relationships, and comments, we remember those who are our friends and whose records are so overwhelmingly commendable in the field of equal job opportunity.

In any event, a continuation of the achievements of both Government and industry will stand for a long time as an ideal example for others to follow. This is the way it ought to be, for these are the two most likely institutions that will determine the destiny of this great Nation, insofar as its destiny relates to the equal opportunity afforded its citizens.

My friends, what is more important than the record of accomplishment of this great party is: that first, we tell this story over and over again to those who need it, and to those whose minds have been and are being poisoned by the opposition. Let us now concentrate more on supporting the administration openly and more frequently. The job done by every New Frontiersman is hard enough in itself. Each one needs less criticisms and more encouragement. As Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy told a publishers meeting in Baltimore last week—and I quote:

"This progress doesn't come about with the wave of a magic wand. It takes work." In one voting case, he said, 36,000 voting records were examined and testimony taken from 180 witnesses. Parenthetically, he pointed out, that in recent months (and of course as a result of the effort of the administration), 14 airports have voluntarily abolished segregation. Six of these are in the deep southern States. This is but one of countless successes of this administration.

My friends, the image which I now picture in the field of civil rights is the image that we must develop once and for all in our city. It is no longer a question as to whether our goods and wares sell themselves. We must sell them before others distort them.

Use of Foreign-Built Vessels in Domestic Coastwise Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in connection with a bill now pending in Congress, an interesting and informative editorial was published in the Fairbanks, Alaska, News-Miner of July 27, 1962, dealing with the use of foreign-built vessels in domestic coastwise trade. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAIN-SHIP PURCHASE WARRANTED

Bills are now pending in Congress to allow Alaska Steamship Co. to use a Japanese-built ferry carrying railroad cars from Seattle to the Alaska railbelt. Arguments favoring this legislation are convincing.

The Senate measure, by Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, would waive merchant marine law forbidding use of foreign-built vessels in domestic coastwise trade in this one instance.

Shipping interests protesting the half-price purchase of the Japanese-built *City of New Orleans* apparently are not remembering that they are using vessels bought from the United States at less than 50 cents on the dollar.

Railroads, airlines, and truckers purchase foreign equipment from time to time, so extending this practice into another field of transportation is hardly setting any wild precedent.

Furthermore, unless this transfer is allowed or some other development occurs right out of the blue, surface transportation to and from Alaska is certain to shift more and more toward the Canadian route, thus bypassing American ports.

How can Seattle compete with railcar barges out of Prince Rupert, 600 miles closer to the railbelt? One answer would seem to be the train-ship since it is faster. The barges from Prince Rupert to Whittier take about 5 days. The train-ship, with 56-railcar capacity, can go from Seattle to the railbelt in about 72 hours.

The new mode of transportation, together with the fact that competition should have a favorable effect on freight rates, diminishes the argument of some opponents that the Canadian sea train and Alaska Steam's proposed venture would hurt the economy of Seward and Valdez.

A charge that the national railroads have a four-fifths interest in the *City of New Orleans* and Alaska Steam only one-fifth is flatly denied by D. E. Skinner of the company.

"I should like to make it clear that no railroad or group of railroads has any financial interest in the proposed purchase of the *City of New Orleans* by the Alaska Steamship Co.," Skinner declared this week. "If, as we hope, the proposed legislation currently pending before Congress is enacted, the purchase of this vessel will be financed entirely by us without any participation direct or indirect on the part of the railroads."

On July 11 the Senate Commerce Committee reported favorably on the bill allowing transfer of the vessel. With this substantial progress, it is to be hoped there will be favorable action in the House. Hearings on the companion bill started yesterday in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

We do not say this particular trainship acquisition is the sole and only hope of the U.S. port of Seattle to retain its role as Alaska's principal supplier.

We do say that unless a trainship goes into operation between Puget Sound and Alaska in the near future, logistics and economics will soon divert the majority of Alaska's surface transportation through Canadian ports.

If the Congress wants to keep freight moving to the 49th State in American carriers from American ports, prompt affirmative action to allow Alaska Steam to consumate the trainship purchase is indicated.

The Space Communications Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the never ending race that the free world's technology runs with that of the Communist empire, it is essential that we have the best available scientific and managerial talent. The way to obtain such talent is to combine private enterprise and public service. A recent editorial in the Powell Tribune, an excellent semiweekly published in Powell, Wyo., makes just such a suggestion. This editorial gives a lucid account of the problems present in the space communications race and offers a concrete approach to them.

Another editorial on this subject appeared August 1 in the Washington Post. This editorial presents a constructive appraisal of the oft repeated charge that the communications satellite bill would create a monopoly injurious to the national welfare. There is no doubt that the very nature of modern communications systems limits participation to one company in one area. But, as this editorial points out, there are already in existence adequate safeguards to protect the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these two editorials printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Powell (Wyo.) Tribune of July 27, 1962]

FUN LIVING TODAY

We live in a tremendous age, a most vital, fast-moving era of world history.

It is the age of infinity with nations attempting to explore space.

It is still the age of colonization with leading nations of man's world attempting to be the first to place humans on the Moon and on Venus, or any other solar planet one might name.

It is the age of education with the best minds of the Nation testing methods and procedures for upgrading the education of our youth so vital in this age of expensive college costs, expanding school building needs and skyrocketing needs for intensive technical information.

Every new invention, each technical achievement—opens a new window on the future. This multiplies the questions about the life of man in this dawning age of infinity. We marvel, though we do not fully comprehend, the promises of Telstar, the plans for the trip to the Moon, to Venus, the Gemini vehicle or the Apollo lunar spacecraft.

Rotarians were challenged by Elven Royer Wednesday in his talk on "cybernation", which is the process of automation and computer phrases, when he predicted the next 100 years would see present labor masses cut by 75 to 80 percent as those employed in agriculture have been cut during the past 100 years.

This does not mean that there would be any more unemployed than today, although it may mean that. It does mean that there would be many more employed in the future in personal services, recreation and other fields tied to the satisfactions of man than at present, such as music, drama, etc.

Our Nation has no choice but to be in the space race. We must choose wisely and use our resources wisely. We are now spending about $4 billion a year on this race.

It was a wise choice that prompted our Government to give to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. the Telstar responsibility.

This should teach a lesson. Private companies, risking money for profit, play a significant role in space. The Government should encourage private enterprise to exploit these space opportunities. It is not the Government's role to take over the project when private business can do it.

It is the role of Government to exercise such supervision as is needed upon private enterprise for the common good.

Today as never before we need the best in leadership as well as the finest minds in technical fields.

In our race to conquer space, we so far have been able to create a stalemate with our enemies—they dare not attack us. We do want to check carefully in all decisions that space does not conquer man.

[From the Washington Post of Aug. 1, 1962]

BEHIND THE TELSTAR DEBATE

The filibuster in the Senate has almost obscured the merits and demerits of the administration's plan to create a satellite communications system through a private corporation under Federal regulation. The furor over unlimited debate and the proposed cloture petition have claimed the headlines. A mere squandering of time has taken the place of serious deliberations on the basis of the national interest.

Much of the opposition is centered in the word "monopoly." It is always safe to assail monopoly on the basis of general principles, but the fact remains that the satellite communications system will have to be a monopoly. This is not a sphere in which competitive systems could be rationally created. Rather, the major problem is to bring many countries together in creating and maintaining a satellite communications monopoly that will serve all mankind.

The administration and Congress might have decided that the Government should own and operate the so-called Telstars and ground stations that will be necessary to this new system. The President decided against that course for many reasons. Our present communications system is privately owned. It is natural to take advantage of its facilities and know-how in extending the system into space. No doubt the President and the House, which passed the bill by an overwhelming vote, concluded that this would be the fastest way to acquire a new communications system in space. They may also have concluded that a private corporation would operate more efficiently than a public body.

With the White House and the House firmly committed to a private corporation, having three public members on the board and subject to regulation by the FCC, the handful of opponents in the Senate could do nothing more, if their filibuster should succeed, than to defeat the bill and thus cause serious delay in this peaceful use of space. If any great principle were involved, perhaps even this drastic method might be justified. But the Congress is merely trying to follow what has long been established national policy in extending our communications system to a new field.

It is true, of course, that the Government would remain in the picture at many different points. It would continue research in the field. It would control the launching of all United States spacecraft. It would conduct or supervise all international negotiations in regard to space communications. Does this mean a gigantic "giveaway" of public facilities to a private monopoly, as opponents of the bill charge? Undoubtedly it will aid the communications companies, but the chief motivation lies in the aid it will give to the public and the country. If the rates are properly regulated, moreover, there will be no "giveaway." Opponents of the bill might better concentrate their efforts on providing the FCC with the funds it will need to make regulation of the new system effective.

Nor does it appear that there are any insuperable obstacles in negotiating with other countries because of private ownership of these satellites. In all matters touching our foreign policy the State Department will be in control. The problems of working with other governments for international control of a satellite system will not be essentially different from the problems arising out of existing cable systems.

These aspects of the bill need to be seriously debated in terms of practical advantages and basic national interests. The country would be greatly relieved if the minority in the Senate would concentrate on the real issues and then let the majority will prevail.

The Declaration of Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this year, the Atlantic Citizens Convention—comprised of delegates from member nations of NATO—met in Paris to discuss mutual problems and challenges.

The convention adopted a series of recommendations, entitled "The Declaration of Paris."

The U.S. delegates to the convention were headed by the distinguished Christian A. Herter, former Secretary of State; and William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State.

The recommendations, I believe, deserve the consideration of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have a brief résumé of the declaration printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DECLARATION OF PARIS

The 92 delegates voted in favor of the organization of a true Atlantic community. Not one spoke against it. The 2 weeks of discussion and debate related solely to timing—when the organization could be brought into being. The convention in the Declaration of Paris overwhelmingly supported the following specific proposals, among others:

(a) That the NATO governments promptly establish a special governmental commission to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of an Atlantic community organized to meet the political, military and economic challenges of this era.

(b) That a permanent high council at the highest political level be created to concert and plan and, in agreed cases, to decide policy on matters of concern to the community as a whole.

(c) That an Atlantic High Court of Justice be established to decide specified legal controversies.

(d) That the NATO Parliamentarians Conference be developed into a consultative assembly.

(e) That a trade partnership be formed between the United States and the European Economic Community, the basis of an Atlantic economic community, open to other nations of the free world.

(f) That the Atlantic nations cooperate on a larger scale with the developing nations in their economic progress, through direct and multilateral action, through the acceleration of investments and through measures which would increase both the volume and value of their exports.

(g) That, in view of the hundreds of millions of hungry people alive today and the prospect that there will be three billion more persons in the next generation, the Atlantic community be requested to address itself forthwith to the population problem.

Jerseymen Can Be Proud of Records at Age 300

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we of New Jersey are preparing for our tercentenary in 1964. In almost 300 years, New Jersey has scored an unbelievable record of achievement and accomplishment both in the rural and urban areas of our State.

In the July 24 issue of the Camden Courier-Post, John O. Davies, Jr., a skilled journalist, has proclaimed that as a State New Jersey is a "big little bantam." His article is further testimony to the undeniable fact that the Garden State has far more in it than many persons realize. In terms of industry and farming, transportation, retail purchasing power, cultural opportunities and all other facets of life, New Jersey possesses one of the most amazing diversities in the country. For example, the most urbanized State in the Union also has within its boundaries Hunterdon County, among the most rural counties in the United States, with 67 percent of its lands being farmed. Mr. Davies' keen insight and skillful handling of the State's records allows one to see that New Jersey offers much to everyone who lives or visits within her borders.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Davies' article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that the information contained therein can receive greater attention.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JERSEYMEN CAN BE PROUD OF RECORDS AT AGE 300

(By John O. Davies, Jr.)

TRENTON.—You can be proud you're a Jerseyman. You live in one of the smallest States of the Nation—but it's among the biggest and the best in many fields.

You've got a lot to talk about because you're the mostest. In almost 300 years, you've scored many firsts, achieved many records. You can stand eye to eye with New Yorkers, Pennsylvanians, Californians, even Texans.

As a State, you're a big little bantam.

Even your nickname is justified. The Garden State boasts more farm income per acre than any other State. A larger percentage of your farms have electrical service. Your dairy cows are the third most productive.

You're an industrial giant-killer. You're 1st in the Nation in chemicals, 3d in the manufacture of clothing and clocks, 4th in electrical machinery, 6th in food, stone, clay, glass, and tobacco, 7th in metal fabrication and in printing and publishing, 8th in transport equipment, 9th in machinery, 10th in leather goods.

More motor vehicles roll on your highways than anywhere else. With almost 2,000 line miles of railroad, you've got the most concentrated trackage per square mile in the United States.

You're richer than you think. Your retail purchases amount to $8 billion. Yet you've more than $14 billion to spend. Your average household has a spending power of close to $8,000. Each year you make close to 14 million calls on more than 3 million telephones.

Your industrial growing pains began in 1676, when an ironworks was established in Shrewsbury. Since then you've demonstrated an inventiveness that still is attracting factories big and small.

The first steamboats were produced here. So was the first steam locomotive, the first practical electric light, the first usable submarine, the first smokeless powder.

In cultural circles, you can hold your own with the eggheads. Yours was the only colony with two colleges, Princeton and Rutgers. The third oldest high school in the Nation was built in Newark. Now you have close to 40 colleges and universities of all types, more than 356 high schools, close to 2,000 elementary schools, more than 300 libraries.

You're third highest in the Nation in educational expenditures per pupil.

You can look into the mirror with pride. You've got many striking features, unusual characteristics.

Your Atlantic City is the Nation's convention capitol. In Burlington, your largest county, you touch ocean in the east and river in the west. Your Camden County is known for its industrial diversification. Your Cumberland County is among the leading producers of clay, glass, and stone. Your Gloucester County is noted for agricultural advancements.

Your youngest county, Union, is the second smallest in land area, third largest in industrial output. Your Hunterdon is among the most rural counties, with 67 percent of its land being farmed. Your Middlesex County, home of Rutgers, is noted for both industry and agriculture. Your Somerset, while a rural paradise, boasts some of the Nation's leading industries.

As a Jerseyman you can stand up straight and walk with a strut. That's not your nature, of course, but when you're 300 years old in 1964, you'll surely be forgiven for swaggering a bit.

The Davis-Bacon Act and Its Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as you know the Special Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, has been holding hearings on the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration.

There has been no full-scale congressional review of the Davis-Bacon Act since it was enacted into law in 1931.

The hearings are now coming to a close. Thirty-eight witnesses have testified and 15 statements have been filed by persons who did not testify.

The subcommittee has provided an opportunity to all who wished to testify whether or not they were critical of the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration. I wish to insert at this point in my remarks a letter which I recently sent to one of our witnesses, Mrs. Bessie Slautterback, who was interested in a small housing project for the elderly. The letter indicates that not only did the subcommittee welcome testimony from representatives of large labor organizations, construction, and aircraft industries, but from interested individual citizens as well.

As a result of Mrs. Slautterback's testimony, the Solicitor of Labor, in his recent testimony before our subcommittee, acknowledged that the interpretations and procedures of his office could be improved. I wish to submit the pertinent excerpts from the Solicitor's testimony:

Mr. DONAHUE. Now, I personally, Mr. Chairman, took the time to read her testimony in detail, to look into the matter in detail, and I have satisfied myself that the Department of Labor stopped somewhere short of where it should have in its efforts to ascertain the proper prevailing rates in her case, and I have every sympathy for the position in which she was placed.

I believe that we did not fully carry the burden and the responsibility of moving forward to find out what the rates were when Mrs. Slautterback suggested to us that housing and residential wage rates in Fremont were at a different and lower scale from those which were determined.

If at any time Mrs. Slautterback would desire to make a reapplication to the Department of Labor, we will assure her, and I will assure the chairman personally, that the wages in Fremont, Mich., will receive a very careful survey in order to find out what are the true facts concerning residential and housing rates in that area.

From Mrs. Slautterback's testimony the subcommittee received a better appreciation of various problems relating to the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration. She and individuals like her are to be commended for exercising their privilege as citizens in helping to improve our laws.

JULY 31, 1962.

Mrs. BESSIE B. SLAUTTERBACK,
Executive Secretary, Fremont Foundation,
Fremont, Mich.

DEAR MRS. SLAUTTERBACK: I want personally to thank you for your assistance to the Special Subcommittee on Labor in bringing certain matters to its attention.

As a result of your efforts in testifying before our subcommittee during the hearings on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act, the subcommittee will study ways to eliminate such problems as you brought out in your testimony.

Because of your interest in this matter I am enclosing a copy of the testimony of the Solicitor of Labor relating to the Fremont Foundation.

It is only through the individual efforts of citizens such as you that laws are improved. I know I speak on behalf of the members of the subcommittee when I compliment you on your coming forward to provide the subcommittee with your experience with the Davis-Bacon Act.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Chairman.

Restoring Business Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article written by the noted writer, Mr. David Lawrence, for whose views I have a great respect.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESTORING BUSINESS CONFIDENCE—SIX MOVES TO IMPROVE PSYCHOLOGY OFFERED AS TAX-CUT ALTERNATIVES

(By David Lawrence)

The spectacle of a President of the United States watching over the country's business mechanism as if it were a sick patient, and waiting for the opportune moment to administer or withhold an economic hypodermic, is psychologically at least, a strange one. It could prolong rather than cure the illness.

For the argument about whether to ask Congress to grant a tax cut now or next January ignores the realities. The theory back of a tax reduction is that the money saved by the taxpayer would be used to spur spending. But the truth is that people in the aggregate have plenty of money today which they could spend if they weren't scared—lots of it in savings banks and lots of it in surpluses in corporations. The real trouble is a widespread fear that savings will be depleted and cash accumulations drained if business gets worse and if what's ailing business isn't soon remedied.

The Nation doesn't really need a general tax cut, either for individuals or corporations, though there are some glaring inequities that should be promptly removed.

A business making $1 million a year today pays the Treasury $520,000 in taxes and retains $480,000. If, by the cut in tax rates now being suggested for corporations, the rate was to go from 52 percent to 48 percent, it would mean that the same business would retain $520,000, and the Government would get $480,000. This represents a net gain for the above business of exactly $40,000. Ask any businessman which he would rather have—a gain of only $40,000, or a rise of about $240,000 in net profits—and he will quickly choose the larger sum. How could he get that extra $240,000? If business conditions improved and his sales rose so that his profits were $1.5 million a year, he would have an additional net after taxes of $240,000 without any change whatsoever in tax rates.

Increased volume of sales, therefore, is a much more important factor than a tax cut. For the latter could conceivably diminish public confidence because of the big Treasury deficit that would be incurred. It could bring an array of new and perhaps more acute problems as the finances of the United States come under the sharp scrutiny of the outside world, especially since the dollar is in serious trouble anyway.

What, then, is the alternative if there isn't to be a general tax cut? The answer is for the Kennedy administration and factional groups in Congress to stop doing the things that have undermined confidence and to give some assurance that such a reversal would not be temporary but permanent. What are some of the things that need to be done? Here are a few:

1. Stop tampering with the normal and natural processes of the free-enterprise system and leave it to Moscow to argue for government ownership or the suppression of private incentive as a way of life. Recent speeches by so-called "liberal" Democrats during the filibuster in the Senate, espousing Government ownership of communications projects in the air, have alarmed investors, who see this as a movement hostile to private business.

2. Stop asking for the election of more such "liberals," who want the Government to take over and run the country.

3. Stop the flow of gobbledygook on "guidelines" for wage and price increases. If prices or wages are to be regulated by the Government, it's better to set up a wage-price board under Federal law.

4. Stop using the antitrust laws to harass business, and start getting laws that will do away with monopolistic power exercised by either big unionism or big business.

5. Stop interfering with the operations of American businesses in Europe which are bringing back hundreds of millions of dollars a year in tax revenue, and stop telling them they cannot use their earnings for reinvestment. Competing businesses owned by the British and other Europeans are permitted to do so by their respective governments.

6. Stop scaring the promoters of free enterprise. Make them feel they have a future and that investors have a better-than-even chance of getting their money back at a profit if they now lay long-range plans based on the natural growth of America's population and the inevitable triumphs that efficiency can bring in a self-stabilizing economy.

There is nothing wrong with the economic situation currently that can't be corrected by a change in business psychology—brought about by a conservative-minded President and a conservative-minded Congress, elected in November. For conservatism today primarily means to conserve the free enterprise system as against those who would undermine it and perhaps unwittingly destroy it.

Tribute to Senator Gruening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on June 2 last in Alaska's largest city friends of Senator Ernest Gruening gathered at a dinner to do him honor. It was a heart-warming occasion, and the tributes paid were as strong and as vigorous and as sincere as the man himself. The address of Senator Wayne Morse led the many tributes, both written and verbal.

I ask unanimous consent that the Anchorage speech of Oregon's senior Senator be printed in the Record, as well as a few of the many messages received, together with the capsule account, reproduced from the dinner program, of an outstanding public service career.

There being no objection, the address and other items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

Stanley McCutcheon, Ernest Gruening, all you wonderful friends of Ernest Gruening, you have paid me a great honor and great compliment by inviting me to come here tonight and join you in paying homage and honor to this great American statesman, Ernest Gruening.

I want to say that Stanley McCutcheon flattered me far beyond any possibility of relating what he said to prove I am a friend of Alaska, but there were many of us in the Congress of the United States who joined in battling for the right of Alaska to cease being an American colony and proceed to be an American State. And for all those that helped in that great cause in behalf of you I express here tonight on this public record our thanks and deep appreciation. There were many of us. But, let me say that Alaska in my judgment would not be a State tonight if it were not for the man that we honor and his colleague, Bob Bartlett, who now also is in the Senate and at that time was your Delegate to the Congress and many, many here in Alaska who gave us the facts and the information that we needed to prove our case.

I well remember, Stanley, when I came here in 1949 as chairman of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and we traveled throughout Alaska up to Nome. And we went back and made our report. It is true that in that report I used the phrase that Alaska was a colony and that America should not join the colonial powers by maintaining colonies and we ought to give Alaska not only her independence but we ought to see to it that Alaska became the 49th State of the Union. And you proved how right we were in that battle. But I turn now to the dedicated purpose of this great meeting, as we come here to rededicate our friendship with Ernest Gruening. I want to refer to him as a statesman in what I consider to be the true sense of the word. You ask me what I mean by a statesman. I'll tell you what I mean. You give me a man of courage. You give me a man of unquestioned integrity. You give me a man who understands that the purpose of this Republic of ours as our constitutional fathers laid down when they gave birth to this Republic is to promote the general welfare of the people of this country. You give me a man dedicated to the welfare of the people and the fighting heart to battle for them and I'll give you a statesman, and I give you tonight Ernest Gruening as a personification, of my definition of a statesman.

I come to you tonight—and he can close his ears while I speak about him personally because I know him to be a modest man—I come to you tonight to tell you of some of my observations of this man's statesmanship. When I was a very young man Ernest Gruening was a great journalist in this country who was a source of inspiration to me. His liberal writing—when I refer to "liberal" I want you to know that I always put the word "constitutional" before liberalism—Ernest Gruening is a great constitutional liberal. What do I mean by a constitutional liberal? A constitutional liberal seeks to translate into legislation the two fundamental guarantees of the Constitution, namely the guarantee of economic freedom of choice for the individual, made possible—and made possible only—through a private enterprise economy on the great human rights guarantees of the Constitution epitomized principally in the 14th and 15th amendments and the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. A constitutional liberal seeks to translate into legislation those great guarantees. And Ernest Gruening in every activity that is performed throughout his great life and statesmanship as an editor, as a Governor of Alaska now as a U.S. Senator has performed as a constitutional liberal should perform. But I want to stress this above all else that I may say about Ernest's life. He is on the threshold of a greater service than any service he has yet rendered the American people. His Senate career is really just beginning. He's completed the pledgeship. He's been a freshman for 3½ years. Now Ernest Gruening moves into the inner sanctum, so to speak, with great power in the Senate, with great respect in the Senate.

I want to say that in my judgment Alaska couldn't afford not to have the service of Ernest Gruening in the Senate of the United States for the next 6 years, and it's up to you, the people of Alaska, to see to it that we're not deprived of the leadership of Ernest Gruening.

I want to talk about some of the contributions that he's already made. I want to point out to you what I consider to be some of this legislative philosophy that is vital to Alaska and vital to the Nation. But probably as a preface to commenting on that, I ought to lay down this basic tenet of political philosophy of mine. I happen to believe it's the basic tenet of all constitutional liberals. You will see immediately that I'm Burkian, that I do not think anyone has ever improved upon that basic philosophy of Edmund Burke enunciated in 1774 when he discussed the primary obligation of an elected representative of the free people in any parliamentary body. In essence, what Burke said was that those who have the trust given to a parliamentarian is to follow where the facts lead, testing those facts against the question, "What do these facts show the public interest to be in respect to this issue?"

And I submit to you that if you'll study the legislative record, the record of this statesman also as a Governor, the record of this statesman in every public position that he's held, you will find that Ernest Gruening always asks the question, "What are the facts about this issue and what do these facts show the public interest to be?" And once he's decided on his answer to that question, Ernest Gruening's answer is automatic, as it should be. For here is a man that puts the public interest as after all the determining factor in his own action.

All I'm saying really is it not true that the constitutional liberal recognizes that after all the only value that counts when all is said and done is the human value.

For I think the second tenet I would stress tonight as I honor ERNEST GRUENING is to point out to you that as representatives in the Congress of the United States we sit there to promote human value. For the only wealth Alaska has, the only wealth Oregon has, the only wealth the United States has happens to be the wealth of our people. Human values are what count and this system of economic freedom of ours is designed to promote human value.

The third tenet, I think, of political philosophy I would present here tonight in honoring ERNEST GRUENING is to have you refresh your memory that there would be no political freedom unless there is first economic freedom of choice of the individual. Take a look at your knowledge of history for a moment. Show me any society, will you, in which the people do not have economic freedom of choice for the individual but do have political freedom of choice. You can't recall one, for no such society has ever existed.

Some way, somehow, we've got to get the American people to recognize whenever they're confronted with any one of these great issues that trouble us to never forget that our economic freedom of choice is basic to our political freedom of choice. Do you ever stop to realize that after all our basic struggle with the British Crown was not in the first instance a political struggle but an economic struggle? Our colonial fathers insisted on the right to be economically free. You give me a political seedbed of economic freedom and I'll give you a political seedbed in which political freedom will automatically sprout and grow.

Now I want to take this tenet and apply it to American foreign policy because there sits in front of me here tonight the man we honor who has become already one of the leaders in the Senate in the whole field of foreign policy and when all is said and done the one issue that pales all the others into insignificance is the issue of foreign policy. What we do in foreign policy in the next 10 to 20 years will determine whether or not you and I leave a heritage of freedom to our grandchildren. Note my time bracket. I am not talking about great-grandchildren—I'm talking about a time bracket that involves our grandchildren. Unless the cause of freedom is won in that time bracket, there will be no heritage of freedom left for our grandchildren. That's why foreign policy pales all the others into insignificance and here is one of the best scholars, one of the best informed men in the whole Congress of the United States in this field of foreign policy.

If BOB BARTLETT were here tonight and Congressman RIVERS were here tonight, both of them would support what I have just said, for we look to ERNEST GRUENING for leadership in the field of foreign policy. I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America and I want to say that the writings of ERNEST GRUENING have been a source of education and inspiration to me for many, many years. I referred to his writings when I was a young man and he was editor of The Nation. I want to call your attention to the great book that he wrote on Mexico that is still a standard reference book for my Committee on Latin America. You'd be surprised the number of times each year that we go back to a point raised by ERNEST GRUENING in that book.

You know the various positions that he's held in regard to Latin America since. You know the appointment, as is brought out in the biographical material in your program tonight, of Franklin Roosevelt who looked to him for leadership also in respect to American foreign policy in Latin America. The Roosevelt good neighbor policy was a policy based upon the advice that Roosevelt got from ERNEST GRUENING. I can testify here tonight that my Committee on Latin America consults with him frequently regarding Latin American problems. More recently, he has served as one of our Senate delegates for interparliamentary conference with Mexico, both last year and again just last month.

So I say to the people in Alaska, if you will only appreciate the importance of this general issue problem of foreign policy, you'll not deny the future generations of American boys and girls the services of this great American in the Senate of the United States during the next 6 years because it's vital to that issue.

There's about to open in the Senate of the United States, in fact just this next week, a great historic debate on American foreign aid. Our ERNEST GRUENING has made perfectly clear that he recognizes that we have to assume our share of responsibility of helping underdeveloped countries, that we have to assume our share of responsibility in seeing that this seedbed of economic freedom is cultivated so that we can develop great strength in the plants of political freedom in the underdeveloped areas of the world, but he also recognizes, and I want to stress this point because I have been battering away on this point now as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee for a good many years, that the greatest defense weapon the United States has, important as all our nuclear weapons are, the greatest defense weapon the United States has happens to be our own economy. And unless we keep that economy strong, we're going to weaken, in my judgment, our sphere of influence around the world, and we're going to make ourselves succeptible to successful attack against us.

All ERNEST GRUENING has been doing in these debates of the last 3 years on foreign policy in relation to foreign aid is to present the facts. And he pointed out what we have done in the underdeveloped countries in developing roads and schools and dams, what we have done in pouring into those countries the resources of America, pointing out, for example, that the national debt of the United States now has become greater than the debt of all these countries, including our allies and the underdeveloped countries that we've aided. Why? Because you and I, the taxpayers of the United States, paid off their debts while our debt has mounted.

And so ERNEST GRUENING has said the time has come for us to look at the balance sheet: We're going to continue to be of reasonable assistance to them but we've got roads to build. We have natural resources to develop. We have schools to build. We have our own economy to strengthen; and I have pledged to him on the floor of the Senate, I pledge to him in Anchorage, Alaska, tonight, that I'll stand shoulder to shoulder with him as we seek to strengthen and improve, ERNEST, this foreign aid bill this next week in the Senate of the United States.

Now, may I say in closing because, let me point out that the flicking of those lights means that my time is about up because we're on television, you really didn't need me in view of this program that you have here tonight because this program sets out the salient facts about the statesmanship of this great American; then when you turn to the back of the program and you read those wonderful commendations he deserves from great leaders of our country starting with the courageous and great President of the United States and the Vice President, what more could one say. But in closing I want to say this. I've given you my definition of a statesman. I now want to say I shall forever be grateful of the fact that ERNEST GRUENING is my friend. Thank you very much.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 1, 1962.

I am delighted to send a word of greeting to all of you gathering to honor Senator ERNEST GRUENING this Saturday. During his long term as Governor of the Territory of Alaska and as a U.S. Senator ERNEST GRUENING has served Alaska and the Nation well. His work on the Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works, and Government Operations Committees is diligent and constructive. You have sent to Washington an articulate spokesman for our 49th State. His whole career has been characterized by extraordinary vigor and vision.

To ERNEST GRUENING, to his colleague, BOB BARTLETT, and to all Alaska Democrats I send cordial regards and warmest wishes.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Care of Senator Gruening's Testimonial Dinner, Elks Hall, Anchorage, Alaska.

DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate most highly the invitation to join in a testimonial dinner, honoring you for the distinguished service you have given the Territory and the State of Alaska, 14 years as Governor and 4 years as U.S. Senator.

I am as sorry as I can be that I will not be able to be with you because you are too far away for me to make the trip at that time.

I wish to extend congratulations to you on this honor and I certainly wish I could be present for this occasion. Kindest regards to you and I sincerely hope that everything will continue to work out with you as it should.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

MAY 31, 1962.

Mrs. HELEN M. FISHER,
Democratic National Committee Woman for Alaska:

The high regard in which you hold Senator ERNEST GRUENING in Alaska is echoed here in the hallowed Halls and Chamber of the U.S. Capitol. In the Senate we value his advice highly and are proud to have his friendship. Please extend my personal congratulations to him.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, May 18, 1962.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Anchorage, Alaska.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: It is a real pleasure to join with your many friends in paying tribute for your many years of devoted service to your beloved Alaska.

For 14 years you gave outstanding service as Governor of the Territory of Alaska and with the achieving of statehood, you continued your service as a distinguished Senator from our 49th State.

Your devotion to the progress and development of Alaska merits for you a lasting place in the history of that territory and State.

Senator WAYNE MORSE speaks for all of us as he pays tribute to your outstanding public career.

May your work in the interest of an even greater Alaska meet with the same success as your efforts in the past.

With sincere best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. SWAINSON, *Governor.*

JOHN ALCANTRA,
Special Assistant to the Governor,
Department of Revenue:

Twenty-one years ago, as a freshman member of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, I first met ERNEST GRUENING, who was then in his freshman year as Governor of Alaska. That first encounter was a memorable one for me. I was confident that in Ernest Gruening Alaska had a brilliant, courageous Governor with a keen sense of public interest and dynamic ideas for furthering the growth and development of Alaska. But I could not foresee—and I suspect no one else at that time could either—the tremendous impact this man would have on our territory and ultimately our State. Rarely does one man influence the course of history, but in Ernest Gruening Alaska has met such a man and has become a far better place from the encounter. Words can scarcely express my admiration for him. Likewise, it is difficult for Alaska to begin to repay the debt it owes him for what he has accomplished during two decades of dedicated service. My fondest wishes are with you tonight, Ernest, tempered only by the regret of Neva and I that we cannot be with you to extend them in person.

Your friend,
Bill Egan,
Governor of Alaska.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senator Gruening Testimonial Dinner,
Elks Hall, Anchorage, Alaska:

I would like to take this means to join with our colleague, Senator Wayne Morse, and the other distinguished guests and friends who are honoring you on this occasion, in sending my personal greetings and best wishes to you. You have been a strong right arm in the Senate. Your conscientious attention to duty, and the needs of your State, our country, and our party have been outstanding and the effectiveness of your efforts has been a tribute to your career in the U.S. Senate.

Sincerely,
Mike Mansfield,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Testimonial Dinner,
Elks Hall, Anchorage, Alaska:

I wish I could join many of your friends Saturday night to honor and salute you. You are truly one of the outstanding statesmen of our time. I know of no one with a more impressive record and productive career. Your experience and wisdom have served your State and the country magnificently. We need you. We respect you. We look forward to your continued contributions to the Senate and the Nation.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey.

U.S. Senate,
May 16, 1962.

Mr. Stanley J. McCutcheon,
Gruening Campaign Chairman,
Anchorage, Alaska.

Dear Mr. McCutcheon: I have known Governor Gruening during his period of service as one of Alaska's great Governors and have worked closely with him as a colleague in the U.S. Senate. We also serve on two committees together. I can say that the people of Alaska are fortunate in having a man who is such an able and effective advocate to represent them. I am happy to join in sending congratulations and all good wishes on this important occasion.

Sincerely yours,
Henry M. Jackson,
U.S. Senator.

Democratic Senatorial
Campaign Committee,
Washington, D.C., May 29, 1962.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Elks Hall,
Anchorage, Alaska.

Dear Ernest: I regret I will be unable to make the long trip to Anchorage. I had hoped to find some way to join your many other friends in paying tribute to your long, able, and faithful service to the people of your State and our Nation. I enjoy a deep sense of pride knowing I am serving in the Senate along side such a distinguished and deciated public servant as yourself.

As a new State, Alaska can well be proud of the record you have achieved over the years as Territorial Governor and now as a member of the U.S. Senate's Interior Committee, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Public Works—all vital to the progress of your State.

My best wishes and the best wishes of my wife, Martha, are with you and Mrs. Gruening tonight.

Sincerely,
Vance Hartke,
U. S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1962.

Mr. Stanley J. McCutcheon,
Chairman, Senator Ernest Gruening Testimonial Dinner, Anchorage, Alaska.

Dear Chairman: I am happy to learn that the Alaskan admirers of the Honorable Ernest Gruening plan a testimonial dinner in his honor at Anchorage on June 2.

Regretfully, circumstances prevent me from joining with the Senator's friends on the soil that he loves so deeply and serves so faithfully; but I would like to register my sentiments of esteem for my good friend and colleague.

It seemed most appropriate that with the admission of Alaska to statehood that Ernest Gruening should come to Washington as her Senator. He had been the arduous and able advocate of whose pleas and persistence there came this recognition of our great frontier territory.

A lifetime of many skills and talents found their flower in his dedication to Alaska through a score of years. Eloquent, energetic, informed—genial to win friends—dynamic to win causes—he holds Alaska as the land of his heart's desire and its gains are his goals. Quick to defend—loyal to protect—Ernest Gruening has helped to make Alaska a meaningful partner of all the States and a front line bulwark in our country's world responsibilities.

I extend my felicitations to all who honor themselves in honoring him.

Most sincerely yours,
John O. Pastore,
U. S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1962.

Mr. Stanley J. McCutcheon,
Chairman, Gruening Testimonial Dinner Committee, Anchorage, Alaska:

As a citizen of Maine, I have more than a passing interest in the State of Alaska. Both of our States are noted for cold winters and warm-hearted people.

I have long valued my association with your two good Senators, Bob Bartlett and Ernest Gruening. Tonight, I am pleased to extend particular greetings to Senator Gruening.

You know, better than I, his record of devoted service to your State and the gallant role he played in bringing Alaska to statehood. I like to think that part of his ability in achieving success, under difficult circumstances, stems from his career as a liberal and progressive newspaper publisher in the State of Maine. There is hardly a day that passes when I do not wish that he were still publishing a paper in Maine, but I must confess that whatever advantages there might be in that situation, they are more than balanced by his contribution to Alaska and the Nation, as your Senator.

I congratulate you on your good luck in having him as a citizen of Alaska, and on your good sense in electing him the U.S. Senate.

Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1962.

Mr. Stanley J. McCutcheon,
Chairman, Gruening Testimonial Dinner Committee, Anchorage, Alaska:

My Dear Friends: Alaska is rightfully proud of Ernest Gruening. He serves the Senate with honorable distinction and his work reflects credit to the great State of Alaska. I join his legion of friends in honoring him for his distinguished service, and I congratulate Ernest Gruening upon the high place of respect and affection he holds in the hearts of his friends everywhere.

Sincerely yours,
Ralph W. Yarborough,
U.S. Senator.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Care Chairman Stanley J. McCutcheon,
Elks Hall, Anchorage:

Your able leadership, and dedicated scholarly service to your great State commends the admiration of your colleagues in the Senate. I join your friends in paying tribute for one has done so much.

Ralph W. Yarborough,
U.S. Senator.

Mrs. E. A. Fischer,
Chairman, Senator Ernest Gruening Testimonial Dinner, Anchorage, Alaska:

Please extend fond good wishes to Ernest Gruening, a colleague whose friendship and counsel I have cherished for many years. We in the Senate have a debt to the people of Alaska for giving us the benefit of his talents and wisdom. Best regards.

Maurine B. Neuberger,
U.S. Senator.

Gruening Testimonial Dinner Committee,
Anchorage, Alaska:

Senator Ernest Gruening is one of the finest friends and ablest supports of the rural electrification program on the U.S. Senate. We are happy to join with all of you in doing him this great honor. I personally wish for him many more years of successful service in the interest of his country.

Clyde T. Ellis,
General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C.

Charlo, Mont., *May 19, 1962.*

Mrs. Helen M. Fischer,
Cochairman, Gruening Testimonial Dinner Committee, Anchorage, Alaska.

Dear Helen: It would be a real pleasure to attend a testimonial dinner for Senator Gruening. I wish I could.

I shall never forget his courtesy in writing me at length about his book, "The Public Pays," when I, a plain stranger, not holding any party office at the time, inquired about it. Nor shall I ever forget the courteous, fair, and skillful manner in which he conducted the hearing in Missoula on Senator Murray's Knowles bill. I wish he could return right now to advise us. The issue has come up and is being fought with relentless bitterness by Montana Power Co.

You will understand, because you are so busy in your own State, why it is impossible for me to leave mine. Nor can Rae and I contribute to your campaign as we would like to because our resources are being strained to the limit on Montana's own campaigns.

Will you give Senator Gruening our warmest greetings? We wish him well in November and in his endeavors during his next term in the Senate.

Sincerely,
Francis Logan.

Tribute to Senator Ernest Gruening

In 1957, 87 Boy Scouts and leaders from Alaska, attended the national jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa.

They departed from Anchorage by train to Whittier and from there boarded an Army transport the MSTS *Frederick Funston* for Seattle.

The boys and leaders boarded a chartered Great Northern Railway train from Seattle. Their trip covered Chicago, Detroit, Niagara Falls, New York, and Valley Forge. The boys were at the jamboree for 7 days during which time they were required to cook their own meals.

At the close of the jamboree, the boys and leaders proceeded to Washington, D.C., and were met by the Alaska delegation under the Tennessee plan, Senator and Mrs. Ernest Gruening, Congressman Ralph J. Rivers, and Gov. William A. Egan. The Scouts were escorted to their hotel by the delegates. Senator BARTLETT was out of town and was unable to meet the group. Senator and Mrs. Ernest Gruening invited all 87 Scouts and leaders out to their home for dinner the next day.

Upon arriving at the Senator's home, the Scouts were ushered to the back yard and served all the broiled hamburgers, hot dogs, assorted flavors of cold drinks, mountains of potato salad, pickles, olives, and relishes. After eating their own cooking for 7 days at the jamboree and several unsatisfactory meals en route, this meal was outstanding.

Senator and Mrs. Gruening had their television set carried out to the lawn for the Scouts' enjoyment. Some of the boys had never watched television before. In fact, one Eskimo boy, Allen Alowa, from Savoonga, Alaska, had never seen a tree, cow, horse, train, car, or bus. I might add that of all the different things Allen saw, the thing he wanted most to take back to Savoonga was a cow. He really liked the milk he drank. It was noticed that all extra milk the boys in his patrol did not want was consumed by Allen.

During the evening, Senator GRUENING was asked to say a few words to the Scouts. He went to great length to inform the Scouts as to his purpose of being in Washington fighting for statehood and how important it was for Alaska to win that fight. It was most inspiring and was received by the Scouts with a great deal of enthusiasm.

I can honestly say that the inspiration received from Senator GRUENING's reception made the burden of responsibility for the return trip to Alaska much easier for the Scouts and their leaders. From the many comments by the Scouts and leaders, it was the most enjoyable highlight of the entire 30 days.

I should like to add that Senator GRUENING has accepted the nomination and has been elected to serve as vice president of the Western Alaska Council, Boy Scouts of America for the Scout year April 1962 to April 1963.

ROBERT RISLEY,
Jamboree Scout Leader, Council Commissioner, Western Alaska Council, Boy Scouts of America.

In his vigor and strength, ERNEST GRUENING will continue to give all that one life can give to one State. He needs no eulogy from me, or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it boldly.

E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT,
U.S. Senator.

[From the dinner program]

ALL HISTORY BEGINS WITH A MINORITY OF ONE

In the beginning there was Alaska. The vibrant history of this great land, when traced back through the years, begins to emerge following the life of one man representing his Emperor. Then another statesman representing his Nation fought for the purchase of the land. Another lonely man on a nameless stream found gold, and somewhere in the passage of time a fisherman marked a page in history by taking salmon from the land to send to the market places of the Nation.

In 1935 another man came. His name: ERNEST GRUENING.

Within the pages of "Who's Who in America" can be found the name of ERNEST GRUENING followed by a long paragraph of honors and achievements. The first four words of this biographical listing read: "Government official, editor, author."

To know ERNEST GRUENING is to know the history of Alaska over the past three decades. As the 49th member of the United States, the State of Alaska owes a great share of its partnership in the Nation to this man with the accolade "The Original Minority of One."

Born in New York, the son of an internationally acclaimed physician, he graduated from Harvard University as a doctor. He elected as a chosen career the field of journalism and served the fourth estate in various editorships on Boston Traveler, Boston Journal, and the New York Evening Post, climaxing his journalistic career as the crusading editor of the Nation, a New York magazine.

For more than 35 years ERNEST GRUENING has been a contemporary and associate of our Nation's greatest leaders, but it was President Franklin D. Roosevelt who launched him into the field of public service and administration by naming him as advisor to the Inter-American Conference of Latin American Affairs in 1933. This was followed by appointment as the first Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions in the Department of the Interior.

In 1939 President Roosevelt appointed him Governor of Alaska, and he was twice reappointed; the last time by President Harry Truman.

He was to wait and fight for another generation. It was not until he was the Alaska-Tennessee plan Senator from the Territory were the pages of Alaska history inked with the sovereign and majestic word "statehood."

During the long and hard fought years before statehood it was he who said, "To develop this great, raw and vast land we must harvest the power of one of the world's greatest rivers—the legendary and powerful Yukon."

It was Governor GRUENING who said, "The destiny of Alaska will never be set until the equality of statehood is achieved," and to back his belief he appointed the first statehood committee. As Governor he argued for and built Alaska's airfields to meet the needs of a dawning air age. Expansion of major power plant facilities at Eklutna were authorized under his administration and full-scale hydroelectric power came to Alaska. And, if the pages of history could be rewritten, the city of Palmer, Alaska, should rightly be called Grueningburg, because it was he who first reported to President Roosevelt that the Matanuska Valley had a future in the field of agriculture.

And so the ledger is thusly written: Statesman, Senator, Governor, public servant, author, journalist, editor, historian, father and grandfather, Phi Beta Kappa, friend and adviser, but always the record will read: Alaskan U.S. Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

During the past 2 years—a short span in a man's total lifetime—Senator GRUENING has fought for equality of Alaska on all fronts; hydroelectric power development; foreign trade, expansion of air, highway, and ocean trade routes; the defense preparedness of Alaska, and the recognition of our strategic role in the global affairs of tomorrow's world, but in the words of a poet, perhaps the best biography was written:

"You cannot choose your battlefield,
  The gods do that for you,
But you can plant a standard
  Where a standard never flew."

Independence Day of Dahomey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic of Dahomey, Hubert Maga; and His Excellency the Ambassador of Dahomey to the United States, Louis Ignacio Pinto, on the occasion of the second anniversary of Dahomey's independence.

A narrow land between Togo and Nigeria on the west coast of Africa became the independent republic of Dahomey on August 1, 1960. Roughly the size of our State of Pennsylvania, Dahomey is one-fifth as large as France and is the smallest of the now independent countries of former French West Africa. But its size is no gage of its importance, for its current history is an interesting document of African political development and inter-African relations, while its past history is a colorful tale of regal rivalry and intense warfare.

Dahomey's earliest history seems to date to the 12th and 13th centuries. Internal rivalries and migrations resulted in the establishment of several chieftaincies, but by the 17th century one kingdom, Dahomey, had become all powerful with smaller principalities tributary to it. The 18th century marked the arrival of European traders, and by the 19th century Dahomey had become a French protectorate.

Then in the mid-20th century began the process which culminated in the reassertion of Dahomey's independence, this time as a modern democratic state in a world community. In 1946 Dahomey became an oversea territory of the French Union. In 1952 the first territorial assembly was elected. In 1956 universal suffrage was initiated. In 1958 Dahomey voted to adopt the new constitution of the French Union and became a self-governing member of the French community. The final stage of political evolution was Dahomey's proclamation of independence on August 1, 1960, and its admission soon afterwards under French sponsorship to the United Nations.

In the field of inter-African cooperation Dahomey has also played a not insignificant role, for along with the Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, and Niger, it is a member of the Conseil de l'Entente, a cooperative venture unique among the former French west African territories. The four states have adopted similar constitutions. They have set up a customs union and a solidarity fund for financial assistance. They have decided to coordinate development plans and policies in the fields of labor legislation, public administration, taxation, transportation, communications, and public works. The success of the Conseil is confirmed by the very real amount of cooperation already achieved among the four member states.

On a larger inter-African scale Dahomey has become a member of the Brazzaville group of French-speaking African states which adopted a charter of union in September 1961 providing for coordination of foreign policy, for the creation of committees aimed at harmonization of economic and fiscal policies, and for mutual defense. The Brazzaville group has very wisely recognized the principle of noninterference in each others affairs while nonetheless working toward real coordination on matters of mutual interest.

Finally, on a worldwide scale, Dahomey is a respected member of the United Nations. It is a peace-loving state dedicated to strengthening the world organization as man's best hope in a divided world. Dahomey is a most welcome addition to the community of nations—a democratic state whose constitution is based on the principle of popular sovereignty, a creative supporter of African unity, a useful member of the United Nations. On this second anniversary of independence we commend the Government and people of Dahomey for the accomplishments of the past 2 years and wish them every success in the future.

A Statesman Speaks on Zionism and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was most interested to read a recent article by Rabbi Jacob Freedman of Springfield, Mass., giving an account of an interview he had with my distinguished colleague and good friend from Massachusetts, Joe Martin. Congressman Martin and Rabbi Freedman discuss Zionism and the State of Israel, and the ideas expressed once again reveal the great statesmanship of our beloved former Speaker.

In view of the turmoil and unrest which exists in the Middle East today, it is imperative that the United States exercise its leadership in every effort to create an atmosphere in which nations can be brought together to seek a settlement to their problems. This calls for the kind of creative and imaginative thinking which Joe Martin exhibited in an instance related in the article.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Rabbi Jacob Freedman from the Jewish Advocate published in Boston, Mass., on Thursday, July 19, 1962:

CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH MARTIN ON ISRAEL

(By Rabbi Jacob Freedman, of Springfield, Mass.)

As I took my seat facing Congressman Joseph W. Martin, Jr., across his spacious, well-ordered desk there flashed across my mind the many times previously that I had visited him in Washington before, during, and subsequent to his speakership. On every occasion I was promptly and courteously received. His sincere friendship and his spontaneous cordiality were always manifest under all circumstances. I recalled, too, the instances when he graciously sought to be of help to a variety of people who had come to me for aid through his intercession. His affability and kindliness were unfailing.

"When did you first become interested in Zionism?" I asked. "Well, let me see," he replied, as he leaned back and relaxed in his chair to reminisce. "Did you know Dave Radovsky of Fall River?" he queried. "Of course, I did. He was a fine man, a good citizen, devoted Zionist, and communal leader." "It was more than 30 years ago, 1924, to be exact. It was early in my political career. Dave came to me and asked me to be the main speaker at a Zionist meeting to be held in his cottage on the Cape. It was shortly after I had been elected to my first term in Congress. He wanted me to speak about the homeland in Palestine. I told him that I did not have too many facts about it at the time. But Dave said that he would do all the research. And he did. So I gave the talk. I remember that it was called 'The Palestine of the Future.' In it I emphasized the transformation of the desert into a veritable Garden of Eden. That was the main theme. And that was my initial contact with Zionists and Zionism.

"I have maintained my interest and positive attitude toward Zionism and the State of Israel to the present day. I supported the resolution in favor of the Balfour Declaration and helped get it through Congress. Subsequently I supported aid bills for Israel and introduced several myself. I visited Israel at my own expense. I was deeply impressed. I observed that the country needed more help to 'put it over.' For example, they needed copper mines and oil—and ultimately they were discovered."

"In 1948–49 I tried to help adjudicate the Arab refugee problem. I spoke to the Israeli Foreign Minister about it. He said, facetiously, that 'maybe it could be adjusted by locking the Arabs and the Jews in one room and having them stay there until they arrived at a solution.'

"I had a good look at their air force. The women were serving along with the men. I observed how great was their need for help when I saw that the center of their air fields were ploughed for planting in order to provide food for both the armed forces and the general populace.

"I visited the kibbutzim. I was impressed by their zeal to achieve their objectives. There were no shirkers. Everybody worked. It was to be a long struggle," Congressman Martin earnestly emphasized. "But all nations must go through a long struggle to become truly independent."

"Yes, it does take a long time. In the meantime Israel needs friends and help along the way," I interjected. To nudge his memory I continued, "Do you remember the time that Senator Vandenberg, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, much to our chagrin and disappointment, took an intransigent stand about our position in Palestine? I came to you on a lone mission. I was the emissary of no organization or group. I came out of my own great concern and the knowledge of your own sincere and favorable commitment to our cause. I had hoped that you could intercede with the Senator and soften his opposition."

"Indeed, I do remember. But nothing could be done. As I told you at the time: 'once Vandenberg makes up his mind, no one can budge him.' Nonetheless, through the years I have been helpful with others, speaking to my colleagues in the House and to Senators, too."

"By the way," he volunteered, "do you know who have been my chief contacts through the years among your people for the cause of Zion and Israel? Besides the late Dave Radovsky and the late Elihu Stone, of Boston, there have been, since the thirties, Dewey D. Stone of Brockton and yourself."

"Talking of New England," I said, "Weren't Mrs. Roosevelt and you among those especially honored by the Israel bond organization in New Bedford?"

"Yes. It was a very fine event. I met many of our friends there. By the way," he continued, with a note of great satisfaction, "at a recent bond dinner in Chicago, where I was the speaker, a young lady rose from the audience to explain. 'I'll buy a $10,000 bond if Mr. Martin will give me his autograph.' Turning to the chairman I said, 'Tell her I'll give her five autographs, if she'll buy that bond.'"

I turned the conversation to the current situation anent Israel, the Arabs and the United States. I recalled his statement to me during the Suez crisis when we discussed the critical situation in the House cloakroom. "'Nasser won't bluff us,' you said. But he did bluff us just the same, didn't he," I now added. I asked him what he thought of the action taken by President Eisenhower and the administration. He averred that in his judgment it was doubtful that the U.S. action in re the Suez Canal and the Suez invasion was the right course to have taken. "You don't run out on friends," he emphasized, "because you don't know about the future."

With this I interjected, "By the way, Congressman, what do you think about the activities of the John Birch Society?" To this he replied, "This country has always had 'Know Nothings' of one kind or another. Don't pay any attention to them. Hate organizations never flourish in America. If the Birchers stick to ultraconservatism only, they may 'do well.' But if it is nothing but a hate organization, then it has no future."

We reverted to the consideration of the Arab refugee problem.

"The settlement of the problem of the Arab refugees is a 'ticklish one.' It has now become a political weapon for the Arab leaders," he said. "If you could only get the groups together in the spirit of give and take, real progress could be made toward a definitive solution. The Western countries and the United Nations should be of greater help. If the Western countries would open their gates, the 'new' and younger ones would emigrate to them. It is not impossible. Let's explore it. The sheiks and the other Arab leaders who are insecure would benefit by it. The United Nations must 'steer' toward the solution, with each country taking some refugees. The many threats in the Near East give an opening to the Communists. Certainly Israel stands to gain a great deal if there were peace and harmony. The investment of Western funds not only in Israel, but in Arab countries and other parts of the Near and Middle East, too, would benefit everyone involved. There should be an easy transfer of goods between Israel and the Arab States. Israel doesn't have enough land to produce sufficient agricultural products for a large population. The Arab countries have vast areas available for cultivation. So Israel could call upon these Arab countries for food and by this action help make the Arab countries prosper. Israel has well-trained and well-equipped personnel who could also help the Arab countries make progress. If Israel and the Arabs, as well as the Turks and Greeks, were on good terms, it would automatically eliminate the threat of Russian intrusion. To achieve this would require strong agreement on all points. This takes time. If they were on good terms, the situations would work out of themselves."

"I believe that a leader of the Western Powers should take the initiative," he continued, "Premier McMillan is too soft. President de Gaulle is too stubborn. Chancellor Adenauer, among other things, is too old. That leaves it up to President Kennedy. President Kennedy is the only one to seize the lead to bring about a solution. Whoever conducts the negotiations must be very careful. But, of course, if Nasser wants to continue to act in the spirit of vindictiveness then nothing can be done. Nobody wants war. Under modern conditions war is hell, literally. The Arabs must be made to see that their life, individually and collectively, will be better without war. The trouble is that it is all enmeshed in politics. There are too many men in power who are afraid to alter their positions for fear of being overthrown in their own countries. So the leaders must be expert in handling the situation for the good of the world. Peace in the Near and Middle East would bring peace to the world.

With considerable satisfaction he then gave an example of how political leaders in positions of influence and trust can mediate, even settle, crises. He recalled the situation at the time of the coal strike when he was Speaker of the House. "Even the President couldn't stop the strike. There was an impasse because there was no agreement on the third member of the panel who was to represent the public to help mediate the strike. John L. Lewis didn't like the Democrats and he wouldn't make an agreement through a Government agency. I received a 'tip' from a newpaper that Lewis thought highly of me and that Lewis might agree to mediation if I could come up with a third member of the panel who would be satisfactory to him. So I telephoned John Lewis and invited him to meet with me in the Speaker's office at 11 o'clock the next morning. I also called Mr. Moses, head of the coal mines faction, and invited him to come at the same time. He said he would attend. I tried to get Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire. I finally located him at the Waldorf in New York City that night. I told him that a strike would be averted if 'you, Styles, would accept the appointment as the third member of the panel of referees.' He said that he would think it over. I took a chance that he would accept it by the next morning, when I was to meet with Lewis and Moses. The next morning I did get his call, accepting. Promptly at 11 that morning both Lewis and Moses were in my office. I told them that it was my understanding that if they would both agree on the third man to be a referee in behalf of the public, then the panel could meet to mediate the strike. They affirmed that it was so. I therefore suggested Senator Styles Bridges as the man. Lewis quickly OK'd it. Moses also agreed, 'if you can get him.' So when they both had expressed their satisfaction with Bridges, I immediately spoke up, taking them somewhat by surprise. 'Fine. I've got him. He has accepted.' It happened so fast that Mr. Moses, taken somewhat aback, queried, as he turned to me, 'it's on the level, isn't it?' 'Indeed, it is,' I replied. John Lewis looked up at the clock in the office. It was exactly 11 minutes past 11. The meeting was over in those 11 minutes. The basic fact was that neither of them wanted a strike, but neither wanted to give in to the other, or to the Democrats. And yet in only 11 minutes we initiated the settlement of that strike.

"So, I say, you always need a good and strategic mediator," he continued. "The same is true in the current differences between the Arabs and the State of Israel. If we had a good mediator now, we would get much further ahead in the adjudication. The United States is the logical choice for this role. The initiative should come from President Kennedy. Even if you don't succeed, you haven't lost anything.

"As I see it, there are close ties between Israel and the United States. We ought to keep the ties even closer. I agree with former President Truman in this. Israel should not be neutral. It should stand with the West. Even India will find out ultimately that strict neutrality isn't right. Even if they think it is OK with reference to the Russians, what about the Chinese?

"I had lunch with Premier Ben-Gurion in Jerusalem. I spent considerable time with him both in Israel and on his visits to the United States. The former Ambassador to the United States, Abba Eban is a brilliant young man. I don't yet know the new Ambassador Harman. I will say that, watching the progress of the State of Israel through the years, there is no reason for Israel to feel discouraged. On the contrary, they should be very optimistic about their future. I believe that it is necessary for American Jews to continue to give to the United Jewish Appeal and to purchase Israel bonds until after the Israelis and the State of Israel learn to walk and stand firmly and squarely on their own feet. Until that time American Jews should continue to contribute."

H.R. 3745: Pensions for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include numerous newspaper announcements and resolutions by veterans posts and organizations and certain State official bodies, expressing their support of H.R. 3745, the bill which provides a modest, deserved pension for veterans of World War I, as follows:

VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I
OF THE U.S.A., INC.,
Soldier, Iowa, July 29, 1962.

Whereas the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., have reached an age where many are now disabled and unemployable; and

Whereas the average age of the World War I veteran is approximately 67 years; and

Whereas the organization of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. has been sponsoring legislation to secure a just pension for the aging veterans of World War I with no success; and

Whereas the veterans of World War I, have had a suitable bill, H.R. 3745, introduced in the House, and now tied up in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee; and

Whereas the veterans of all wars on the grassroot level, do not take the same stand that some national leaders do: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the veterans of World War I here assembled in regular session of the Seventh District, go on record humbly requesting the Seventh District Congressman, Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, to have recorded the attached resolutions, statements, etc., in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the earliest possible date, in their entirety.

Adopted this July 29, 1962.

OSCAR P. JORGENSEN,
Seventh District Commander, Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Attest:

CLARENCE W. JOHNSON,
Seventh District Adjutant.

ANOTHER LEGION POST COMES OUT FOR H.R. 3745

At a regular meeting of Capt. Harry B. Doremus Post No. 55, of the New Jersey American Legion at Hackensack, N.J., a resolution was adopted asking support of the New Jersey Department, American Legion, for legislation which would grant added benefits for veterans of the First World War.

The full text of the post resolution reads:

"Whereas the American Legion, an organization of honorable discharged service men who defended their country in times of war; organized in the year 1919; and among its purposes so eloquently phrased in its "Preamble to the Constitution" pledges itself to "mutual helpfulness" and "rehabilitation" of the veterans; and

Whereas the veterans of World War I sought to get the American Legion's support of H.R. 3745, providing increased monthly pension benefits without success thus far, and

"Whereas other major veteran organizations in the United States of America are rallying to the cause of the older veterans, even many component units of the American Legion throughout the land, including the Department of Indiana, the State in which the national organization of the American Legion is situated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Capt. Harry B. Doremus Post No. 55, the American Legion, New Jersey, go on record as approving the American Legion's support of H.R. 3745 or any other legislation that will accomplish the purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That upon passage of this resolution, it be referred to the Bergen County Committee of the American Legion for action and dissemination among all posts under their jurisdiction, with a view to ultimately presenting it to the delegates at the next Department convention in Wildwood for their consideration and action.

MARSHALL F. WYMAN,
Commander.

Attest:

JOHN LICHSTIN,
Acting Adjutant.

LEGION POSTS SUPPORTING H.R. 3745

American Legion posts all over the Nation are falling in line to put their posts, districts and departments on record as supporting H.R. 3745, the official pension bill of the veterans of World War I.

The Department of Florida took official action at its department convention held just 2 weeks ago. The Florida veterans came out flat footed for H.R. 3745.

From the 29th District of the Legion, Department of California, comes information that that group, consisting of several Legion posts, has voted to support the pension bill.

CALIFORNIA LEGION POSTS ARE GIVING SUPPORT TO H.R. 3745

EDITOR, NATIONAL TRIBUNE: The delegates to the monthly meeting of the 20th District, American Legion, Department of California, which met at the Highland Park Post No. 206 in Highland Park, Los Angeles, April 23, 1962, adopted a resolution which had earlier been adopted by the North Hollywood Post No. 307 and also the Sun Valley Post No. 520, the American Legion.

The original resolution was initiated by Allied Post No. 369, American Legion, East Chicago, Ind., supporting Congressman WINFIELD DENTON's pension bill, H.R. 3745.

Prior to this on March 2, 1962, the 26th District, American Legion of Northern California, adopted this same resolution which had been approved by the Redwood City Post No. 105, in Redwood City, Calif.

This 26th district represents 17 posts with over 3,000 members and the 20th district represents 42 posts and over 7,000 members. Now, that makes in the two districts a total of 59 posts and over 10,000 members who have approved this resolution.

A letter is being prepared to send to each member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee informing that body of this action.—Clyde E. Kimball, 6433 Ben Avenue, North Hollywood, Calif.

Legion Post Asks Benefits

Post No. 76, American Legion, of Port Orford, Oreg., has adopted a resolution urging the Department of Oregon in convention to press for enactment of legislation "more in keeping with the needs of World War I veterans, namely: $100 per month, social security not counting against pension, with $3,600 income limitation."

Adjutant A. Windmaiser of Port Orford Post noted that the average age of veterans of World War I is "about 68, and many are not covered by social security. Most are past the employable age."

Iowa VFW Post Backs H.R. 3745

Rank-and-file members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion are increasingly becoming more insistent that some action be taken by their organizations to assist the veterans of the First World War in their determined efforts to secure pension benefits for the men who fought in 1917–18.

Printed below is a copy of the resolution adopted by members of VFW Post No. 9663, Dubuque, Iowa.

Another Legion Post Acts Upon Legislation for World War I Vets

Editor, National Tribune: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a resolution regarding H.R. 3745 and H.R. 4611, which was adopted and unanimously approved by the membership of Rotterdam Post No. 1091, American Legion, Schenectady, N.Y., at the regular meeting held by the post on Thursday, May 3, 1962, which might be of interest to other posts of the American Legion.

Legion Posts Supporting H.R. 3745

American Legion posts all over the Nation are falling in line to put their posts, districts, and departments on record as supporting H.R. 3745, the official pension bill of the Veterans of World War I.

The Department of Florida took official action at its department convention held just 2 weeks ago. The Florida veterans came out flatfooted for H.R. 3745.

From the 29th District of the Legion, Department of California, comes information that that group, consisting of several Legion posts, has voted to support the pension bill.

At a regular meeting of Palomar Post No. 531 the post members voted to support the bill and also declared that the 24th California District, meeting on May 22, had voted unanimously in support of the proposed legislation.

The Henry Teigler Post No. 20 at Fremont, Nebr., had adopted a similar resolution in support of H.R. 3745 as had been previously passed at a meeting of Capt. Harry B. Doremus Post No. 55, of the Legion, at Hackensack, N.J. Copies of the resolution were sent by the Fremont Post to the State Department of the American Legion at Lincoln, Nebr., and also to each Member of Congress.

Texas Legion District Comes Out for H.R. 3745

Last month, Frederick R. Undritz, second vice commander of Alamo Post No. 2, of the American Legion at San Antonio, Tex., submitted a resolution favoring World War I pensions to the 20th District of the Legion in the State of Texas.

This district consists of 25 posts and has over 4,000 members. Alamo Post has over 1,700 members. The resolution strongly endorses the World War I pension bill, H.R. 3745, and asks other veterans' organizations to support it.

Two Legion Posts Urge Passage of H.R. 3745

Two widely separated American Legion posts have adopted resolutions calling for the Congress to support pension legislation for the Veterans of World War I.

Legion Post No. 361, Ennis, Tex., with a membership of 437, adopted the following resolution.

Missouri Legion Post Asks Help for Vets of World War I

Buchholtz-Kiefer Post No. 150, American Legion, Ste. Genevieve, Mo., has passed a resolution endorsing H.R. 3745, the pension bill sponsored by the Veterans of World War I. This Legion post has a membership of 565.

Arkansas Legion District Goes on Record for 3745

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the 15th district, the American Legion, Department of Arkansas, in annual district convention assembled on the 27th day of May, 1962, at Benton, Saline County, Ark.

Florida Backs Pension Bill

The Florida department of the American Legion on Sunday went on record as supporting legislation which would provide pensions of at least $100 per month to the veterans of the First World War.

According to Past National Commander Fred Hollenbeck, who with National Chaplain Lewis Parker spearheaded the drive to secure recognition from the Florida department, the resolution was brought to the floor of the convention over the protests of the Department Rehabilitation Committee.

The resolution is almost similar to the provisions of H.R. 3745 and calls for income limitations of $2,400 for a person with no dependents and $3,600 if with dependents. Social security and pension income to which the veteran has contributed are also exempt in computing eligibility for pension.

Tennessee Legion Post Asks Aid From Other Posts on Pensions

The Lester Harris Post of the American Legion at Mountain Home, Tenn., is the latest Legion post to join in the effort to secure pension benefits for World War I veterans.

California Legislature Asks Congress To Approve H.R. 3745

Both Houses of the California Legislature have approved a resolution calling upon the Congress of the United States to enact pension legislation for the benefit of the World War I veterans. The resolution specifically calls for the passage of H.R. 3745, the official pension bill sponsored by the Veterans of World War I.

VFW Post Moves To Aid Veterans of World War I

Recently a memorandum regarding pensions for World War I veterans was presented to Post No. 4588 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars located at Bossier City, La. The memo was written and prepared by A. G. Boldridge, of Shreveport, supported by Harry L. Clark, quartermaster of the post.

The membership of the post voted wholeheartedly to support the memo and Boldridge and Clark have mailed out over 1,000 copies of it to veterans in Louisiana.

Who Should Operate Telstar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram July 31 states a coherent and logical position on the operation of international communications satellites:

Telstars: Federal or Private Operation?

Telstar, which carried television into the space age, has opened a new chapter in the mundane debate between free enterprise and the advocates of government ownership.

The issue is whether the projected satellite communications network, whose marvelous possibilities were demonstrated by Telstar, should be operated by a private corporation or by Uncle Sam.

Advocates of Federal ownership argue that the private corporation which produced Telstar enjoyed the benefit of money (one hears figures ranging from $175 million to $25 billion) which the taxpayers invested in scientific research for Government operations. Therefore, they assert, the Government should operate the satellite network and get its money back.

Actually, Telstar was produced by a private corporation at no expense to the Government and was placed in orbit by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which billed the corporation for all the costs of launching. From this standpoint, Telstar was an operation of private enterprise. It is true that the achievement was made possible through technology developed by the Government and hardware owned and operated by the Government. From this standpoint, it was a partnership operation.

Does it necessarily follow that the proposed satellite network should be owned and operated by the Government?

Dr. I. M. Levitt, director of Fels Planetarium of the Franklin Institute, notes:

"While it is true that the scientific developments and research for Government operations have gone into Telstar, this is also true of most of the devices we use today. The transistors in our radios, our TV tubes, even our TV dinners resulted from Government-supported research. The new glues, plastics, metals, and building materials have in most part resulted from research sponsored and paid for by Government funds. It would be manifestly unfair to penalize one industry because through its vigor and drive it has been successful in establishing a communications satellite."

Dr. Levitt's theme can be elaborated. Over the years, the U.S. Government has spent multimillions of dollars on agricultural research and direct help to the farming industry. Nobody has suggested that the Government try to get those dollars back from the farmers. Corporations, however, are always fine targets for the demagogs.

Neither President Kennedy nor Chairman Minow of the Federal Communications Commission can be accused of scratching the back of big business. The President, however, has said: "Our studies have convinced us that the national objectives * * * can best be achieved in the framework of a privately owned corporation, properly chartered by the Congress." Chairman Minow is of the opinion that Federal operation of the satellite system would be impossible because of civil service restraints.

What they are saying is that private industry can do the job more efficiently because it has the necessary background, knowledge, and skilled personnel and is not fettered with costly redtape. They know that if Government operated the network, there wouldn't be any profits.

With a private industry in charge, Government will get 52 percent of any profit by way of corporation taxes. The indirect return of money in the form of taxes and the creation of an efficient service for Americans will provide Uncle Sam his most practical reward for helping to produce Telstar.

Statement in Support of H.R. 11625, to Bring the District of Columbia Under the Impacted Areas Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement that I presented to the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on General Education in support of my bill H.R. 11625, to bring the District of Columbia under the impacted areas program, on July 24, 1962:

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to present to this committee this statement in support of my bill, H.R. 11625, to bring the District of Columbia under the provisions of the impacted areas law.

At the present time Public Law 874, which provides financial assistance for educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, includes under its eligibility clause every governmental jurisdiction in the United States—including the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Puerto Rico—except the District of Columbia.

It is hard to realize why this is so when we consider that Washington is certainly one of the most federally impacted areas that one can find.

The District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers has noted that 30 percent of the District's school children are a result of Federal impaction. This means that out of an elementary and secondary school population of nearly 115,000 approximately 34,650 are children of Federal employees living in the District. In every case where Federal funds are contributed as a result of Federal impaction, the percentage of impaction is less than that of Washington, with one exception.

There is no question that the District badly needs these funds. They have always needed additional funds for schools and they will continue to need additional funds for schools. There is no question, of course, that even with home rule the District will require a Federal contribution because the large proportion of its land is owned by the Federal Government.

I believe that we must bring the District under the impacted areas program. Its inhabitants are justly entitled to these funds, and it is time to amend the law so that they will receive them. Therefore, I strongly urge that this committee report out this bill at the earliest opportunity. It is estimated that under present school enrollment, the District would be eligible for a payment of $104 for each of the children of Federal employees living in the city. This amount, during the current year, would be about $3.6 million. I might point out that this $3.6 million is slightly more than the remaining balance of the authorized appropriation for the District of Columbia of $32 million. As we all know, Congress has appropriated only $30 million of this authorized amount.

Thank you.

Spend, Tax, and Borrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I include for the Appendix the following article:

SPEND, TAX, AND BORROW

It was with seeming complacency that the Treasury recently announced it had closed the fiscal year ended June 30 with a deficit of $6.3 billion. Rather than the size of the deficit, considerable stress was placed upon the fact that it was about $700 million below earlier estimates.

The fact remains, however, that it was the country's second largest peacetime deficit except for the year 1953 which reflected the carryover costs of the Korean war. And it was the 25th time in the past 31 years that the Nation operated in the red.

These deficits naturally reflect the tremendous increase in Government spending which has rocketed from $4.6 billion in 1932 to $87.6 billion in the fiscal year just closed. And budget experts freely predict we will have $100 billion budgets during this decade. Defense expenditures, of course, account for a considerable share of the increase. But not all of it, by a long shot. Nondefense spending, in fact, has been growing by leaps and bounds.

In the first 7 months of the fiscal year just closed, for instance, nonmilitary expenditures ran 10-percent higher than during the same period in the previous year. Total Federal expenditures in that period were up $3.9 billion and of this increase $2.4 billion were for nonmilitary purposes as compared with $1.5 billion in the military area.

This led to a new warning by Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, against the continuing increase in unnecessary Government spending.

'We have been the policeman, the banker, and the Santa Claus for the free world more than 15 years," Senator BYRD declared. "Recent figures showed U.S. foreign aid has totaled more than $100 billion and it is continuing.

"Meanwhile we are faced with a menacing deficit in the balance of international payments between the United States and nations we have assisted. It has run as high as $4 billion a year. This situation has resulted in a drain on our gold supply. We have lost 30 percent of our gold.

"In addition to $300 billion in direct debt, we have assumed contingent liabilities at home and abroad amounting to untold billions more. Now we propose to underwrite the debts of the United Nations.

"As the situation stands now, this will be the year of the highest revenue and the highest debt in history.

"Neither our form of Government nor our system of enterprise can survive insolvency. All of us know that we cannot continue much longer to spend and spend, and tax and tax, and borrow and borrow."

There's little anyone can add to that.

Business Is Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as one Member that represents part of the metropolitan area appropriately described as "Greater Kansas City," it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD the content of an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Times for Monday, July 30, 1962.

As one representing part of this area in the Congress, we are proud of this editorial summary. It is most reassuring and even something of an inspiration for such a reliable source to predict that there is a bright economic outlook for Mid-America and that there is nothing on the horizon that should substantially alter this picture in the foreseeable months ahead.

This is in sharp contrast to the pessimism expressed by many persons of our area in the wake of the stock market decline near the end of May. Of course we are mindful that pessimistic talk alone cannot lead to a business slump, nor can the repetition of words of optimism taken alone always cause a change of pace from a business lag into brisk business activity. On the other hand, we clearly recall that some years ago, in Kansas City, there was a firm of oil jobbers whose policy it was to associate with their name on every signboard, in every newspaper ad, on company stationery, and in every way possible, the slogan "Business Is Good." In talking with the officials of this company we were told that the repetition of the words, "business is good" created a psychology that was a stimulus to their salesmen and served as a magnet to attract business to their company.

We want to spread the good news about the Kansas City area and at the same time compliment our Kansas City paper for accurate appraisal and for its contribution to the "business is good" way of thinking. The editorial follows:

AREA ECONOMIC OUTLOOK IS BRIGHT

At midsummer, Greater Kansas City is enjoying something of a boom.

Despite the dire predictions that followed the stock market crash and the general fear that business activity would sag dangerously, this metropolitan area is moving along at a very encouraging pace. Gains have been registered in most important economic categories.

The big news of the moment is the strong showing of the department stores. In the week before last area sales were 12 percent ahead of a year ago. Last week they were up an impressive 21 percent. The figures fluctuate, often erratically, and there is no way to predict next week's volume. However, summertime business is brisk. There is nothing, now foreseeable, that should substantially alter the pattern.

Motor car purchases this year have been at a near-record pace, with 1962 destined to be the second biggest year in the history of the industry since Henry Ford put together his first model T. This strength in both motor cars and department store sales is significant because of the very nature of both types of merchandise.

During times of business uncertainty, many people defer the purchase of so-called durable goods. Unless a crisis presents itself, the old jalopy will generally go a few more miles. It is also easy to put off buying the new rug, or sofa, or the automatic dishwasher. But people are buying these and many other items this summer in Kansas City. It is a good sign.

Digging deeper, one finds several items of special significance to the welfare of the area. Farm incomes are relatively high, although no records either in production or dollar sales are in the picture. Summer rains have wiped out the drought of April and May.

But the big plus factor comes from employment. Ever since last winter's slump, the Kansas City area has shown moderate increases in employment. Additional modest gains are expected from now until the preholiday season when the big buildup will begin.

In the year ending June 30, the Missouri side of the metropolitan area registered a 1½-percent employment increase. The net gain was 5,600 jobs. The main advances were in motor car assembling and electrical equipment, where, of course, Western Electric has made the big impact.

For the area the disappointment has come in homebuilding. Volume has dipped from 10 to 17 percent below a year ago. To make matters worse, 1961 was a poor year. Happily, other segments of the economy have more than taken up this slack.

Accumulated savings offer another excellent economic barometer, and midsummer reading is impressive. At the end of last month, time deposits in Kansas City banks stood at $222 million, for a gain of $43 million over the year before. Also the amount of money being held by savings and loan associations was at an all-time high. People have money and they are willing to spend it.

Unless some completely unpredictable element disrupts the Kansas City picture, business should remain good throughout the remainder of the year. After the scares of last spring, such news is good indeed.

Missionaries and the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is always stimulating to know that our young people are taking an active interest in the affairs of our Government. A group of young men and women who are history students at Eastern High School, Greentown, Ind., recently raised an interesting question concerning the cost of maintaining a missionary as compared to the cost of maintaining a Peace Corps volunteer. The group's letter follows:

EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL,
Greentown, Ind., July 16, 1962.

Representative J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROUSH: We, the students of American history in the summer school at Eastern High School, have read about the Peace Corps in the July 15 issue of the Indianapolis Star. We have also found information on the missionaries who are engaged in a similar enterprise.

We have discussed this matter with a Methodist minister and have arrived at the following points:

1. The Methodist denomination has sent missionaries to 44 different foreign countries.

2. The total number of missionaries is approximately 1,469.

3. The organization that sponsors these missionaries is called the board of missions, and approximately 4 percent of all church charity is used to build missions, an amount which is about $2,100.

4. Most of the married missionaries take their families with them. A missionary is paid according to his particular needs in a particular country.

We believe that there are too many unnecessary Government workers in Washington. In connection with the Peace Corps they are averaging $1,811,250 per year in salary, while the Peace Corps members overseas only get $75 per month, or a total approximately equal to that of those "upstairs." In comparing the amount recently asked, an increase of $33 million over the last requested expenditure for this program, we are concerned with the reason for the increased spending. Are the overhead expenses increasing over that of those in the field?

We would appreciate any information you could send as to the breakdown of expenses for the program, as well as results of the program after a year of operation.

Yours very truly,
CAROLYN GOLDING,
Chairman.
PEGGY FAWCETT.
LINDA WILLIAMS.
KEITH BADGLEY.
DENNY CONDON.

Robert Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, answered with a very interesting and informative letter which follows:

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1962.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: Thank you for your letter of July 19 giving me an opportunity to answer questions raised by Miss Carolyn Golding in her July 16 letter to you.

Miss Golding states that her source of information is a Methodist minister who reported the cost of a Methodist missionary to be $2,100.

Earlier this year we had requested this kind of information from the National Council of Churches in New York City. The Reverend Theodore A. Braun, codirector of the Peace Corps desk at the council, reported the following:

A Presbyterian missionary costs $6,000 annually, but this does not include administration.

A Methodist missionary costs $7,500 annually, but this does not include administration.

A United Church of Christ missionary costs $8,000 to $9,000 annually, but this does not include administration.

(Miss Golding can write directly to Reverend Braun if she would like to do so. His address is National Council of the Churches of Christ, 475 Riverside Drive, New York 27, N.Y.)

A member of my staff, who is also an ordained Southern Baptist minister, called the Southern Baptist Convention's Foreign Mission Board and was told that their budget for 1,480 missionaries this year is $12,892,472—or $8,711 per missionary. This figure does not include administration.

The annual cost of one Peace Corps volunteer is $9,000 and this does include administration. When you include the administrative costs of the mission programs, there is often little difference in the figures for a missionary and a volunteer.

The $9,000 includes all training costs, medical examinations and care, transportation, termination payment reserved during service at the rate of $75 per month, living allowance (food, clothing, housing, etc.), project equipment and materials, and all administrative costs.

It has been our purpose from the very beginning to hold the administrative staff of the Peace Corps to the minimum level necessary for effective work. Our ratio is 1 administrative person to every 10 volunteers.

Congress has authorized an appropriation of $63,750,000 for the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1963. This amount was requested not because overhead expenses are increasing but because those funds will make it possible for us to send more volunteers overseas. They will permit us to continue in service the 5,100 volunteers, brought aboard with funds from fiscal year 1962 and to add another 5,000 or more in the next 12 months. The average cost of the volunteers, including administration, will in our opinion continue to be approximately $9,000.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or if I can be of further service.

Sincerely,
ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this group of students for their interest and diligence. I believe they have performed a worthy act involving research which has in turn stimulated interest on the part of others. I trust that this information will be of interest to my colleagues.

The Flight of Small Investments Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the July 24, 1962, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

WORRYING THE DOLLAR—FLIGHT OF SMALL INVESTMENTS ABROAD

(By John Quirt)

The transfer of funds to Europe by small investors searching for a hedge against devaluation has become widespread enough to rank as a major factor in the dollar crisis. Wall Street brokers specializing in foreign investments made this point yesterday in the wake of President Kennedy's warning that "those who speculate against the dollar are going to lose."

The President's warning clearly was directed at professionals, both in New York and abroad, who have been snapping up gold stocks and fanning rumors of impending devaluation in hopes of turning a quick, speculative profit.

The concern in the street is that the urge to find a hedge against a cheaper dollar is prompting otherwise prudent investors to switch $5,000 and $10,000 accounts into European securities and currencies that may, in fact, afford no dollar protection at all.

Few brokers go so far as to term this small-scale hedging the principal cause of the crisis. Most feel it is a byproduct, inspired by the professional speculating and reinforced by the vague fear that an income tax cut would lead to a bigger budget deficit and, inevitably, to cheaper money.

COMPLEX MECHANICS

The experts hold that hedging among small investors can never reach the dimensions of an "attack" on the dollar, partly because the mechanics of European investing are too complex for most man-in-the-street investors to fathom, and partly because this sort of account-switching does not appear to stand up well when subjected to what the pros like to call cold investment analysis.

But there is equal agreement that small investor hedging is becoming more prevalent, and, misdirected or not, is resulting in a physical outflow of dollars at a time when American currency has taken a pounding in other quarters. Precisely how much of an outflow is guesswork, since brokerage firms do not keep separate figures on this type of money movement.

Much of the interest now appears to have shifted from gold-mining stocks to Swiss francs and to low-interest foreign securities payable in francs. The comments of a few foreign securities experts afford some measure of the flow:

At Carl Marks & Co., a big foreign securities firm that deals exclusively with other brokers, a European specialist observed:

"I get four or five inquiries a day concerning bonds of one concern—where I used to get one a week 6 months ago. These are bonds of the Bank for International Reconstruction and Development—one of the most popular investments among those looking for a hedge.

"There also is new interest in foreign bonds that are issued in Swiss francs and payable in francs. IBM, California-Texas Corp., and British Aluminum Co. issues in francs are attracting attention. So are several others that were put out between 1955 and 1960.

SMALL AMOUNTS

"It is strange for us, in that the calls we get are not for $100,000-or-so amounts, but for $1,000 and $10,000 worth. It's pretty apparent that small investors are involved."

A German securities specialist at another firm commented:

"I get calls from customers who ask for guidance. How can I hedge against devaluation, they ask me. I suggest to them that if the price of gold is raised, it will be done globally, so that American securities will be as valuable as Swiss. But he says, 'No, and the President is going to spend and spend and cheapen the dollar and I want to find a sanctuary.'

"So he buys German Government issues paying about 5¾ percent to maturity rather than Swiss bonds paying 3 percent. Has he found himself a hedge? It's hard to say. Personally, I doubt it. Our contacts in European banks assure us that nearly every free world country would act on gold in concert with the United States as a show of force against the Communist bloc."

Lacey Kux, a foreign securities specialist at Vanden Broeck, Lieber & Co., noted:

"Customers call and ask, 'What kind of a hedge do I have against a cheaper dollar?' They want to put funds into Switzerland, but Swiss bankers have agreed not to take new accounts. Some of them read about the strength of the Swiss franc, so they buy francs. Others buy bonds payable in francs. It's small investors who are doing this—those with a few thousand dollars. But you multiply it thousands of times over and it becomes a big part of the dollar crisis. It has been going on this way for 6 or 7 weeks, but I don't see that it will grow into a dangerous attack on the dollar."

WENT THROUGH HEDGING

"Some of the more sophisticated investors went through this hedging against the dollar a year and a half ago. I know one who bought a certain German bank issue for $100 then, and I can't sell it for $49 for him now. Among these more experienced types, there is less hedging. They recognize that if there is a change, it would probably take the form of an increase in International Monetary Fund parity rates. That is, the relationship of the currencies would remain unchanged. I believe as more realize this, the hedging will subside."

A customer's man at a large wire house spoke for several when he said:

"I have just a few people who used to be content with A.T. & T. or some other blue chip, but who now ask me where they can stash their money to guard against devaluation. They started talking this way a couple of months ago, when it first appeared the Federal budget was getting out of control.

"Most of them are just thinking about transferring funds to Europe. A few have actually done it, explaining they figure the Government is bent on spending more than it takes in and that's that.

"They feel it's a matter of confidence, or a lack of confidence, and not one of fundamentals or international cooperation. But there are so few places that afford a really safe hedge against the dollar and it becomes a little complicated for the average investor to switch money to Europe. I really don't think this sort of hedging is going to snowball."

U.S. Buying Will Aid Anthracite Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Thursday, July 26, 1962, indicates, the Defense Department's purchase of 450,000 tons of anthracite coal for use in West Germany will represent roughly 2¼ weeks work for the industry. It will benefit the depressed anthracite industry as well as the railroads and a number of other segments of our economy. Such an order at this time is indeed good news. We in the anthracite area of northeastern Pennsylvania know the full meaning of such an order as this and we trust that further such orders will be forthcoming in the future because our major industry, anthracite coal, has been seriously depressed for a number of years. As part of my remarks today, I include the announcement of the contract award as it appeared in last Thursday's Wilkes-Barre Record:

U.S. Buying Will Aid Coal Industry—450,000-Ton Order To Provide Work for Roughly 2¼ Weeks

Defense Department's purchase of 450,000 tons of hard coal for use in West Germany will represent roughly 2¼ weeks work for the industry.

More companies will participate in this year's tonnage and the schedule of shipments of the egg, stove, and chestnut sizes will not interfere with the industry's ability to meet the demand for these sizes in the United States and Canadian markets, according to the Anthracite Institute.

The export business will be produced by more participants this year than last, among which are Gilberton Coal Co., Glen Alden Coal Co., Greenwood Mining Co., Honeybrook Mines, Inc., Jeddo-Highland Coal Co., Lehigh Navigation-Dodson Co., Lehigh Valley Anthracite, Inc., Moffat Coal Co., Reading Anthracite Co., and Susquehanna Coal Co. Shipments will begin in August and will continue in each month through July 1963.

The benefits of the new order extend beyond the anthracite producing industry and area to include supplying, servicing, and transportation industries and their employees The railroads will haul over 8,800 additional carloads of anthracite to tidewater piers, as well as additional incoming carloads of colliery materials and supplies. The freight bill to tidewater will approximate $1,500,000, of which $800,000 represents additional railroad employees' wages, or jobs for 120 men.

Other industries to be similarly benefited include cement, lumber, explosives, steel, lubricants, electricity, and local merchants whose sales will increase with higher payrolls. U.S.-flag vessels and their crews which participate in the ocean transportation of the export tonnage will also benefit.

Congressman Charles A. Buckley: His Plea for Justice for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1962, Mr. Carl Fell, a distinguished writer in the field of Jewish affairs, wrote a very interesting and informative article concerning Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY. This article appeared in the American Examiner, which is America's largest independent Anglo-Jewish weekly newspaper.

I recall that Congressman BUCKLEY was in the forefront in rallying support for the creation of the State of Israel. He was one of the earliest friends of this just cause. His untiring efforts in the Halls of Congress, at the White House and elsewhere played an important and vital part in the creation of the State of Israel in 1948.

Thereafter, he consistently sought full economic assistance for the young State of Israel, as exemplified by his bill in Congress—H.R. 6660—providing for $150 million aid to Israel.

It is interesting to note that the Jewish community leaders of Bronx County honored Congressman BUCKLEY at a dinner on behalf of Israel bonds. Due to his efforts the greatest sum of money ever raised was made available for the State of Israel.

I herewith include Mr. Fell's article as part of my remarks:

A Leader's Powerful Plea for Justice

(By Carl Fell)

Congressman CHARLES BUCKLEY, county leader of the Bronx, the only survivor of the Wagner steamroller, will be honored on May 21 with a testimonial dinner at the Waldorf. The event will serve a double purpose: to honor a man to whom principles are important and to demonstrate the confidence which Democratic leaders of Bronx County have in their leader.

From this reporter's point of view, it is worth noting that Mr. BUCKLEY was one of the few Congressmen who took the floor of the House of Represenatives in Washington to criticize this country's U.N. delegation for its role in the recent Security Council censure of Israel. At that time he also made public a telegram he had sent to Dean Rusk, our Secretary of State, declaring that he was "appalled at the action of the American delegation's sponsorship of the resolution."

Mr. BUCKLEY made the important point, in his wire to Dean Rusk, that the U.N. censure had "completely failed to reflect the facts of persistent Syrian provocations, the constant Arab threats to liquidate Israel, boycott its commerce, trespass on Israel's territory, and threaten the peace-loving citizens of that democracy."

Mr. BUCKLEY's message to the Secretary of State is, in fact, one of the most forceful presentations of the justice of Israel's case that this reporter has seen. I believe it should have received much more attention in the press than it did, and I hope that by citing passages from it here, I will do my small share to give it the circulation it vastly merits.

Congressman BUCKLEY made the vital point, for example, that if Syria, "by persistent attacks on Israel's sovereignty, denies to that democracy the plenitude of its U.N. Charter rights, then it inflicts deep injury on Israel." Furthermore, the competence of the Jewish State in invoking Security Council action against Syria is "seriously compromised and reduced."

Particularly effective, in my view, is this passage from the Bronx Congressman's wire: "Mr. Secretary, I find it incomprehensible that the American delegation failed to distinguish between acts of aggression and self-defense. Not for one single moment through out the entire period of its national existence has Israel enjoyed that minimal physical security which the United Nations confers on all member states and which all other member states have been able to command."

Mr. BUCKLEY's message to Secretary Rusk goes right to the heart of the matter when he says, "Our Government must surely choose between two candidates for its confidence; on the one hand, the men, women, and children of Israel building a democratic society and culture in its renascent homeland; and on the other, the warlike Arabs who have set their armed might upon Israel in an attempt to wipe it off the face of the earth—by armed intervention, by murder and plunder."

To us, the choice is only too plain, but of course we are partisan; however, when a renowned national legislator makes the vigorous assertion that the Arabs' violent threats against Israel is "aggression * * * belligerency * * * and Israel has been its victim, not its author," he is calling for justice based on fair and honest and even pained observation. If Mr. BUCKLEY sounds pro-Israel, it is the Arabs who have made him so.

The region in which the Israel and the Arab states exist, Mr. BUCKLEY notes, stands at the crossroads of its history. "Our signpost," he declares, "is not to back aggression and belligerency, but to favor peace * * * peace by agreement, peace without blockades, peace without frontier provocation, peace without threats to the integrity and independence of Israel."

Mr. BUCKLEY, this reporter believes you have made a significant and highly quotable contribution to this most vital issue. You have a record of public service going back to the year 1918, when you were elected to the old New York City Board of Aldermen for the first of three terms. Subsequently, you served as State tax appraiser for the State of New York—a 5½-year term of service, and you followed that with service as city chamberlain of New York City for close to 5 years.

In Congress, which you entered in 1935, you have fought vigorously to have humanitarian principles apply to all peoples—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews alike. I recall that it was you who introduced legislation to lift the arms embargo which was seriously hampering the people of then Palestine, and that you then and always supported generous economic aid to the young State of Israel.

Mr. BUCKLEY, you were elected to the 74th Congress on November 6, 1934, and have subsequently been sent back to Congress by your constituency—the 24th Congressional District in the Bronx—in every election since that date. It is the hope and the confidence of this reporter, Sir, that the story will be the same in the congressional elections this coming fall. And I am certain that when you do return, your voice will continue to be heard in behalf of truth, justice, and humanitarianism.

The Symbolic Gold Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Isaac Witkin president of the General Cocoa Co., Inc.

Mr. Witkin's comments on gold are particularly germane to H.R. 6900 which I introduced last year. H.R. 6900 would remove the 25-percent gold reserve requirement.

The article, which is dated July 11, 1962, follows:

OUR GOLD PROBLEM FOR A SYMBOLIC GOLD STANDARD

APOLOGIA

The price of gold, of course, affects the price of cocoa. Although the cocoa price level is but an infinitesimal part of the world economy, I use it as an excuse to air my views on gold with my cocoa audience. I do so in the hope that my excursion into "gold" will provoke thinking among economists, bankers, and lawmakers along the lines that oppose the orthodox views to which the financial world has been wedded in the long past.

If 1 in 20 of my readers agrees with my views, I shall be gratified in having made at least a small breach into the wall of what I consider outworn thinking on gold as it affects man's economic life.

The U.S. Treasury's gold stock has declined to below $16½ billions. Under existing law, approximately $11½ billions of gold are earmarked as reserves against Federal Reserve notes in circulation and certain other demand obligations. This leaves approximately $5 billions available against potential demands of foreign central banks totaling over $23 billions of gold if such foreign holders of dollars demand conversion of their billions into gold.

Obviously the Treasury's position is untenable. Even if we take for granted the continued willingness of the leading European central banks to cooperate with our Treasury to check continued reduction of our gold reserve, our position is intolerable. The Treasury must be independently in position to defend itself.

I propose two steps to achieve an adequate defense:

1. Repeal by Congress of the requirement of a 25-percent gold reserve against outstanding Federal Reserve notes and certain other deposit liabilities. (It is believed that the Federal Reserve Bank now has the power to suspend this requirement). Since no holder of a Federal Reserve note can obtain a single gold dollar in redemption thereof, the reserve of gold is a myth. The gold standard disappeared long ago. The gold backing of currency is at best token or symbolic. For weaning gradually those enslaved to the idea of a gold standard, let us continue some gold backing to our currency on a really token basis—say, 1 percent. When complete emancipation will have become possible at last, then a single ounce of gold can be framed in the Treasury office or the Smithsonian Institute as the theoretic token gold reserve. If my proposal is adopted, the Treasury will have $16 billion of gold to meet potential claims for redemption of over $23 billion held by foreign claimants.

2. Amend the present rule of buying and selling gold at the fixed price of $35 per ounce (subject to minute fractional charges to cover the cost of handling). Continue to pay gold to foreign central banks on demand at $35 per ounce. Continue to buy at the fixed price of $35 per ounce only certified newly mined gold, preferably excluding Russian and other Iron Country production, and gold now held by friendly central banks. Thus current production of gold in the United States and friendly nations could continue undisturbed. Buy all other gold at less than $35 per ounce. At the outset, let the Treasury announce that as of a certain date, say, August 15, it will pay $34 per ounce for gold. Later, perhaps as of September 15, set the buying price at $33 per ounce. Thus the present incentive to the private hoarder or speculator to buy gold in the knowledge that he can always resell it to the U.S. Treasury without loss is removed.

Naturally, the above program ideally would promise greatest effectiveness if foreign central banks of all our allies would act in concert with our Government in adopting this plan.

The old "gold standard" disappeared early this century. The existing "gold exchange standard" is teetering. In the current age of technological explosion, the gold and gold exchange standards are as outmoded as the crystal set and the biwing planes.

For 5,000 years or so, mankind has regarded gold as the acme of material wealth. We grant gold's excellent physical qualifications as a universal hard money. But when the annual production of gold, even though it increases arithmetically each year, cannot keep pace with the relatively geometric increase in the world's production of usable goods, shall we constrict production of real wealth, or shall we make the available supply of gold for currency backing serve the latter on a reduced ratio basis? Gold at best must be the servant of production and commerce, not their master.

In time, man will be completely liberated from his fetish for gold as real wealth. Gold has few intrinsic values for mankind. It has limited uses in industry. Its greatest use is in the arts and for jewelry. It no longer leads even as a material for filling teeth. But admittedly it cannot be dethroned completely overnight in the minds of men. In time, economists will devise better backing for a nation's currency than precious metals. It may be a commodity-backed dollar. It may be the horsepower production of a nation or its kilowatt-hour production. But it should be something that is immediately useful to man and something which in itself "grows." Gold does not grow in value except by government fiat.

How few of us realize that an ounce of gold acquired at $35 in January 1934 is still valued at $35, whereas the same $35 deposited in a savings bank at 3 percent per annum, compounded, would today be worth about $70. I am not unmindful of the fact that peasants in France who buried gold saved some of their substance when paper money became relatively worthless; however, investment in securities, real estate, machinery, and commodities would have given the peasant more productive protection.

Naturally, of late, there has been agitation for devaluation of the dollar and/or increase in the price of gold, although, interestingly enough, not nearly so general as in former years, when our gold reserves were threatened. This may be a result of the arrangements made by our Government and the leading central banks of Europe to work in unison to prevent a run on the dollar and the pound sterling. The heavy purchases by our Federal Reserve Bank of hard foreign currencies, such as the Swiss franc, the French franc, the mark, the guilder, and the Belgian franc to defend the dollar may largely account for the relative absence of agitation to raise the price of gold.

It is my considered opinion that if private gold hoarders would learn that they cannot count upon the $35 per ounce price for their gold; that $35 would be a ceiling; and that the American Treasury—and it is to be hoped also the leading European central banks—would pay progressively reduced prices for gold; large stocks of gold would be thrown on the world central banks by private hoarders. This would bring about a replenishment of gold supplies, possibly even in excess of what the world central banks would consider necessary for increasing reserves against bank notes, etc., in the light of revised thinking as to the need of large gold reserves.

Offhand, it is contradictory to favor an increase in the supply of gold in the vaults of central banks when arguments are adduced such as mine for the lack of need of a large gold supply. However, as stated above, complete elimination of the fetish for gold will take time. It will be a gradual process to wean the world from its enslavement to a gold standard or a gold exchange standard and to effect a transition to what I would suggest be called a "symbolic gold standard."

No one knows how much gold is buried in the ground in France and India, countries notorious for gold hoarding, and elsewhere. But it could reach billions of dollars worth on the basis of $35 per ounce. Certainly countries such as India would be far better off to have factories and machinery making capital and consumer goods to having gold buried in the ground. If such hoards of gold are brought to market for fear of continued lowering of the minimum purchasing price by the United States, the world's central banks would have a problem, not of seeing how much gold each could get, but of encouraging their counterparts to take on more of the share of carrying this costly unfertile evidence of wealth.

In any case, there is no reason why the Central Banks of the world, in buying and selling gold, should limit themselves to charging merely cost of handling. They should be entitled to a profit of, say, one, two, or more percent in the spread between buying and selling.

If hoaders of gold de-hoarded and converted their gold into bank accounts, they would have money ready for investment at a profit to make capital and consuming goods, for which there is a crying need, especially in underdeveloped countries.

If the "symbolic gold standard" be adopted, I can visualize dehoarding of gold on such a scale as to drive its price down to even $25 an ounce, without resulting in deflation, so long as the ratio of gold as a reserve against currency and/or deposits is regulated pari passu in relation to the fall in the price of gold. A symbolic gold standard relegates gold to its proper position as the servant of the world's economy.

The Reverend Father Clement H. Kern, the Saint of the Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues and with the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief glimpse of a man who graces with honor the community in which he lives, the people—whatever their race, creed, or station in life—whose lives he touches. The people who have the privilege of just knowing him personally and the people who have the privilege of just knowing of him are graced by the honor he does to mankind in being what he is. He is a gentle man and a strong man. He is a man of charismatic power and impact. We, of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan, are deeply privileged that Father Clement H. Kern, the Saint of the Slums, was directed to make his home and the center of his ministry in our midst.

The glimpse of him is beautifully provided by Harry Golden, Jr., in an article published in the July 8 edition of the Detroit Free Press.

THE SAINT OF THE SLUMS

(By Harry Golden, Jr.)

The mild-mannered little priest was inquiring about a homeless family.

On the other end of the telephone line, the lady investigator with the social agency reported firmly that the people were found to be "undeserving."

"Well, send them down here then," said the Rev. Father Clement H. Kern. "All our people are undeserving."

It was a typical flippancy of the slight, 53-year-old man with the gray brush-cut and the bluish eyes, alert behind horn-rimmed glasses.

This is Father Kern, pastor of the historic Most Holy Trinity Roman Catholic Church at 1050 Porter.

How far the little candle of that church throws its beams.

Its spire rises majestically over the west side of the John Lodge Freeway, whose roaring stampede of cars marks a boundary of two downtown slums.

Now, these slums are to be gone. But Father Kern, who lit the candle of good deeds at Holy Trinity a generation ago, is staying behind * * * there's still work to be done.

To the south and west of his church lie the 77 acres of something recorded in the files of the Detroit Housing Commission's Urban Renewal Division as "Redevelopment Project (West Side Industrial) Mich. 1–4."

But, familiarly, it's Old Corktown—the Irish community served by the mother church of Detroit's English-speaking Catholics.

Through the decades the Irish were replaced by the Negroes, the Maltese, the Mexicans, the Cubans, the Pakistanis—23 nationalities in all.

At the end, when the lead balls of the wreckers lunged at the tenements, there were 864 families.

They're selling the cleared land to developers of light industry now, and soon neat rows of shops and plants will preempt the ghosts of Corktown.

Eastward across the lodge lie the 59 acres of CBD (for Central Business District) No. 1, Mich. R–3.

Its other name is Skid Row.

The total relocation problem involved a mere 77 families and 1,478 "single people." No one added up the broken yesterdays and lost shallow hopes.

But, long, long after the proposed International Village—a tourist mecca of fine restaurants, motels and entertainment facilities—and retail establishments, office buildings, parking developments and utilities replace the shabby complex of flophouses, bars and pawnshops, the "boys from the Avenue" will remember Father Kern and Holy Trinity.

It was a place where you could always get "bed money."

And there seemed to be an inexhaustible supply of second-hand overcoats at the rectory.

No one was turned away from the church's Mother Cabrini Clinic, where volunteer doctors and nurses, with donated equipment and medicines, care for the sick, and where on Alcoholics Anonymous Thursdays they have had as many as three doctors and six nurses giving shots practically by the gallon, of vitamin B_{12}.

Father Kern also established a reading room—a place, as he put it, "where the lads can come in out of the rain and where they can snooze if they like, or listen to a ball game; and, if they happen to want to read books, why, they're there."

Then there is Alexandrine House, a relatively new experimental home for parolees. The men are released from prison on the promise of this facility's directors that they will be provided jobs and a place to live.

One of Father Kern's talents is being evasive if he suspects someone is going to dwell upon his works at Holy Trinity, which he first joined as assistant pastor in 1943.

But as an example of the peculiar kind of fame that he has earned, an associate in the priesthood tells the story of the night a poor derelict suffered an attack of some illness in one of the 50-cent-a-bed flophouses that line Michigan.

For a moment in the dimness of the second-floor lodging house, the ailing man's roommates were at a loss as to how to get aid.

Then the message was passed down the beds of the dormitory—"Get a-hold of Father Kern."

A car quickly brought Father Kern and a fellow clergyman.

"We carried the poor fellow down the stairs," the latter recalled. "And when we got back to the car the policemen were there wondering why we were parked in the middle of Michigan Avenue.

"No, he wasn't a Catholic. We got him over to Receiving Hospital. But it was one of those hopeless cases. He only had a few hours to live. Perhaps we can say, though, that his last moments were given a bit more dignity."

Associates report that Father Kern, a native of Adrian and the son of an autoworker who was one of the first stewards of the UAW, rises about 7 a.m. each day to offer mass and turns in at the rectory just any time between 1 and 2 o'clock the next morning.

The final hour of the work day usually finds him alone in his office replying to the heavy volume of inquiries from sociologists, fellow priests and others interested in service of the people of rundown neighborhoods throughout the world.

They want to know about such projects as "Corktown College"—which really isn't a college at all, but a night school where volunteers teach subjects like citizenship and folk dancing and sewing and, if you're of Latin-American extraction, enough English so that you can hold down a job (Father Kern speaks fluent Spanish).

They ask about the cooperative homes established for elderly people—one for men, the other women—both recently moved further out in the city.

The final hour of the day's tasks might find Father, too, strolling alone with his flashlight down some dark alley on some mission of his faith—or work of charity not confined to any single faith.

The boys on night duty at fire engine house No. 8, Sixth and Bagley, or the officers in the passing scout car will wave him a greeting.

The homeless men he encounters will say, "Hey, Father."

Friends have asked if he's not too blase about touring the area.

And the little man in the white collar, ordained in 1933, laughs and says, "I wear a uniform, you know."

In the daytime there are always people on the three dark-stained benches in the brown-tiled foyer outside Father Kern's office. They're waiting to see the man who's proud that his church has served as "a port of entry."

The urban renewal that is going on about him will bring a loss of about 200 families. But his parish, which stretches beyond the limits of the projects, still has 750 families.

So his work goes on.

He beams as he shows off the site of his parish's new school (the old one has been condemned as unsafe). By September, the kindergarten will be ready on the new site at Labrosse and Sixth, and the rest of the classrooms are promised for February.

Many sights and sounds of Father Kern's domain are changing.

The transition is reflected in the signs.

"This urban renewal project is being undertaken with Federal financial aid (two-thirds Federal, one-third city), under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended," the new signs proclaim. "For sale, industrial parcels."

Many a building stands vacant now with its windows smashed out, awaiting the wrecker to take it down brick by brick.

At 639 Michigan the Detroit Housing Commission has set up a relocation office to assist the business proprietors and residents. A stream of small shop proprietors comes in with their three estimates of moving expenses.

But the "single people" come in, too. For the word has gone down the avenue that the Government pays the people who have to leave.

The relocation allowance prescribed by law for "single person without furniture" is $3.50.

In the meantime, the humble but honest families that populate the parish of Most Holy Trinity know where to go for a bit of help.

They can go to the church of Father Kern, in whose philosophy every man, woman, and child has an immortal soul and meanwhile should have a chance at a better life.

Especially the undeserving.

Civil Defense and Civil Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 16, 1962, Maj. Gen. William J. Verbeck, commanding general, XIII U.S. Army Corps, delivered an excellent address before the 14th Annual Conference of the Military Government Association at Hartford, Conn., on the subject, "Civil Defense and Civil Affairs."

The information contained in the address by this distinguished soldier on such a pertinent subject should be of general interest, and I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE AND CIVIL AFFAIRS

The 20th century has been called the "Century of Conflict." It has seen world wars; limited wars; brush-fire wars, proxy wars, and police actions; international military forces employed to restrain aggressors, restore seized territory, prevent hostilities, and take protective custody; invited occupations and protective missions, political and military alliances under combined commands; guerrilla and counterguerrilla actions; containment of international incidents involving shooting; externally sponsored political and military subversion, threats, and coup d'etats; espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, poisoning and assassination; trade, monetary and economic pressures; propagandan campaigns and psychological warfare.

The requirements for modern warfare are visualized as a spectrum ranging from a low extreme of operations conducted against lightly irregular forces to total nuclear warfare. The Army, as the organization for land warfare, is prepared to meet either extreme. This Army doctrine is based on factual concepts presuming either the use or nonuse of nuclear weapons, and its organization is founded on the basic proposition that it can conduct land operations in either a nuclear or non-nuclear environment in combat zones, any place, any time, whether of the brush-fire type or a total general conflagration.

Historically, the Army's primary mission has been to engage and defeat the land forces of an enemy nation, but the dimensions of cold war as a continuing conflict have required mobilization and maintenance of a peacetime Army in the present magnitude not to fight a war but to prevent a war.

The avoidance of a shooting war has become the cornerstone of our international policy and although the deliberate instigation of a general war by an enemy nation does not appear likely, the establishment of deterrents to such a decision to wage war on the United States appears the only way to prevent such an involvement.

However, there does exist the possibility of a general war by miscalculation or inadvertence or through the expansion of limited hostilities and to survive, this Nation must not only be victorious in the cold war but also must be prepared to defeat an enemy in a shooting war.

In addition to the spiritual and human values that make up our way of life, the basic elements of our national strength are (1) a healthy economy, (2) a strong military posture, and (3) a sound civil defense.

The Nation must be strong economically to support an adequate defense effort. Military strength, both defensive and offensive, is of course a major deterrent to enemy attack. But of greater importance as a deterrent to enemy attack, when the opposing forces are of equal strength, is civil defense, as measured by the ability of the country's productive capacity, both men and machines, to survive a nuclear attack.

It is not possible to predict the character or pattern of possible attack against any individual target or specific area of this country, but survival under conditions of modern warfare is solely dependent on what each individual can do for himself.

Accomplishments under the Civil Defense Act of 1950 have been greater than generally realized. Good plans have been drawn up under the joint State and Federal arrangement and large numbers of key personnel, public officials and civil defense auxiliaries stand ready to perform vital work in an emergency.

Although civil defense plans, measures and operations are primarily a responsibility and a task of civil governments at all levels, it is the function of the Army to complement the efforts of civilian agencies with a view toward strengthening their capabilities.

The term complement is used advisedly, because it is the task of the Army to support civil authorities, not substitute for them.

In this respect, Army support of civil defense authorities in a civil defense emergency is considered a responsibility secondary only to combat operations.

The availability of military resources for support of civil defense operations during the initial critical phase of a civil defense emergency is dictated by the existing conditions and the degree to which military resources have been employed or are actively engaged in the defense of the United States; are engaged in offensive combat operations; or are required for the direct support of essential military operations.

It is recognized that Army forces surviving a thermonuclear attack and available for support will represent only a small portion of the total effort required for survival and recovery; and that the timing and degree of military response will be directly proportional to the efforts required for the military forces themselves to recover.

Thus, aside from preparing passive defense plans and measures for Department of Army installations, the Army has prepared plans for support of civil defense operations under each of the following contingencies:

(1) Providing military support to a civil defense organization which is in being and capable of using military resources;

(2) Taking over civil defense operations where civil control or leadership is destroyed or overwhelmed for the limited period until civilian agencies are reestablished and operating in the local area concerned.

Military support is synonymous with military assistance and includes the use of any resources of the Department of Defense such as personnel, material, services and facilities, or the use of any nonmilitary resources obtained by contract, hire, or other means which might be necessary to deal with the immediate emergency conditions which would be created by a thermonuclear attack.

Military support may require medical supplies, equipment, food, fuel, power, water, sanitation, building materials and transportation to minimize the effects of an attack. Military support may also require the maintenance and/or support of the reestablishment of law and order and the protection of life and property in the event civil control or leadership is destroyed or overwhelmed until such civilian agencies are reestablished and operating.

The problem of survival, both individual and national, in a thermonuclear war is becoming daily more acute and today's solution may have little practical effect tomorrow with new breakthroughs in the development of future missiles and delivery systems.

The dreadful arithmetic of hydrogen bomb casualties may stun many persons to the point of horrified apathy and an attitude of "it's no use."

It might be that an enemy attack on the United States would kill 5 million or 35 million or 70 million Americans but our attention should be focused not only on the number of people who can be saved by proper civil defense measures, but also on those who survive.

In the postattack period, military assistance is planned for the care of casualties, protection against radiation hazards, and the feeding, housing, and clothing of displaced persons. Then the military assistance would be directed to the restoration of communication and transportation systems throughout the country and the rehabilitation or reconstruction of vital facilities necessary for the support of the war effort and military combat operations.

In the event of such an emergency, the role of civil affairs will be to enable the Army to accomplish its mission of supplementing and assisting civil defense. During this critical early period normal civilian facilities will probably be destroyed: communications will not be functioning; rail and motor transport will break down; public health and safety will be endangered. A complete breakdown of all governmental functions is not unlikely. Therefore, although the civilian authorities are responsible for the ultimate resoration of normal functions, their ability to act will be impaired and will, in all likelihood, have to be assisted by the Army.

The Active Army does not have the capability of providing such supplementary services directly; but, through its Reserve civil affairs units—such as area headquarters, civil affairs groups, and civil affairs companies—it can give substantial and quick assistance where it will be most needed. Normal government organization may be overwhelmed or destroyed in the catastrophe; but specialized Army units will be ready to step into the breach and prevent a total breakdown.

Plans are now being drawn up ot use civil affairs units most effectively by giving each one a specific target complex and alternate target complexes for which each will be responsible. Present thinking is to require the individual unit to make area studies, detailed operations plans, and operating procedures for accomplishing these tasks in addition to its normal mission. One of the units which the Army has to do such tasks is in the Reserve Forces; the civil affairs unit. They would be working at the same kind of tasks as they are called upon to do in occupied areas around the world: restoring order, rebuilding the economy, and making normal government possible once again. They are in a position to assume, without major readjustment, the relief and rehabilitation of areas disorganized by a major air strike. They have the capability of providing invaluable services to the stricken civilian economy: restoring supplies of food, rebuilding community facilities, provision of emergency housing, restoration of communications and transportation facilities, reestablishment of public health and safety services. Without such help the civilian government would be overwhelmed and perhaps destroyed. With such help the restoration of normal conditions is difficult, but feasible.

Civil affairs has, in the past, accomplished outstanding work. It can look with pride on the record make in World War II and the postwar years in Germany, Japan, and the Ryuku Islands. Again, it can be proud of its record in Korea and in the transfer of Hungarian refugees to the United States. Should the need arise, civil affairs will have a tremendous task. Its units, its officers, and its men will be there to accomplish the apparently impossible.

Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12711) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, nothing is more essential to a legislative body than having ready access to information on the functioning of Government. Congress over the years has made great efforts to see that we have such access.

But from time to time there are those who try to frustrate this process.

For instance, I have had great difficulty in getting information from the Federal Aviation Agency and its Administrator, Mr. Najeeb Halaby. I have related some of the difficulties I have had on this score.

At first, I thought that all my difficulties might have come about because Mr. Halaby and I got off to a rather poor start in our relationship with each other. I suspect there are some Members in this House who have assumed the same about this situation. But this is not the case, as I will show.

Mr. Halaby's reluctance to give information about his Agency is symptomatic of a generally unhealthy situation that permeates his entire Agency. This reluctance and its causes are matters that every Member here will be concerned with before many more weeks pass. They will concern and disturb you whether or not you find any cause for concern in my particular argument with Mr. Halaby over the capricious movement of the San Antonio air route traffic control center to Houston.

What you regard as my individual grievance today is going to be your catastrophic problem tomorrow. It is going to be your problem when the air passengers in your district learn of the game of Russian roulette that is going on in our airways. It is a game that this Administrator has been impotent in handling.

When the information that Mr. Halaby now has becomes known to the public, as it will, you will then recall that this is the same Mr. Halaby who tells Congressmen to go "fly their kite" when they inquire about his activities and the work of his Agency. This attitude of treating FAA like it was part of CIA is of far more serious concern to me than the removal of a traffic route control center from one city to another.

More and more people today are asking, How safe is flying today? The general public is understandably confused by the endless flow of soothing reports from the FAA concerning the high level of safety in the traffic control system and the comparison of these statements with the actual number of instances of unsafe operation which crop up almost daily.

How safe is a system, for example, which permits two airliners to hold in the same race track pattern over the Washington area, each at 7,000 feet for a period of 42 minutes; each pilot oblivious to the presence of the other, and the traffic control system operating under the assumption that the two aircraft in question are adequately separated?

The implications of this particular incident are far more grave than the circumstances leading to the flaming midair collision over New York, December 16, 1960. In the New York incident, there was only 1 second in time in which these two aircraft could collide, and they did. In the example over Washington, the aircraft could have collided at any instant, for an entire 42-minute period.

Apart from actual battlefield exposure to enemy gunfire, few individuals have ever been exposed for such a sustained period to imminent death. That they might have gone to their death in utter composure, sipping a martini or reading a sugar-coated FAA press release dealing with the improvements in the air traffic control system, does not alter the gravity of the situation at all. What are the facts in the matter?

Is it true, as stated by the FAA, that there have been only 544 such incidents during the past year? Is it true that, as stated by the FAA Administrator, an en route controller makes only one such mistake every 14 years and that an airport tower controller makes only one such mistake every 45 years; or is it true that a secret report entitled "Project Scan" shows more than double the number of serious incidents as reported by the Administrator during the past year; or is it true that as privately confided by any air traffic controller, these incidents of unsafe separation occur daily in all air traffic control centers and in most of the active air traffic control towers? It is clear that most of these incidents go unreported because of fear of reprisal on the part of the controller. Pilot and controller alike are reluctant to report these hazardous incidents because of the policy of the FAA to discipline first and investigate later. These incidents occur not through negligence but because of deficiencies in our air navigation system and deficiencies in our air traffic control system. In most instances and particularly during instrument weather the aircraft pass each other undetected by the pilots and observed only by the traffic controller. If the incident is officially reported by the traffic controller, he faces suspension, demotion, transfer or loss of pay prior to any investigation of the circumstances. It is clear that we can never hope to arrive at an adequate and safe system of air traffic control until we have a machinery to report and analyze each breakdown in the present system.

But this is only part of the problem in FAA. As I said at the outset, the propensity to conceal is merely symptomatic of more grievous faults. I have prepared some additional materials on this which I shall lay before you in the course of the next few days.

A Salute to the Marriner Wood Merrill Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of the year that many of our western pioneer families are holding their annual family reunion.

A few weeks ago my own Harding family held their reunion at Brigham City, Utah. I was unable to attend the reunion due to the fact that Congress is still in session. However, Hardings from throughout Utah and Idaho and other Western States met to pay tribute to George Harding who made the long trek west by covered wagon and settled at Willard, Utah.

I further understand that the descendants of one of the greatest of western pioneers, Marriner Wood Merrill, will be gathering together this weekend to commemorate his life and works. Although this family will meet in Richmond, Utah, the city he helped found and build, we in Idaho, with many of his descendants among us, look to his life as an example of one man's great devotion to his God and his fellow man.

One of his choicest descendants was my mission mother, Mrs. Annie Merrill Elsworth. I can honestly say that next to my own mother and wife, any achievement or accomplishment that I have been able to make thus far in life has been influenced by this great and good lady who, with her devoted husband, J. Orval Elsworth, presided over the Central States Mission when I was laboring there. I am especially grateful for the descendants of Marriner Wood Merrill.

Marriner W. Merrill migrated from eastern Canada where he was born, to Utah, in 1853—a scant 6 years after Brigham Young's famous arrival in the Salt Lake Valley. Even so, he had some difficulty in locating a 100-acre tract of land. When the territorial surveyor and Governor Young had agreed on the piece of land he should have, he then shared his good fortune by dividing the land in three equal parts, one for his father-in-law, one for a poor Danish brother, and the third for himself.

As his consideration for his fellow men controlled, so did his ability to help them develop. Today, his descendants can remember with pride large farming and dairy operations, the creamery, condensed milk factory, flour mill, railroad, mercantile and other pioneer enterprises which he successfully launched. He encouraged and directed the building of many church structures including the Richmond Tabernacle. And, in addition to all this, Marriner W. Merrill was a leader in public affairs, serving two terms in the Utah Territorial Legislature, and being a trustee of both the Utah State Agricultural College and of the Brigham Young College at Logan.

Not having had the advantage of formal education himself, Mr. Merrill provided diligently for the education of his children, to the end that many of his some 2,000 descendants have distinguished themselves in all phases of American life: church, education, public service, medicine, law, science, and other professions, business, and farming. Many of his family have been or are now listed in "Who's Who in America."

As I humbly regard the accomplishments of this great westerner, I cannot help observe that first and last he was an active member and a leader in his church. At one time, as the result of extraordinary kindness to his fellow men at a moment of great hardship, he was promised that neither he nor his children, nor his children's children, would want for bread. His descendants testify that the following years brought many poor harvests but nonetheless, the promise was realized then as in years of prosperity.

I salute the Marriner Wood Merrill family with the hope that the examples of his life will continue to be a controlling influence on their lives and on the communities in which they labor.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, at the 36th Annual Convention of the Reserve Officers Association, Discussed the Role of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Some of the Criticism Directed Toward Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the frequent references heard recently to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the recent address by the Chief of Naval Operations at the 36th Annual Convention of the Reserve Officers Association proved significant as well as interesting.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., is one of the Nation's outstanding military leaders. He has risen to his present position as the top officer in the U.S. Navy because of his skill, his wisdom, and his great capacity for leadership among men. Admiral Anderson's address deals with some of the aspects of military leadership we hear all too little.

It is my privilege to call to the attention of the Congress the text of this address, given before ROA at its convention at Las Vegas. Those of us who read and understand this message will not be surprised to know that the assembled Reserve leaders from throughout the world, to whom Admiral Anderson addressed his remarks, repeatedly applauded him and gave him a prolonged standing ovation at the conclusion.

His address follows:

I think the Reserve Officers Association has shown remarkable wisdom in selecting Las Vegas as the site of this convention. There will always be a need for officers who are well versed in calculating odds, and it was a pleasure for me to learn that so many of you here have been undergoing intensive training in this art. We also need men who can operate around the clock—when I commanded the great 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean it was our pride that we could do so. I am told that many of you have voluntarily undertaken research projects in this vital area of endurance.

And so I feel justified in thinking of this convention as having important training overtones; indeed, it should be most educational.

We need a lot of confidence to live in today's world. The complexities of our modern society have required us to develop an unusually high degree of reliability in those matters which are essential to our way of life. We have perfect confidence that the water will flow when we turn the tap, that the car will start when we engage the starter, and that we will have light when the switch is thrown. All of us exhibit perfect confiddence literally dozens of times daily—using the telephone—the banking system—the public highways.

Those activities which must be successfully accomplished dozens of times daily by millions of our people have been so systematized and refined and further refined until it is the exception—and sometimes a disaster—when they unexpectedly fail to perform. The frequency of their occurrence has forced us to build a high reliability—and therefore a high confidence—that the services and functions vital to our well-being will be provided when they are needed.

A high degree of confidence may be placed in a system only when it is justified by repeated successful performances. I would like to tell you this morning that your armed services are daily and hourly successfully completing many varied and difficult missions, and that you may justifiably place a high degree of confidence in the Nation's military power.

We consider that our primary responsibility is to preserve peace, and that in order to do so we must be ready to wage war—war of any kind, large or small. The single word "ready" encompasses a staggering range of activities—from research into exotic areas to the preparation of reports and analyses of exercises. Between the conception of a weapons system and its sucessful operation lie the myriad activities of recruiting, training, and supporting our men; designing, procuring, and testing their equipment; conceiving, planning, and executing hundreds of sorties, flights, exercises, and drills designed to demonstrate and prove the reliability of our weapons systems—reliability essential to confidence.

The Strategic Air Command, for example, has acquired the capability to launch its aircraft on short notice, to fly long distances, penetrate defenses, and to find and hit with carefully selected weapons targets deep in enemy territory. SAC is ready, and typifies the high standards of readiness which pervade all the services. At the same time, SAC is in transition as more and more long range missiles are brought into its inventory.

The readiness of our Navy is illustrated most dramatically by the Polaris system. These submarines are at sea on station, the crews are fully trained, and each ship's 16 missiles have been ready to fire on instant notice 95 percent of the time. Fifteen of the missiles have been ready 99.9 percent of the time the submarines were on patrol. We have confidence in Polaris today, even as we prepare to increase Polaris submarines in number and the range and potential of the missiles.

Our Marine Corps is ready, with a strong and spirited force based on each coast, and with battalion landing teams continuously embarked in amphibious ships in both Atlantic and Pacific. Our Nation has confidence in our Marine Corps because its current performance is in keeping with its glorious traditions.

Troops of the Strike command can be airborne in 60 minutes—supported by transport and tactical aircraft capable of transoceanic flight—to reinforce our Army and Air Forces overseas with highly skilled combat units trained to fight together.

These few examples illustrate the very high level of readiness of all of our forces. The intensive training being done by all services has resulted in a level of alertness and smartness which has seldom been attained by any organization. You may, and should, have great confidence in the ability of each of our units successfully to carry out its assigned mission.

Readiness has not been attained without leadership, direction, and a high degree of professional competence over many decades. What we have in the services today is the result of the magnificent contributions of those who have preceded us. Our military commitments are being met throughout the world by forces from all services organized into unified commands. The unified commanders are, in turn, under the command of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, responsible to our civilian Secretary of Defense and to the President.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been the subject of much comment and discussion, as indeed they should be. Any agency with such responsibility to the Nation should properly be under continuous scrutiny in order to seek ways and means of improving its performance.

But not all of the criticisms are well understood, whether they be well-founded ones or not. I would like to discuss some of them so that you can consider them in a new perspective.

One of the most frequently heard criticisms is that the uniformed services forfeit their decision-making responsibilities when the Chiefs of Staff differ in their judgments or recommendations—when they are unable to agree on a decision. The split decision must be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense for resolution, and the criticism is that the decision therefore must be made by civilian authorities who may very well not have the military knowledge and experience of the Chiefs of Staff themselves.

Less than 1 percent of the judgments made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff are split decisions, and the term "split decision" is misleading in that it suggests only disagreement. Actually, a split decision most often results in alternate solutions being presented to the Secretary of Defense and the Commander in Chief. The advantages and disadvantages of each of the differing courses of action have been studied and set forth by the Joint Chiefs, and by their joint staff, composed of officers with highly specialized knowledge and broad experience. There are decisions of such national importance that they should properly be made by civilian authorities, and the alternatives should be presented only after thoughtful consideration of differing opinions, of dissenting views, and, consequently, after maximum assurance that critical factors have not been overlooked or underestimated. The present system meets this requirement admirably.

The Joint Chiefs have been described as too slow in making decisions, the inference being that a single Chief of Staff could move into action faster. Many of our problems include unprecedented complexities, and it is only prudent to gather as many facts as possible before reaching mature judgments which may have profound, long-range implications. Whether or not the Joint Chiefs do respond quickly is dictated by the urgency of the situation. The system is designed for, and capable of, instantaneous response when necessary. This issue must be viewed not from the standpoint of speed alone, but from the point of view of the Joint Chiefs' ability to act quickly, decisively, and correctly in an emergency situation. It is illogical to conclude that deliberate action on complex peacetime problems is indicative of slow response to future emergency requirements. The Joint Chiefs must have, and do have, the ability to react quickly, but their first responsibility—no matter what the second and third are—is to arrive at sound solutions in the interest of national security. The present system provides the maximum assurance that this responsibility is indeed fulfilled.

There is also the issue of whether or not the dual role of Service Chief and member of the Joint Chiefs is a practical arrangement. I believe this issue should be viewed this way: from a theoretical point of view, a Service Chief member of the JCS might not be able to act dispassionately as a member of the Joint Chiefs—whose function is to review the proposals of the Service Chiefs—one of which is of course himself. But we are, after all, in a very practical business, and the job is being done. It gets done because the Chiefs and their staff represent a pool of talent, experience, and specialized knowledge which is irreplaceable. Because of their great ability, the work of the Joint Chiefs is successfully accomplished, much like the bee which continues to fly in spite of the fact that some engineers might assert that his wingloading is too high.

In fact, I know I do a better job as a member of the Joint Chiefs because I am also the Chief of Naval Operations, not in spite of it. Conversely, I do a better job as the uniformed head of my service by virtue of my experience as a member of the JCS. Each Service Chief is responsible for the performance of his Service. The importance of this fact is that authority and responsibility are not divorced. The Joint Chiefs have a collective authority to make decisions and an individual responsibility for their execution. Separation of authority and responsibility is a sure road to chaos.

The Secretary of Defense, for example, has both broad authority and responsibility, which also covers some matters not within the statutory responsibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—matters inherent in the administration of the largest single organization in the world. His access to information and advice is equally broad. His Assistant Secretaries, and his staff, and the Service Secretaries, are each required and authorized to make recommendations to him. In exercising his own best judgment, he normally refers information or proposals from other sources to the Joint Chiefs for comment or recommendation. Under this procedure it is hardly conceivable that any Secretary of Defense would not consult the Joint Chiefs of Staff on matters which are included in their statutory responsibilities.

In a nutshell, whatever system we use must be unfailingly responsive to the needs of the Nation, not always in speed of decision, or in theoretical performance, but in soundness of decision and actual performance. I believe the present system has demonstrated advantages which far outweigh any hypothetical disadvantages about which some crticism centers. I believe that, in the best interests of the Nation, the present Joint Chiefs of Staff organization should be retained, and that the confidence we have in our Armed Forces should also be accorded to the command arrangement under which the Armed Forces have achieved their outstanding readiness. The Joint Chiefs of Staff system, despite the criticisms it has been exposed to, fully warrants the confidence that it is and will be the most reliable and responsive arrangement for handling national military matters.

I must make one qualification here with respect to confidence in the Nation's military strength. The reliability and capability of our forces and our systems must not be taken for granted. Our accomplishments have been achieved through hard work, sacrifice, and dedication, which are qualities possessed by the people who compose our forces—not by the weapons. But "forces" is a sterile term with respect to describing the people involved, and it is in this area that I feel the Nation could profit from greater understanding. It is one thing to speak of the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean—it is another to speak of the men who man the carriers from whose decks fly supersonic aircraft; of the crews of destroyers; of marines embarked in our amphibious ships. The extent of our commitments and the degree of personal sacrifice which many of our men make are not sufficiently understood, and consequently the respect accorded to military men is not proportionate to their contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

Respect in our society is too often associated with income, and no one would deny that many of our men are at a disadvantage here. It is important to appreciate that our most highly trained and skilled personnel—both officers and enlisted—are career men, and therefore volunteers. There is no provision of law, comparable to the draft, which compels a man to make the military a career. Our career men are therefore voluntarily making a double contribution—they suffer by relative pay standards, and they make personal sacrifices far beyond the norm.

But "sacrifice" is another word which is too general to convey the intensely personal nature of the experiences our men undergo. The bitter cold and snow of Antarctica is not a general weather phenomenon—it is very personal to the men who must fly, and live, and build in support of our polar research. The heat and jungle and mud of Thailand are not abstractions, but realities forming the backdrop against which our men stand watch in the farflung picket line of freedom. A ship deployed for 8 months means America's great power is being projected overseas, but it also means loneliness for wives and families; babies born while father is in Antarctica, or on Polaris patrol, or steaming in the Formosa Strait; many small things—the uncut lawn—the leaky faucet, the unfixed bike. Indeed, the sacrifices of our men are matched in full by their families—there is no pay which will replace Dad's help in homework, in sports, or in just growing up—except the respect of his fellow citizens. Our men and their families have earned and deserve that respect many times over. There is, in my mind, a real dignity in men who serve steadfastly during cold war and who are knowingly committed to the rigors of a cold war turned hot.

In addition to our commitments involving units in specific places, we have broad continuing commitments which we must also meet. These are to attain and increase our combat readiness, to get best performance from our weapons systems, and to maintain mental, moral, and physical fitness. Indeed these commitments apply to you as well.

Over half of the officers and men in our Navy are attached to afloat or mobile units. Our records show that out of 285 of our ships which were away from their home ports last Christmas, 47 were also away at Christmas in 1960, and 14 were absent during Christmas 1959. This is a kind of sacrifice many men were not called upon to make during World War II, and it is being duplicated by the men of the Air Force, and of the Army, and of our incomparable Marine Corps. Marines are customarily deployed to Okinawa for periods of 13 months—without their dependents—in order to meet such commitments as we have in Thailand. Our deployed fleets and units are only part of the picture. When a ship is in its home port, a crew competent to get the ship underway must remain aboard at all times. Thus even though the ship may be at home, the crew must spend one out of three or four nights and weekends on board. The Marines, Air Force, and Army also have training and readiness commitments which must be met whether the unit is deployed overseas or based in the United States.

The rigors of service life should be worthy of respect, even if the men didn't do anything. But this is not the case. The men who make these sacrifices must also have the ability and skill and training to master the complex weapons systems we now employ. Such systems as the Polaris, Hound Dog, Bullpup, Asroc, Sparrow, and Nike are but today's manifestations of weapons systems growing more and more to depend on computers, electronics, nuclear power, and rocketry. Obviously, we must have good men to perform these duties.

Our men are doing a magnificent job, for little material reward, at substantial personal sacrifice. But we are living in a split-level society, in which part of our population values material reward over public service. The degree to which our people value the material over the spiritual is one measure of the degree of danger facing our Nation. This is not a new idea. The 18th century philosopher Rousseau wrote: "As soon as the public service ceases to be the chief business of the citizens, and they would rather serve with their money than with their persons, the state is not far from its fall." It should be our common purpose to promote the reputation and respect accorded to public service, as opposed to that fallacious worship now accorded the acquisition of goods. It is indeed unfortunate for the Nation that the contributions of our dedicated service people may be contrasted with the pernicious activities of that part of the populace whose principles seem to be composed of equal parts of evasion, corruption, and unethical practice.

I cannot make this kind of contrast without emphasizing that the vast majority of our citizens are wonderful people—the finest in the world. I believe that we in the services have a collective realization of the fundamental integrity of our people. Indeed, it is this faith in the ultimate virtue of our Nation which sustains us in the face of long hours, low pay, and difficult work. When small groups, or individuals, do seem to obstruct, or debase, or dilute our progress, we believe that the majority of our great citizenry will rise and react and correct these defects to produce an even better America.

In the meantime, our career uniformed citizens ought to be recognized, not for what they get, but for what they are, and what they do, and what they give.

They are volunteers.

They do a magnificent and difficult job.

The give the rest of our citizens their time and talent, that the freedom all have inherited will continue to survive.

Your dual status as civilians and Reserve officers puts you in both camps, as are the retired officers of our services. As officers, we look to you to complement the Regular forces when necessary, and you have proven more than once that you are equal to the task. As civilians you are an important link between the services and the populace. We in the services respect you as military men, and we have faith that you will, in your civilian role, keep the United States always on the move upward.

In 1937, I was in the USS *Yorktown* as a landing signal officer. In that peacetime year we had a veteran and experienced crew—all Regulars—and the ship operated to her full potential. Six years later in 1943, I was in the new *Yorktown*, as navigator, with a crew 90 percent new to the ship, drawn from the Reserve and the civilian world. The new *Yorktown* did just as well as the old, even though she was not in action until the war was almost 2 years old.

During Korea we learned again of the great value of a trained and ready Reserve, and during the past year we have once again seen the Reserve step forward into national prominence.

I have mentioned the actions of the Reserve in three situations of varying violence. The Reserve has had a role in general war, in a limited war of the Korean kind, and in the cold war—as we have recently seen.

But as I have said in outlining our military commitments, there are continuing and important roles in addition to the purely military. There is a responsibility on your part to improve your own capabilities, and to keep your services informed as to your best qualifications. Your support of legislation which you consider to be in the best interest of the Nation is an important contribution. When you support patriotic ceremonies, you are improving the image of the Armed Forces in the civilian community. Many of you have firsthand knowledge of ROTC programs and the opportunities open to officers both on active duty and in the Reserve, which admirably qualify you to publicize the services in their best light, and to influence talented young men to make the services a career. The services all need more public recognition for the contributions which are being made daily by our men and their families throughout the world. There is no group better qualified to meet such a need than the Reserve Officers Association.

There are today, soldiers of the Special Forces, marines, seamen, and airmen in Thailand. They arrived quietly and quickly because of the ability of our armed services to perform their missions day in and day out, year after year. The magnificence of our daily accomplishments frequently goes unnoticed while attention is focused on an occasional failure. We need an awareness and an appreciation of the difficult jobs which are being done so superbly around the world by all the services and, close to my own heart—our Navy and marines, deployed in four great fleets—and the swift silent Polaris submarines at sea continuously. These are great accomplishments, and they deserve full recognition.

We are always aware of the great numbers of Reserve officers on active duty who contribute so much to today's defense posture, and of those in Reserve components who contribute so much to our defense potential. Your services, as military officers, are invaluable to us throughout the spectrum of conflict. In addition, you possess the special characteristic of both having firsthand knowledge of military affairs, and of being in positions to meet and convince our young citizens of the value and opportunities of officership—on active duty and in the Reserve. Just as we rely on you to augment our combat strength, we rely on you to maintain and improve your own mental, physical, and professional capabilities, to publicize the very real achievements of all of the services, and to foster the idea that the man, in the final analysis, is the sine qua non of military power, and that he who devotes his skill, his time, and his treasure to the defense of the Nation is deserving of the highest respect from all of us.

Let the Right Hand Know What the Left Hand Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on Tuesday, July 31, 1962, in opposition to bills H.R. 10205, H.R. 10344, H.R. 10347, H.R. 10441, H.R. 10569, and H.R. 12323, which would prevent law-enforcement agencies from obtaining copies of census reports retained by reporting companies. My statement follows:

These bills espouse the philosophy of "what you don't know won't hurt you." Ignorance, we are told, if not bliss, is preferable to disclosure of business statistics to law-enforcement agencies. Today when free access to information is more important than ever before, it is disturbing indeed to find the Congress being asked to enact a law to promote ignorance on the part of its own Government.

These bills are designed to keep agencies of the Government, directed by the Congress to enforce laws within their jurisdiction, ignorant of data necessary for such enforcement, merely because a copy of such data is in the possession of another agency of the same Government.

An ignorant executive agency is expected to achieve a high degree of performance. Freedom of information is to be denied to Government agencies because such information might disclose a violation of law.

The Supreme Court is to be rebuffed for holding that relevant data in the possession of a corporate defendant in an antitrust suit can be used by a Government agency to prove the violation.

Congress has the duty, I believe, to enact legislation to promote interagency exchange of information rather than legislation promoting secret closets of information in every agency. Very recently the headline of a story in the New York Times was: "ICC Withholds Data on Rail Loan." From whom was this agency withholding information? From the General Accounting Office.

The bills before this committee are designed to nullify the recent decision by the Supreme Court in *St. Regis Paper Co.* v. *United States* (363 U.S. 203 (1961)). The Court there held that the Federal Trade Commission could compel the production by a company of its file copies of its census reports.

These bills would gravely prejudice the effective enforcement of the antitrust laws. This is particularly true of monopoly cases under section 2 of the Sherman Act and merger cases under the Celler-Kefauver Act. The St. Regis case, incidentally, involves a number of merger acquisitions.

In monopoly cases and in merger cases the question of the market, and the relative positions of the defendants and others in that market, are crucial. The determination of these intricate economic factors is difficult at best. The Government's figures are challenged at every step by the defense. Census data furnishes the most readily available and widely acceptable figures upon which such crucial determinations may be made. The published data are often inadequate. This may be becaues the line of commerce involved is included in the published figures as part of a larger classification or because it is necessary to know, as a measure of concentration, the position of the four largest and the eight largest companies in an industry and the position of the particular defendant or defendants in that context.

Whatever may be said of the policy of the Bureau of Census, operating under its particular laws, to keep the original returns secret, the Supreme Court has held in the St. Regis case that no such policy obtains with respect to copies of the returns to Census which are retained by reporting companies. Significantly, original income tax returns, as well as the taxpayer's copy, are available to Government agencies enforcing our laws.

In a recent speech before the Senate, Senator HUMPHREY said: "Secrecy is an enemy of democracy * * *. The trouble with secrecy is that it begets more secrecy." These bills illustrate the truth of Senator HUMPHREY's wise words. These bills would extend the secrecy of information in a Government agency's files to secrecy of information in the files of a corporation.

As a general rule, information in the files of one agency of the Government should be available to other agencies of the executive branch in the enforcement of the laws. The administration of justice should not be reduced to the level of a game of blind man's buff, played between different departments of the same Government.

If the Bureau of the Census has in its files information relevant to a violation of the antitrust laws, it seems to me as a general proposition that such information should be available to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission—the agencies charged with antitrust enforcement.

It would be more appropriate, therefore, to repeal the secrecy presently accorded the original census returns in the possession of the Bureau of the Census than to extend the shroud of secrecy to file copies of the census returns retained by the reporting companies.

I say this, because it seems to me that secrecy should be the exception and not the rule, certainly with respect to business statistics in the possession of Government agencies.

Judge Learned Hand remarked in *United States* v. *Coplon*, 2 Cir. 185 F. 2d 289 at p. 638: "* * * there may be evidence—'state secrets'—to divulge which will imperil 'national security'; and which the Government cannot, and should not be, required to divulge. Salus rei publicae suprema lex."

But even this ultimate privilege, founded on the "supreme law" of national self-preservation "is not to be lightly invoked," by the executive branch of the Government, as the Supreme Court held in *United States* v. *Reynolds* (345 U.S. at p. 7).

If this ultimate privilege may be interposed only as a last resort at the expense of the administration of justice, I fail to see any comparable urgent necessity for enveloping in secrecy business statistics needed for the enforcement of our laws.

Two main arguments are made for nondisclosure. First, it is said that census reports of statistical data are made on a voluntary basis, and knowledge that copies are subject to disclosure would deter companies from reporting voluntarily. Secondly, it is said that companies might not furnish accurate information if compelled to give such information with knowledge that some other agency might make use of it.

As to the first argument, Congress has imposed a legal duty to make such reports by imposing penalties for failure to furnish information to the Bureau of the Census (see 13 U.S.C. 224, 226). If the taxpayer's copy of his compulsory income tax return is subject to disclosure, I fail to see why a company's file copy of its compulsory census return should be privileged from disclosure.

The second argument—that companies would deliberately falsify their census returns—would put reputable businessmen in the class of criminals and racketeers, busily engaged in falsifying records. I refuse to accept any such conception of businessmen as a class.

Furthermore, the census statutes provide penalties for false or misleading statements, and other penal statutes also stand as a deterrence. These provisions should insure the accuracy of census returns, as they do income-tax returns.

Indeed, it seems to me that statistical data subject to the observation of more than one Government agency is more likely to be accurate and reliable than data not subjected to such observation. One may be able to fool one agency all of the time much more readily than several agencies with additional information in hand.

This argument—that compulsory census returns will be less reliable if subject to disclosure—flies in the face of daily experience in our courts. Until the advent of these bills, I never heard it suggested that documentary evidence was less reliable because it was subject to disclosure by subpena.

If the courts were to adopt the novel argument here for the first time asserted and mistrust documentary evidence merely because it was subject to subpena, I daresay the administration of justice would suffer with a vengeance. By the same token, I see no reason to suppose that compulsory business statistics will be less reliable because subject to disclosure. To conceal them in a veil of secrecy would cause a comparable breakdown in antitrust enforcement.

The statement filed with this subcommittee by the Department of Commerce is a model of inconsistency. On the one hand, the attempt is made to impress the subcommittee with the assertion that the Bureau of the Census is the "factfinder for the Nation," and is such by virtue of collecting information from business companies. On the other hand, the Commerce statement asserts that Census figures are not reliable because much of them are based upon "estimates" of business companies.

The subcommittee is told in the same statement that confidentiality insures that the companies will send statistical information without any delay caused by legal review. I suggest that a little delay by a company for more complete review might well improve the accuracy of the statistics compiled by Census.

It should be our objective to protect the innocent and to expose the wrongdoer. Secrecy of information may bring about a result contrary to right and justice. A recent decision provides a striking case in point. In *Klein* v. *American Luggage Works, Inc.* (D. Del. 1962) (CCH Trade Cases, par. 70355), excise tax returns proved indispensable in demonstrating the error in plausible but fallacious economic evidence. Had these excise tax returns been immune from disclosure a miscarriage of justice might well have resulted.[1]

This argument of secrecy has an additional air of unreality. There is nothing inherently confidential about business statistics, and when legitimate business secrets are at stake, existing law provides ample means for their protection from disclosure to competitors. Even in a private lawsuit, a court may compel disclosure of relevant confidential business data under appropriate safeguards where disclosure is essential to a proper determination of the case. By the same token, business statistics, even if confidential, should be similarly subject to disclosure, likewise under appropriate safeguards, where needed by the Government for the due enforcement of the law. These bills would make it difficult or impossible for the Government enforcement agencies to procure the most reliable form of business data.

These bills would have the further extraordinary effect of discouraging cooperation by law-abiding companies, otherwise willing to cooperate with the Government. I am reliably informed both by the Federal Trade Commission and by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice that generally companeis contacted have been willing to make such returns available. Their willingness often extends to informing the Bureau of the Census that they would have no objection to such agencies looking at their original census returns in the possession of the Bureau. Surely such wholly desirable cooperation should be encouraged.

What are the alternatives?

Agencies of the Government would have to spend an enormous amount of time, at substantial cost to the taxpayers and substantial drain upon their own appropriations, if they must make their own economic survey of an industry. They may not have the expertise of the Census Bureau, born of long experience with that industry. Moreover, on the basis of past experience a "homegrown" industry survey by an antitrust agency is subject to attack as incomplete, or inaccurate, or not the best evidence, and it may be excluded from evidence on such grounds.

Further, the Government might have no alternative, where such material is not available in the course of an investigation, to filing suit without the necessary facts in hand, if a probable violation of the antitrust laws is to be remedied.

Once a suit has been filed, a company may be required to reconstruct all over again the figures embodied in its census return. In that event, the company would either use the figures from its return or go through a painful, lengthy, and expensive process of reconstructing those figures. The difficulty of such reconstruction on the part of the company, or on the part of the Government attempting to make a survey of its own,[2] becomes magnified where, as often happens, market statistical data for more than a single year are required. The sheer delay thus entailed would often frustrate enforcement of the antitrust laws where enforcement is most urgently needed.

---

[1] In the Court's opinion, Judge Wright stated:

"During cross-examination of plaintiff's expert accounting witness, counsel for Wanamaker called attention to Klein's Federal excise tax returns for the same years, which indicate the dollar volumes of gross sales of all brands of luggage marketed. These figures are tabulated in the margin to facilitate comparison. In the face of Klein's testimony that he sold American luggage at a profit, it is readily apparent that the two sets of figures are hopelessly irreconcilable. If anything, they infer plaintiff consistently sold American luggage below cost. Nor may resort be had to the gross sales reflected in the tax return for computation of profits derived from sales of American luggage. Assuming the accuracy of these figures, they fail to show what portion of the gross sales in each year were derived from American luggage products. The record is thus devoid of any reliable evidence of Klein's profits from the sale of American luggage in the years prior to the refusal to deal."

I am informed that attempts by the antitrust agencies to secure equivalent data are often unsatisfactory because such equivalent data is often compiled on a different basis from the industrywide census universe figures. In such cases, defendants, as well as the Government, may face the arduous, if not impossible task of reconciling the defendant's equivalent figures with the census universe. In such a comparison, the parties and the court become inextricably enmeshed in a morass of disputed statistics.

In many instances, moreover, the data compiled by Census is simply not available from other sources, so that antitrust enforcement becomes, not tortuous, but impossible.

Obviously, a company under suspicion of an antitrust violation will not make an all-out effort to cooperate with the Government if it is guilty. The St. Regis case itself is one long history of frustrating attempts by the FTC to obtain information from St. Regis dating back to 1956, and the end is not yet in sight.

Two of these bills—H.R. 10344 and H.R. 10441—prohibit agencies other than the Department of Commerce from obtaining by compulsory process copies of census reports retained by "respondents."

One bill—H.R. 10205—immunizes not only copies of reports but copies of "any such information" from legal process and prohibits its use in a judicial or administrative proceeding. This would not only preclude use of a copy of such report, even though voluntarily given; it might also be construed to prevent antitrust and other agencies from having similar information reconstructed.

Two bills—H.R. 10569 and H.R. 12323—prevent the use of census reports and information as evidence or for any other purpose unless consented to. Worse, they seem to forbid even a reconstruction of necessary information. This would not only repeal the St. Regis case but would repeal pro tanto the discovery procedure of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Of course, once it becomes well known that there is no way to compel disclosure of such reports and information, voluntary disclosure will be greatly lessened.

These bills are symptomatic of a dangerous climate of secrecy among Government agencies. Among the worst offenders, I am told, are the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of the Budget. Census, I am reliably informed, in addition to refusing to give antitrust agencies individual statistics, has refused information even as to the names or the number of companies it has used to construct total industry figures. Even despite the consent of the reporting company, Census has refused to allow representatives of antitrust agencies to examine the company's reports in Washington.

My files contain many examples of this "don't inform" attitude on the part of Government agencies. I attach as an appendix to this statement a glaring example of the sort of run-around whereby the Census Bureau obstructs the enforcement of the antitrust laws and fastens Herculean labors on antitrust agencies and defendants alike.

In view of the recalcitrance of the Bureau of the Census to furnish information to other agencies, I think it only fair to point out that the Secretary of Commerce sought and obtained statutory authority to call upon other Government agencies to furnish information for Census work (13 U.S.C. 6).

To sum up, as a matter of commonsense I fail to see why information which has been obtained at considerable expense by one agency of the Government should not be made available to other agencies of the Government in the enforcement of our laws, except in cases of national security.

The right of the people to know what their Government knows is indispensable to that informed public opinion which alone can make our democracy work.

As chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary I have had my share of frustrating experiences, attempting unsuccessfully to obtain from uncooperative Government agencies information to which the people and their elected representatives in Congress were legitimately entitled.[3]

We pay a high price for ignorance. We can indulge a bureaucratic desire for secrecy only at the expense of a less enlightened electorate, less effective enforcement of our laws, and prodigal waste of the taxpayers' money. As a rule, I believe Macy's should tell Gimbel's, for Congress may justly complain where one agency lavishes the taxpayers' money for something readily available from another agency.

These bills promote an abuse of secrecy. Secrecy so abused in this instance is a threat to our free enterprise system—a system whose freedom depends upon the ability of our Government to enforce the antitrust laws.

Accordingly, I earnestly urge that these bills be rejected. Indeed, I suggest that this distinguished committee might well consider lifting the shroud of secrecy from original census returns centrally located in the files of the Census Bureau right here in Washington. Thereby we could at once effect a substantial saving of public funds and foster effective administration of the laws.

APPENDIX[4]

On January 19, 1962, the X company made formal request of the Bureau of the Census for duplicate certified photostatic copies of MC–20C reports filed with the Bureau in connection with the 1954 and 1958 Census of Manufacturers, and of the MC–20C Reports filed by companies which had been acquired by X since 1954.

By letter of January 31, 1962, the Bureau of the Census outlined certain procedures to be followed in determining whether the reports filed by subsequently acquired companies would be made available to the parent corporation. It further advised that the estimated cost for searching its records and preparing copies was $500. From the general tenor of this letter, there was no indication that the Bureau would refuse to comply with the company's request for copies. However, on February 2, the Bureau wrote a brief letter to X, stating that it was the policy of the Census Bureau not to make copies of original company returns available to survey respondents except when it was administratively determined that such action was necessary to the efficient conduct of the statistical program of the Bureau. It further stated that certain statements in the company's letter of January 19 were not necessarily consistent with such policy.

On February 19, the X company renewed its request, stating that it intended to use the form in its own interest and for its own purposes. The company also stated that without such schedules, the company would suffer irreparable harm since it was virtually impossible to reconstruct and reproduce the information from its own files.

On March 5, the Bureau replied that it had reexamined the situation but had concluded that the policy outlined in its letter of February 7 should stand. The letter continued by outlining the difficulties which would be involved in conducting a search of its records and concluded by expressing regret for the difficulties which confronted the company as the result of its decision.

In an effort to obtain information substantially similar to that contained in the reports, a Commission attorney and an accountant visited the offices of the X company in Chicago to assure themselves that copies of the reports were not available and to discuss other means of securing the desired information. Officials agreed to and did make available the X company's departmental annual reports for each processing plant for the years in question as a means of reconstructing the data contained on the missing forms. These departmental reports, however, do not reflect the detail that is asked for on the census forms so that it is impossible to reconstruct the data in the same detail as was originally filed by the numerous processing plant managers. Consequently, the acceptance of this material either by respondent or by the hearing examiner is questionable.

This refusal by the Bureau of the Census to provide X company with copies of its own reports has materially increased the burden of counsel in support of the complaint and may in the end jeopardize, by invalidation of the industry survey, the entire lawsuit. The additional cost burden to the Commission can only be measured as of certain dates but will increase materially as the case progresses. The increment to manpower cost over and above the normal cost incurred has already amounted to several thousand dollars and applying the same criteria to cases of the present and future, the additional manpower costs could well cost the Commission very substantial sums of money in excess of the normal expenditures for such actions.

---

[2] These difficulties include identifying the firms to be surveyed, obtaining Bureau of the Budget approval for proposed questionnaires, obtaining answers from reluctant respondents, and correlating and presenting the data in a manner admissible in court. To undertake such a survey in a preliminary investigation, with no process available to compel answers, would be virtually impossible.

[3] See, e.g., *U.S.* v. *Tobin*, 195 F. Supp. 588, rev'd, D.C. Cir., — F. 2d — (June 7, 1962). The Antitrust Subcommittee's report on "The Consent Decree Program of the Department of Justice" (1959) states (pp. XI, XIII):

"Early in the course of the committee's study it became apparent that wholehearted cooperation would not be forthcoming from the Department of Justice. * * *

"The uncooperative attitude displayed by the Department of Justice throughout this investigation hampered the committee in its work. * * *

"Faced with the intransigent attitude of the Department, the committee turned to, and obtained from, affected private parties the type of specific information that the committee needed. Defendants subject to the provisions of certain consent decrees were requested to supply documents which had been withheld by the Department of Justice. The committee recognizes that these requests were burdensome, but, in view of the Department's position, it had no alternative. It is clear that most of the necessary information was readily available in the files in the Department of Justice, one centralized location. The committee, however, was required to search out corporations all over the country and, at great trouble and expense to these companies, obtain documents in a piecemeal fashion. The committee regrets that the circumtances required it to impose these hardships in order to complete its investigation."

It is as wrong today for the Census Bureau to withhold business statistics from the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission as it was wrong, in 1959, for the Department of Justice to withhold relevant documents from the Antitrust Subcommittee.

[4] I have deleted the name of the company.

Who Keeps the Nickels?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this world of ours sometimes takes on a sort of Alice in Wonderland appearance and I find there are few better places to observe this fact than right here in this Congress.

Perhaps it is to be expected that with ideas from as many quarters as we have represented here there should develop from our synthesis of these some rather weird and misshapen public policies. But I venture that few policies have been hammered together in such odd, contradictory form as the space communication satellite bill which passed recently from this House.

Alice saw nothing like it in her dreamworld wonderland. Apparently the Senate has never seen anything like it. Little wonder that it is laboring with such difficulty trying to find some means to lay hold of this bill.

But it is well for our country and for the reputation of this Congress that the Senate is looking before it touches. Were the Senate to do otherwise and perhaps lend its approval to the bill, as did the House, the American people might well ask what kind of dreamworld we have here.

Because the Senate has held up a cautionary hand, we have time in which to consider the conflicts embedded in this bill. There are several.

The basic conflict is one of trying to pay obeisance to the symbols and forms of private enterprise despite the uniqueness of purpose the satellite system has in serving our whole national interest and policy. What I mean is that the bill itself fully recognizes that the system must serve our own national objectives and contribute to world peace and understanding but then it seeks to pour these worthy objectives into a vessel of commercialism. It wants to rig these objectives so profit can be gained from working toward these ends.

One does not have to look beyond the terms of the bill itself to see that its authors were not quite sure that the promotion of peace and profit are always compatible.

Consider for a moment how the bill details for many pages all the responsibilities a variety of Federal offices, from the President down, are required to assume to insure that the private corporation to be created performs its appointed tasks.

The President must aid in development and foster the execution of this commercial system. He must continuously review both the development and operation of the system; he must coordinate all activities of Government agencies in this field; he must exercise supervision of relationships of the corporation with other governments; he must insure arrangements for foreign participation; he must take all necessary steps to insure availability of the system; he must exercise authority to protect the electromagnetic spectrum.

Now, with the President given mandates to "aid," to "foster," to "review," to "coordinate," to "supervise," to "insure," to "take all necessary steps" and to "exercise authority" over the corporation, one is tempted to ask, "What is the corporation responsible for doing?" What verbs are left to describe its functions.

But, wait, despite the bill's charges to the President, it is still not satisfied that our national objectives and the cause of world peace and understanding can be turned over to the corporation. There are further guarantees to be erected.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration must get into the act and "advise," "coordinate," "furnish," "consult" on things ranging from research and launchings to a catchall "other services."

But the bill does not stop yet. There are more chores for the Government to do for this corporation. The Federal Communications Commission must "prescribe" the bookkeeping system, must "approve the technical operations," must "grant" a license for construction, must "insure" the technical compatibility of the system, and then must "insure" that this monopoly does not destroy effective competition or result in discrimination.

As though all of these were not enough, there is yet one other Federal department with a stake in this system: The Secretary of State can move in to require commercial communications to a particular foreign point.

After detailing all the functions of the President and others and adding three Presidentially appointed members of the board of directors, one would think the bill had done enough to get us an operational communication satellite system. And, actually it has. But it is at this point that the bill says "now let's do all this in the name of good ole private enterprise."

Private enterprise indeed. With all the governmental involvement required in this system, why do we delude ourselves by thinking there is any enterprise left for private persons. The bill erects a superstructure of governmental responsibilities and then calls in "private enterprise." For what purpose?

The only purpose I can see is to permit private persons to profit from something government must and should do. The function of the private corporation is to fill the role of the organ grinder's monkey which appeals to the crowd.

It is important, however, that the American people understand that in this case the monkey is going to keep the nickels he collects. And this is what I think some Members of the Senate are trying now to tell the people.

American Missionary Defends U.N. in Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, an American missionary with first-hand personal experience in the Congo has just given Oklahomans an illuminating report on United Nations peace-keeping activities in that strife-torn land.

In a speech before the Stillwater, Okla., Lions Club, the Presbyterian Church's William E. Pruitt gave the United Nations major credit for blocking Russian efforts to take over the Katanga and Congo governments.

"If U.N. action had not stopped the troop movements, the Congo would now be Communist," Mr. Pruitt asserted.

The full text of the report on the Pruitt report, as carried by the Stillwater Daily News Press on April 18, 1962, follows:

MISSIONARY DEFENDS U.N.

"We need the United Nations and we need America."

William E. Pruitt, Presbyterian missionary to the Congo, told members of the Stillwater Lions Club that this is the cry coming from political leaders and Congolese tribal leaders in Africa.

Pruitt spoke at the club's regular meeting Tuesday night.

"The Communists want the Congo because of its wealth, but they are more interested in its potential as a lever with which to apply pressure," the missionary said.

Pruitt said that the United Nations had been responsible for blocking Russian efforts to take over the Katangan and Congo governments.

He told of an incident in which Communist troop carrier planes were flying Lumumba's troops into the Kasai capitol.

"A United Nations order blocked runways in the capitol city and in Léopoldville," Pruitt said.

"I firmly believe that if U.N. action had not stopped the troop movements, the Congo would now be Communist," he added.

According to Pruitt, the United Nations is doing an excellent job in the Congo, and has been instrumental in stopping Communist aggression.

"That's why Russia wants the U.N. out of the Congo," he said. "If the U.N. were gone, chaos would result—and chaos is exactly what the Russians need to operate."

Pruitt also told of surplus American food, flown in by the United Nations and distributed by Protestant missionaries.

"The food we helped distribute saved an entire Congolese tribe from starvation," Pruitt said. He said that the surplus food carried markings in capital letters, "Donated by the people of America."

"The people see this and appreciate it," he commented.

He also told of Congolese requests for a Protestant university. He said that the Protestant missions are now operating schools through junior college level and that the government wants a university as soon as possible.

"I know that there is a great deal of anti-U.N. feeling in America," he said. "But every time I get a chance I emphasize that the U.N. is doing a wonderful job in the Congo. It is the only thing keeping the plans of the Communist leaders from becoming reality."

He said that the Congo people realize what the U.N. and America are doing for them. He said that they are beginning to realize that their future lies with the West. "We must continue to help," he emphasized.

Pruitt, who has served 11 years in the Congo, is the brother of Mrs. Robert Firebaugh. Following his appearance at the Lions Club, the missionary spoke to members of the First Presbyterian Church.

He told of several occasions on which he had miraculously escaped death. He told the Presbyterians that when these things happened, he had an awareness of people praying for him at that minute.

"I tell you these things to let you know your prayers are not in vain," he said. "You must continue to pray for and support your missionaries. You should support the United Nations."

Pruitt will return to the Congo in October to resume his missionary work.

Communism and Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a large question in American public life today is what we can and should do to bring about a fuller and more accurate understanding of the danger of imperial Russian communism to the existence of our free society. Various approaches have been advocated and used by a large number of organizations throughout the United States. There is disagreement on the methods most suitable to this end.

Cleveland, Ohio, is fortunate in having a group of farsighted and very knowledgeable individuals who have taken the initiative to organize the Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc. This council is performing a genuine educational service in the Cleveland community, approaching this vital issue in an objective and scholarly fashion. The members of the board of control of this council are outstanding citizens of Cleveland who give freely of their time to make sure that the truth and nothing but the truth is used in their community education program. Members of that board are: Very Rev. Msgr. Lawrence P. Cahill, president; Dr. Michael S. Pap, vice president; A. George Hauer, vice president; James B. Naylor, secretary; Robert T. Hexter, treasurer; Dr. George Baird; Judge John V. Corrigan; Frank Farrell; Hudson Hyatt; Mrs. Mazzilee Jackson; Chester Koch; James B. Mooney; Wesley G. Schmidt; Anthony J. Suster; Beatrice Vincent; Rita Vincent; and Rev. B. Bruce Whittemore.

A series of resolutions were adopted by the board of control of the Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., on February 7, 1962. Those resolutions serve as guideposts for the work of the council. I commend these resolutions to all organizations and groups throughout the United States who are interested in examining the facts on the threat of Russian communism and in doing something positive about it.

Under leave granted, I insert the resolutions in the RECORD:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF CONTROL OF THE CLEVELAND COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION ON COMMUNISM, INC., FEBRUARY 7, 1962

ALLIANCES

It is the judgment of the Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., that the United States is in no position to protect its own national interests without an alliance with the other nations which desire to remain free. Thus, alliances must be based on mutual trust, common interest, trade and cultural ties, and—most of all—on a determination to remain free and advance the cause of liberty on a worldwide scale.

It is imperative that the primary objective of our foreign policy should be the preservation of the traditional concept of the indivisibility of freedom. The Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., would welcome an alliance not only with the nations still living in freedom but also an alliance with the oppressed nations through their national and freedom-seeking representatives abroad who are dedicated to the reestablishment of individual liberties within a democratic society. Such an alliance would hasten the inevitable process of disintegration of the Russian Communist empire.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., welcomes and wholeheartedly supports U.S. Public Law 86-90 which was passed by the 86th Congress on July 17, 1959. This law initiated an ideological reorientation of American policy toward the Soviet Russian empire, recognizing unconditionally the right of nations under Communist domination to liberty and independence.

The Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., calls to the attention of the American public that the free world's best friends and allies are the oppressed nations of the Soviet colonial empire who know the difference between freedom and slavery. A positive stand taken by the United States on their behalf gives these nations a new hope of regaining their liberties and of joining the community of free nations. This public law reestablishes the confidence of all captive nations in the United States of America.

COLONIALISM

The Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., expresses a strong desire to seek an end to all forms of colonialism wherever they may exist today. It advocates the implementation of the principle of national self-determination not only for those Afro-Asian lands which, until recently, have been wards of the European nations, but also for those nations which continue to be dominated by Soviet Russia.

Toward this end, the Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., urges the formation of a special congressional committee which will investigate in depth Russian colonial practices. The findings of such a committee would realistically identify the propagandized and overblown image of Russia as an anticolonialist power, particularly in the underdeveloped areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. A special congressional committee on Russian colonial practices would, moreover, instill greater hope in and provide Russia's colonies with just and prudent leverage in their cold war against the colonial master.

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

The Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., endorses the final decision of the U.S. Supreme Court declaring the Communist Party, U.S.A., an agency of a foreign power. Ever since the meeting of the Second International in Moscow during 1920, the Communist Party in foreign countries was obliged to pledge allegiance to Moscow as a center of the Communist conspiracy. During and after World War II the Communist Party, U.S.A., repeatedly made known its intentions of destroying the accumulated values of the free societies. The documents presented at congressional hearings prove even to the skeptics and the well-meaning that in times of crises the Communists would use any means whatsoever to force us into submission.

For this reason the Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., takes an attitude of no compromise with those elements in our society who knowingly and willingly support an enemy who seeks to destroy our freedom.

EXTREME RIGHTWING AND LEFTWING MOVEMENTS

While the extreme leftwing organizations in the United States are utilized by the Communists to propagate Soviet lines and thus to undermine the very foundation of our free society by offering comfort and services to the enemy, the extreme rightwing groups are diverting our Nation from the real problem of communism.

The Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., is aware of the fact that in the fight against communism and Russian imperialism there will never be too many persons dedicated to freedom. The Council must insist, however, on time-tested American methods to meet the Communist challenge. Our enemy is in Moscow and not in Washington; our economic system is a byproduct of our liberty and not vice versa.

All Americans, bequeathed a heritage of freedom, have the responsibility to strengthen our free institutions by becoming better informed about the threat of communism in order to cope with it without panic, frustration, denunciation, and hopelessness.

THE FREEDOM ACADEMY BILL

The Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., voices its approval and energetically supports the measure pending in the Congress to establish the Freedom Academy. The Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, Senator from Connecticut, arguing for the Academy, stated in the U.S. Senate on August 26, 1960:

"We have been losing the cold war partly because we have failed to understand its total character, partly because we have been amateurs fighting against professionals. The Soviets have been winning the cold war because they have from the beginning accepted it as a total war, to be waged with all their resources and on every plane and, second, because they have through their specialized training institutions developed scores of thousands of practitioners in the art of political warfare" (quoted from Vital Speeches, vol. XXVII, No. 4, Dec. 1, 1960, p. 115).

The Freedom Academy would develop systematic knowledge about all aspects of the Communist conspiracy, develop a science of counteraction against Communist subversion and train Americans and nationals of other countries in the art of total warfare.

NUCLEAR TESTING

It is the position of the Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., that to permit this Nation to lose its nuclear weapon equality would be an immoral art. It would be a violation of the trust charged to the citizens of the United States by the men who have died to gain and preserve freedom. It would be a betrayal of all people who seek their freedom from Communist tyranny or hold that they have the right of self-determination.

If it is necessary for the United States to resume testing of nuclear devices in order to maintain national security and meet the Communist threat, then such testing must be done.

TEACHING ABOUT COMMUNISM IN OUR SCHOOLS

The Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., strongly suggests that the best way to meet the Communist challenge is through education. Any effort on the part of school administrators and teachers to offer our youngsters a better knowledge and understanding of the Communist conspiracy will be endorsed by the Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc.

It is for this reason that the Board is gratified to learn of the establishment of a special Institute for Soviet and East European Studies at John Carroll University, designed to retrain teachers in the field of communism and the Russian empire. The Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., also greets the efforts of Kent State University to offer a compresenhive program in this area.

Our school superintendents are urged to adjust our educational system to the requirements of the times and to include in the curriculum at the earliest practical school level studies on communism versus freedom. Our young citizens must be informed by our schools on this vital problem in order to fulfill their duties as responsible citizens in a free society.

UNITED NATIONS

While it is true that the United Nations has not been in a position to settle all disputes peacefully, to prevent the unjustified use of force and to promote the welfare and freedom of all peoples it has become, in a very real sense, the nerve center of the world. Over 100 governments make use of its facilities. The Soviet Government has used the forum of the United Nations for its own obstruction and propaganda purposes.

With the elimination of colonialism—Western style—the Cleveland Council for Information on Communism, Inc., firmly believes the United Nations capable of turning its attention to colonialism—Soviet Russian style. We support President Kennedy's declaration in the United Nations to this effect. The declaration of the American representative to the United Nations on Soviet colonial practices (on November 25, 1961) deserves our undivided attention and endorsement.

The United Nations may yet play a positive role or it will fail—not because of a lack of American support but because of a Soviet decision not to heed world opinion on their own colonial practices.

Summer Intern Seminar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has recently established a summer internship program in Government agencies. This program has brought several thousand students to Washington for the summer and has given them a valuable practical experience in the workings of the Federal Government.

As part of the program, the White House has set up a seminar series so that the students may hear leaders of all the branches of Government. Last month the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MANSFIELD, spoke at one of these seminars and gave a remarkable insight into the nature of Congress. Mr. MANSFIELD's address follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD BEFORE THE SUMMER SEMINAR OF COLLEGE STUDENTS, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 10, 1962

A textbook will reveal how our system of government operates in theory. Only a direct contact such as you are now undergoing can provide the beginnings of an insight into its operation in practice. I say, the beginnings of an insight on the basis of personal experience. Twenty years in the legislative branch, roughly divided between House and Senate have given me, I believe, some understanding of that branch as well as the executive branch and the Court. Yet hardly a day passes even now without additional awareness—some new appreciation of the vitality of the Constitution or some new apprehension at the fearful complexity of the system which has developed under it.

I am delighted, therefore, that the President has seen fit to introduce a formal summer internship in government for students. It is typical, may I say, of his dedication to the cultivation of excellence in the public service. You may or may not choose to pursue a career in government in the future. Whether you do or not, I have no doubt that the experiences which you and future groups obtain by firsthand practice will act as a leaven throughout the Nation for improvement in the public service. For that reason, if for no other, I am delighted to try to contribute to your understanding of the legislative branch, particularly its Senate wing.

The Senate has been called many things—some flattering, some not so flattering. But whatever it has been called, in practice, it is a coequal half of the legislative branch of the Government. It is neither an upper body, nor a lower body. It is, with the House, a coequal body. I stress that point because popular interpretations of the Constitution tend to emphasize the differences between the two wings of the Capitol. Thus, the House is sometimes interpreted as being the more popularly responsive body and the Senate as the upper and the more deliberative and dispassionate body. History indicates, I believe, that the Senate is at least as responsive as the House. And I assure you that the Senate can be at least as passionate as the House. If the Senate is senior to the House in any significant way, it is in the average age of membership; we are undoubtedly a little more decrepit. If it is junior in any significant way, it is in total membership; there are five in Mr. McCORMACK's organization for each one in ours.

So I repeat, the two wings of the Congress are coequal, except in certain unique functions which are stipulated in the Constitution. The reason is clear. The basic function of the Congress is to consider and to pass the legislation which becomes the basic law of the land. Congress has exercised powers which are quasi-judicial and powers which are quasi-executive, just as the other branches have exercised quasi-legislative functions. But, basically, Congress exists to legislate and the Congress, as we know it, has no ultimate validity except in the light of that basic function.

Neither the House alone nor the Senate alone can perform that basic function. The Congress cannot fly on one wing. Only both the Senate and the House, acting together, can perform the basic constitutional function of the Congress.

We hear much of the importance of divided power in our system of government. But even though we hear much less of it, cooperation and restraint among the elements is of at least equal importance. This importance is starkly revealed when the interplay between the House and Senate breaks down even temporarily as it has done recently between the two Appropriations Committees.

The importance of cooperation and restraint is not confined to relations between the Senate and the House. It applies equally in the relationships between the executive branch and the Congress and, even to the relationship of each with the Court. And it applies, too, even within each body. I am sure that many of you have already had some inkling of its importance as among the agencies and offices of the executive branch. Within the Senate, in the inner operations of the Senate, it is of the greatest importance. You may be surprised to learn, for example, that by far the greater part of the Senate's day-to-day business is conducted by unanimous consent or at least without objection of any Member. This is the case despite the fact that the Senate is composed of some of the most highly individualistic men and women in the Nation—100 Senators of varied personal outlooks and predilection, representing many shades of political opinion and 50 States of varied interests and concerns. This body of great diversity moves as one far more often than not.

The rules of the Senate are such, moreover, that there exists the greatest latitude for individual assertion and maximum safeguards for the rights of each individual Member to make his assertion. With rules so designed, there is a possibility of abuse by any Member or group of Members. Yet, this abuse is so rare an occurrence that it is newsworthy. It is rare because Members of the Senate, however much they may disagree on specific issues, recognize that the operations of the body—indeed, the survival of the body as a vital element in our constitutional system—depends, in the last analysis, on a basic cooperation and restraint within the body. How else would the Senate have been able to handle 46,581 confirmations of Presidential appointments, 7 treaties and 570 legislative bills which, at the last count, was the total of completed work since this session of the 87th Congress convened in January?

In terms of the problems of leadership in the Senate, this same element of cooperation and restraint is fundamental. There is, as you know, a majority leader and a minority leader, as well as assistants to both who are known as the whips and the secretaries for each party organization in the Senate. But do not let the word "leadership" deceive you. The Senate is not an army with the leader giving orders and the rest of the troops carrying them out. It is not the executive branch whose basic source of power is the President and whose chief personnel serve at his pleasure. Each Senator draws his constitutional powers directly from the people of his State and is responsible only to those people and to his conscience.

Each Senator, in effect, is a party member; but he is also an independent leader in his own right and is coequal in rights with every other Senator including the majority leader. Each Senator has one vote and in the last analysis it is that vote which counts—not a title.

As I have already pointed out, the rules of the Senate are designed to provide maximum protection for the equal rights of all Senators. Yet if all Senators asserted those rights to the maximum at all times, the body as a whole could not function. Again, therefore, the factor of cooperation and restraint is fundamental to carrying out the responsibilities of leadership in the Senate.

In general, Members recognize this fact and defer to the leadership most of the time on procedural and routine matters.

In the present situation, with the executive branch and the legislative branch controlled by the same party, I view the principal function of leadership in the Senate as interpreting the President's program to my colleagues, interpreting to the President the attitudes of the Senate with respect to his program and obtaining action—a vote, a decision—on the legislative elements of his program.

There is no guarantee that any particular part of the President's program will be approved by the Senate. There is no magic wand in the hands of the leader. There is no party discipline to insure that the 64 Democratic Members will invariably vote the President's wishes. Indeed, many measures depend for passage on the vote of Republican Members. I am not dismayed by this lack of rigidity in the party structure. Obviously any President, any majority leader would prefer the support rather than the opposition of his own party members. But we must recognize the reality that we are a vast land of contrasting interests and concerns and party labels have different meanings in different regions. In this setting, legislative action, it seems to me, is best sought by the interplay of these concerns and interests by those who know and represent them most intimately regardless of party labels.

Nevertheless, there is a minimum party role in the Senate which must be sustained or the labels lose all meaning. The majority party role in present circumstances is to bring about at least that measure of cooperation and restraint on the part of individual Members which permits decision one way or the other on legislative elements of the President's program in the Senate and the day-to-day disposal of routine business. By the same token, the basic minority party role is to see to it, that this legislation, along with alternatives, is considered fully but without obstructing the taking of timely decisions. By and large, there has been that cooperation and restraint on the part of the individual Members in both parties in the present Senate. If you have been led to believe otherwise by press reports, I would note again that that which divides tends to receive the popular stress over that which unites. I have already alluded, for example, to the sheer numbers of Presidential appointments confirmed, the treaties and the bills on which the Senate has acted during the present session. Add to these huge numbers, the totals from the previous session which were 48,961 Presidential appointments, 10 treaties and 1,133 legislative bills. You will gain from these figures some sense of the sheer volume of activity of the Senate, a volume which could not begin to be sustained without the highest degree of cooperation and restraint on the part of the individual Members.

Or look at the record in the light, alone, of the highly significant proposals which the President has advanced since assuming office. During the present Congress—both sessions—perhaps in excess of 275 proposals of this kind have been sent to the Congress by the President. Any one of these represents a major undertaking which properly calls for the most careful and extensive consideration by the Congress. Yet, the Senate has actually passed about 60 of these proposals this session, and during the last session, enacted 124 of them into law. You hear much of the defeat in the Senate of a Presidential proposal to establish an Urban Affairs Department or the rejection of a farm bill in the House. But you hear little of the passage of a manpower retraining bill or of an aid to higher education bill or an extension of unemployment compensation bill or dozens of other highly significant measures.

Whether or not legislation passes in the Senate in response to the President's program is a question which goes, not to the operation of the Senate or the House as such. Rather it goes to the social, economic, and political forces continuously at work throughout the Nation and the manner in which these forces are reflected in the representation in the Senate at any given time. In these forces there is much that conflicts, much that divides. It is the essence of the legislative function to deal with these forces in terms of the enactment of laws for the common good. And in the exercise of this function, I do want to impress upon you the importance of elements of cooperation and restraint.

It is as important to the internal operations of the Senate and the Congress as it is to the inter-relations of the separate branches in the effective operation of the Federal Government. It is this element which makes possible agreement to act even where there is strong disagreement among strong men and women as to the proper course of action. It is this element which permits orderly and peaceful change in the structure of our society to meet the ever-changing of our people. It is this element which, though unexpressed in a constitutional cause, nevertheless, is a major source of the validity and vitality of our constitutional system.

A Mission of Peace: A Nigerian Student Evaluates the Peace Corps, by John Ojo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this summer I have had the good fortune to have as a summer intern in my office Mr. John Ojo, a student from Nigeria. Mr. Ojo, who is here under the African scholarship program of American universities, has been most helpful to me in a number of ways. Most importantly, he has given me a penetrating evaluation of the Peace Corps from the point of view of a citizen of one of the nations to which the corps is sending its teams.

I include his evaluation and should like to call particular attention to his statements of support for a reverse Peace Corps—a reciprocal exchange program—which would bring more young people to our shores. He points out that this was originally included as part of the recommendations of the Colorado University study in 1961:

A MISSION OF PEACE: A NIGERIAN STUDENT EVALUATES THE PEACE CORPS

A few years ago, Dr. Palyi in his "Dollar Dilemma" declared that "the U.S. financial sacrifices did not result in success either in making friends or influencing people." Today, Dr. Palyi and those who shared his view cannot but rejoice at the huge success of the new form of foreign aid program to the underdeveloped countries—the Peace Corps.

The Corps, in its 1 year of operation, has worked at the grassroots level with the average men of the countries who need their help, rather than with the governments of those countries. This has two major advantages. First, the humanitarian ideals of the American people to help the poor citizens of the globe are gradually being realized. Second, the majority of the citizens who live on farms and in villages and have known nothing about America's desire to liberate mankind from bondage have now begun to appreciate these ideals. In fact, those who, hitherto, did not know the distinction between the French, the British, the Germans, the Americans or the Russians have begun to realize the distinction and are no longer ready to blame America for every bad thing that happens.

The Peace Corps, in addition to helping other countries to a better life, also corrects the mass ignorance of these people about Americans. An intelligent but handicapped farmer in western Nigeria was taught the use of fertilizers on his farm by a Peace Corps boy who teaches in the town. After seeing the improvement of his crops, the farmer came to the boy and asked, "I thought they said the Americans will destroy us soon? Why do you help us to be more prosperous before you bomb us?" As a missionary of peace the Peace Corps boy explained that the world situation was a result of lack of knowledge about nations and their motivations and culture; one of the aims of the Peace Corps is to be a forum for cultural exchange that by an understanding and mutual respect for the ideals and institutions of other nations peace may be brought into the world.

There is an additional advantage. Because the Peace Corps works at the grassroots level, and because the Volunteers live under the same conditions as their foreign hosts, Americans, for the first time, are coming into direct contact with the masses and, of course, are doing this as humble men in no way the same as the white man of yore who alienated himself from the society and culture of the nonwhite and who "emasculated the will of the latter to live as a human being and enjoy his fair share of the bounties of the good earth." There is a reciprocal response from the people who now are beginning to like the Americans, teaching them and learning from them many valuable things. This is the basis of a constructive friendship. Congressman Henry Reuss once quoted the farewell speech of the Akugbene Community of Nigeria to the 1960 Operation Crossroads participants, viz:

> "We deeply appreciate your association with us in which our foreshore wall embankment has been completed. * * * During your stay you so identified yourself with us that we regard you as members of our Akugbene Community. You have, since your stay, endured to put up with the uncomfortable lodgings we provided you. You submitted yourselves to care for the health of our children. You took the trouble to conduct outdoor classes with our children. * * * How lonesome shall we feel your absence from our town, Akugbene, when we shall no more cast our eyes upon American dances and ways of life."

I dare quote this same message in appreciation of the works of the more elaborate Peace Corps, a gigantic crossroad. Nor is the realization of this worth of the American peculiar to the Akugbene community. Tom Scanlon, a Peace Corps volunteer in Chile, writing for the Peace Corps congressional presentation fiscal year 1963, said that Chileans were usually flattered that U.S. citizens had come to work with them. This observation is true in Tanganyika, Ghana, St. Lucia, and other African and Asian countries where the Peace Corps operates currently. The people of these countries have come to appreciate:

(a) That the United States is helping them socially, technically, educationally, and economically.

(b) That the United States identifies herself with all nations having common goals for the purpose of achieving world peace.

(c) That the United States has something to offer to the rest of the world aside from their economic and technical assistance—the dignity of labor and the dignity of man.

It is not surprising therefore that all these countries have asked for more volunteers. For example, by August 31, 1962, West Indies wants the number of volunteers raised from 15 to 128; Philippines from 182 to 999; Ghana from 51 to 236; Malaya from 36 to 232, and Sierra Leone 37 to 172.

By August 31, 1962, the number overseas will be 4,879 instead of 698 initially sent out and it is expected that 230 more will join before the end of the year. This unceasing demand for more points out the fact that the Peace Corps is a huge success. It also removes the scepticism of many Americans who feared that the foreign governments will oppose the idea of a Peace Corps. People do not ask for more of what they oppose or hate. So much is the demand that the Peace Corps officials report that the total 5,100 volunteers as of now "does not meet the demand for Peace Corps volunteers on the part of other countries. Many of these countries have requested far more volunteers than the Peace Corps is able to provide at the present time."

But the demand is itself not the sole yardstick of success. A more important criterion is how far the chief aims of the Corps have been achieved viz:

1. Accelerate economic and social development of the less developed areas and transmit technical skills and organizational ability.
2. Demonstrate the dignity of labor.
3. Foster mutual understanding and increase United States understanding of world affairs and prepare for future oversea service.
4. Provide an opportunity for personal fulfillment.

The agricultural projects in India, Colombia and Dominician Republic; health projects in Bolivia and Honduras; the Community development schemes in Malaya and Chile; and the educational expansion and social services in many parts of Africa coupled with the participation of the indigenous people of those countries in the type of job they will otherwise not engage in, demonstrate the achievement of the first two objectives. The vast number of volunteers together with their numerous letters expressing their satisfaction at being instrumental in the improvement of the lot of the less fortunate people, proves that the third and fourth objectives are being achieved. A volunteer in Chile writes: "I have learned enough to fill books and deepened my understanding of things I thought I knew before." From Nigeria: There is joy in giving help where help is desperately needed.

President Alberto Lleras Camargo of Colombia has labeled the Peace Corps as "* * * the finest way in which the United States could prove to the humble people of this and other lands that the primary purpose of its international aid program is to build a better life in all of the free world's villages and neighborhoods."

Despite these successes, the Peace Corps cannot and should not be complacent. The Corps will be much more effective if its activities are not limited to a particular social group in any country; all classes or social groups in the countries requesting volunteers should participate in this person to person aid program. The effects of the Peace Corps should not be transient, but permanent. To this end the intellectuals of most emerging nations need to be oriented toward the Corps.

Beyond the grassroots level, technical aids are desperately needed for more advanced economic needs. If possible, a senior specialist Corps, such as that proposed by J. Peter Grace should be started to run simultaneously with the grassroots level Corps. This branch need not be as elaborate as the junior corps, but it is desired even at the expense of cutting down the number of volunteers for the junior corps. It is one of the best means not only of accelerating economic and technical progress of these countries but also of reeducating the leaders of such countries on the first essentials in the building of a nation.

Another factor which the Peace Corps should note is the mass ignorance on the part of the vast majority of the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the good intentions of the American people. This ignorance has jeopardized the Afro-American relationship in the past and, no doubt, will do so in the future. The antagonism stems from the intellectual youth who are neither the "have's" nor the "have not's." They are usually the university students. Today they are regarded as forces to reckon with for they are capable, if their studies leave them enough time, of a revolution. A notable politician once described them as "bearded men who want to seize power." These are the people the Peace Corps cannot neglect, particularly in Africa.

To the United States, because she is ignorant of the beliefs and aspirations of these students, these students are "Communists." To the students, because of their ignorance of the good will and friendliness of the United States, the latter is "an imperialist in disguise." This state of affairs is rather unfortunate because the U.S. people and such students invariably have the same ideals. For example these students have always been the watchdog of parliamentary democracy in the sense it is known throughout the world, championing the cause of the common man and making sure that they do not fall a prey to oligarchy or anarchy and that the people have their fair share of the bounties of their fatherland.

In the past these students have revolted for their ideals, but foreigners branded them Communists whereas the authorities were in fact the oppressors hidden under the cloak of democracy. The disdain for the appellation, "Communists," coupled with the fact that they hardly understood the world situation made this new elite seem anti-American. Even now they hardly understand why Americans are so much worried about the Soviet Union; they cannot see the humanitarian blood which runs in the American veins. They interpret every thought, every word, every action of the Americans in terms of "insipid propaganda."

An African student who was nearly stranded in the U.S. was rescued from his misery by an American family. The student wrote to his supposedly well-informed parents asking them to write a letter of thanks to the generous family. Amazingly, his parents saw in this hospitality one more example of American propaganda. With this mass ignorance, with this shocking interpretation of genuine attempts to foster friendship in the world, the Peace Corps is faced with some problems which are aggravated by the financial support it receives from the American government.

The post card incident in Nigeria was an outward expression of the accumulated hatred for the U.S. Government. The hatred for the Americans was not new on the University campus where the card was picked up. Members of that university have led demonstrations, sometimes peaceful, sometimes violent, against the U.S. Embassy in Nigeria for incidents with which the United States might or might not have had any connection. The demonstration at the death of nationalist Patrice Lumumba of Congo (Leopoldville) is a case in point. So these students are the people in the public eyes and their views, soon or late, will determine the views of the masses. Moreover the future depends on these young men who are bound to hold the reins of government. These students are found every where in the underdeveloped countries and it is only with their cooperation that peace and friendship can be built. It is also through these men that the United States can learn the motives and aspirations of modern underdeveloped countries which she desperately needs if she will avoid international blunders such as she has made in the past in many parts of the world, including Africa. It is for this reason that the Colorado University's recommendation for a reciprocal exchange program ought to be taken seriously. It is a sine qua non to mutual understanding and friendship between the United States and the uninformed world.

Such an exchange will bring as many as 1,000 students to the United States and about the same number from the United States to the underdeveloped countries. The students may study for only 1 year. The writer, himself a desperate anti-American for no reason save limited understanding, discovered his folly after 10 months of study in the United States and he regrets his participation in anti-American demonstrations in his home country. More such students need to live among Americans or Americans among them.

The most probable causes of rejecting this idea will be (a) Cost of tuition, room and board, and transportation; (b) too few universities in the underdeveloped areas. Other causes are not as important as these. Whatever these causes are, they constitute no insoluble problems. At the moment, the Agency for International Development, in cooperation with almost 1,000 American universities, awards a 4-year scholarship to about 300 African students annually. The program, called African Scholarship Program of American Universities, is starting its third year of operation. By simple mathematics, it will cost the same amount to bring to United States 1,200 students for 1 year as will 300 for 4 years. In 1 year the youth will be able to imbibe those nonacademic virtues which the underdeveloped countries need more desperately than anything else. Technical personnel is secondary in their needs; an understanding of what they are and a radical modification of their present sense of values are primary prerequisites in the race to raise their own standard of living. The realization of the need for these prerequisites usually comes by living among the more advanced people. Therefore the more the people who participate in this exchange program the better for Afro-American relationship.

However, the program this time should include India, Pakistan, Colombia, Philippines, and St. Lucia. It should be emphasized that 300 undergraduate students constitute a microsmall percentage of the need

of the underdeveloped countries whereas 300 graduate students mean a great deal. Perhaps it will be more profitable to replace the present AID 4-year scholarships with graduate scholarships while the Peace Corps takes care of the undergraduate education through the 1-year exchange program.

If the exchange program becomes a reality, it may be wise to have on the campuses of the participating universities Peace Corps clubs, members of which will be special friends to the foreigners who will not only insulate them from bitter experiences but also orientate them on the path to lasting friendship.

The Peace Corps is a unique undertaking. All nations of the world should rally round in its support for world peace and solidarity, for the eradication of ignorance, famine, disease and untimely death. It is hoped that all other nations will emulate the good example of the United States to maintain a Peace Corps, a mission of peace.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*-------
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*-------
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*-----
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*--------
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*-
Bible, Alan, *Nev*-----------
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*-------
Bottum, Joe H., *S. Dak*----
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*------
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*-
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*-----The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*-----
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*--
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*---The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*------Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*------
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*------
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*----2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*-----
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*-------
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*-
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*--------
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*-------
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*----
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*-------
Eastland, James O., *Miss*---5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*------
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*-----
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*----5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*------
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*-----
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*--------
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*--
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*------
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*---------
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*---------
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hickey, J. J., *Wyo*---------4736 W St.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*-----------
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*--Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*---
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*--
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*-------
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*------
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*----
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y*--1233 31st St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*-----4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*------
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*--
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*----
Long, Edward V., *Mo*-------
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*-----
Long, Russell B., *La*-------
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*-7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*----
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*-------
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*------
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*-----
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*--------
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*-------5417 Kirkwood Dr. Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*-------4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*---
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*------
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*-----122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, Maurice J., Jr., *N.H.*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*-
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*------
Pearson, James B., *Kans*---
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*--------3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*-----
Proxmire, William, *Wis*----
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*-4608 Reservoir Rd.
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*----
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*----
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*-2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*-----------
Smathers, George A., *Fla*---
Smith, Benjamin A., *Mass*--
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala*------4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*--------
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*----
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*--
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*----
Tower, John G., *Tex*-------
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*------2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*-----
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*---
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*--Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*--

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Kerr (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, and Capehart.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and ———.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Bush, Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Javits, and Tower.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Butler, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Keating, and Prouty.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, Smith of Massachusetts, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Burdick, Metcalf, Hickey, Kuchel, Allott, Miller, Pearson, Bottum, and ———.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Murphy.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Metcalf, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, Murphy, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan, Cannon, Hickey, Pell, Curtis, Dirksen, and Bottum.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd., NW.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Herbert Hoover: Great of Mind, Heart, and Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial by Wilbur D. Matson, famous editor of the Morgan County Herald, McConnelsville, Ohio, entitled "Herbert Hoover: Great of Mind, Heart, and Character," in which he pays tribute to Herbert Hoover, who, on the 10th of August, will celebrate his 88th birthday.

The editorial follows:

[From the Morgan County Herald, McConnelsville, Ohio]

HERBERT HOOVER: GREAT OF MIND, HEART, AND CHARACTER

(By Wilbur D. Matson)

The 10th of August will mark the birthday anniversary of one of America's alltime great and most distinguished sons. On that date Herbert Hoover will reach his 88th milestone. The event will be especially marked by the dedication of his West Branch, Iowa, birthplace, as a library and museum. A program befitting the occasion will be observed.

The story of the life of this great American, is, or should be, an inspiration to every youth in the land. A poor boy, he battled his way upward and climbed the heights—struggling to earn his way through college—then as a mining engineer who directed important projects about the round globe. At 40, he had achieved affluence. Thereafter, he gave his great abilities to his fellow countrymen. As a humanitarian, through his compassion and high organizing abilities the lives of millions of helpless children and the innocent victims of World War I were saved. He never charged for, but even contributed to his public services; said he owed them to his country which had done so much for him.

No American statesman in our time has figured in so many mighty world events or played a role of higher distinction to himself and honor to his country. An intimate friend of Woodrow Wilson, he was entrusted with assignments of grave import in the conduct of World War I and at the Treaty of Versailles. His conspicuous abilities as an administrator of public affairs were again evidenced as Secretary of Commerce. As President, he was cruelly wronged by a political conspiracy which sought to fasten upon him responsibility for the great financial collapse of the thirties—a tragedy which had traveled about the world before it reached America's shores and for which he was no more accountable than are you or I.

Readers of this column are, no doubt, aware of the fact that we have long held an abiding love and admiration for Herbert Hoover. To the writer's mind, he is America's greatest and noblest figure of our time. Through chance we became acquainted with him while in attendance at Republican National Conventions where he was the keynoter and easily the principal figure. As is said of most truly great men, he is modest and unassuming, democratic and unaffected, likes people and is easy to meet. With a real sense for the true values of life, gleaned through many years of world experience and in meeting countless thousands of people about the globe, he is keenly cognizant of Bobbie Burns' great truth—

"The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
A Man's the gowd for a'that."

In the July 28 issue of the Saturday Evening Post is a splendid article on Mr. Hoover, written by Ben Hibbs, former editor of that publication. It is well worth the reading. Happy birthday, Herbert Hoover. In the galaxy of all American statesmen and patriots, past and present, your name will rank among the highest on the list. Freemen and lovers of liberty throughout the world and all who appreciate high ideals and the finest and best in humanity, owe you an undying debt of gratitude.

Civil Defense in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these war-threatened times, a sound civil defense program play a vital role in our national defense.

National in scope, a program as broad and costly as civil defense cannot be administered on an erratic, "slowdown, speedup" schedule.

If this is to happen, it will: retard progress; discourage the leadership and support necessary at the State and community levels; and create greater financial burdens—and perhaps losses.

Today, I received a letter from William K. Chipman, director of the Bureau of Civil Defense of Wisconsin.

Director Chipman outlines, for example, the way in which civil defense projects in Wisconsin would be adversely affected by recent cuts in appropriations, made by the House of Representatives.

As of now, hearings, I believe, are scheduled in the Senate committee for August 6.

Believing the views of Director Chipman deserve the attention not only of the Senate, but particularly of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to have this communication, together with a letter from Mr. Chipman to Hon. Steuart L. Pittman, Assistant Secretary of Defense, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 1, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing to ask your aid in a matter of critical importance to Watertown and to Brown County, relating to the Office of Civil Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1963. As set forth in the enclosed letter to Assistant Secretary of Defense Pittman, in fiscal year 1962 Watertown commenced a project to construct in the new city hall a civil defense emergency seat of government (an "emergency operating center" or EOC).

The Office of Civil Defense approved a project application providing for $10,000 of Federal fiscal year 1962 funds for the design of the EOC, to be matched by $10,000 of local funds. The actual construction, however, would involve a further sum of some $150,000 of OCD matching funds on a fiscal year 1963 project application.

As you undoubtedly know, the House deleted $8 million requested by OCD for fiscal year 1963 EOC projects. If at least some of these funds are not restored by Senate action, Watertown will have lost $15,000 to $20,000, plus approximately a month of time, by proceeding with the EOC project in reliance on fiscal year 1963 funds being available for actual construction. (Watertown would have to foot half the bill for the wasted detailed design of the EOC plus the added cost of completely redesigning the city hall structure without the EOC.)

Brown County is also in an extended position with regard to an EOC to be built under the new county jail in Green Bay. A project application is in the final approval stage at the Pentagon for $12,000 for EOC design, with the requested Federal share being $6,000. (This initial stage was to have been funded out of fiscal year 1962 funds, but OCD requested they be changed to fiscal year 1963.)

The best solution would of course be a Senate restoration of at least some of the EOC moneys for fiscal year 1963. It would appear that in fairness to the cities in Wisconsin and elsewhere which have EOC projects in process, and thus stand to lose by their cancellation, a sum sufficient to complete these pending projects should be made available by Senate and conference committee action.

I understand that the Senate Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations will be hearing the OCD fiscal year 1963 request on Monday, August 6. I should therefore deeply appreciate your doing everything possible to secure favorable consideration of the OCD request for EOC funds for fiscal year 1963.

As little as $1 million might serve to complete the EOC projects pending in the country, though I, of course, do not have the exact figures on pending projects. A much smaller sum, probably on the order of $250,000, would suffice to complete the in-process Watertown and Brown County projects.

In view of the crucial importance of this EOC funding matter to Watertown and to Brown County, I know that Mayor Robert White, of Watertown, and Mr. Arthur Norgaard, of Green Bay, Brown County CD director (Brown County Courthouse), would appreciate hearing from you as to Senate appropriation action.

In more general terms, the Nation must look to the Senate for restoration of other House cuts in the OCD requests for 1963. Secretary McNamara has testified that DOD regards a balanced, effective civil defense program as essential in the 1960's. With increasing numbers of thermonuclear weapons in existence, there is always the possibility of the great powers slipping over the brink into war, perhaps largely unintended, as in 1914. It would be grossly imprudent not to have taken the modest steps which could save scores of millions in the unhappy event of a war so occurring.

With thanks for your help in these matters, I am,

Sincerely yours,
William K. Chipman,
Director.

July 31, 1962.

Re Emergency Operating Center, Watertown, Wis. Project WIS 400–6–62.

Hon. Steuart L. Pittman,
Assistant Secretary of Defense, Civil Defense, Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

Dear Secretary Pittman: This letter will be further to our telephone conversation today, relating to the emergency operating center (EOC) now in process at Watertown, Wis. The situation is that a "phase I" project application (WIS 400–6–62) was approved by OCD on June 27, 1962, in the total sum of $20,000, the Federal share being $10,000. This initial project covers architect-engineer fees for feasibility studies and for detailed architectural drawings. At this time the detailed drawings are within a few weeks of completion.

The problem posed at this time, as we know, is that the House has stricken the $8 million requested for EOC's in fiscal 1963. You told me that the Senate will hear the OCD appropriation bill on Monday, August 6, and that you are hopeful that all or part of the moneys requested for EOC's will be restored by Senate action, plus conference committee resolution of House-Senate differences.

Watertown's problem is that the EOC design will be half funded by fiscal year 1962 Federal matching funds of about $10,000. The actual construction, however, would have to be funded by a fiscal year 1963 project in the total sum of some $300,000, with the Federal share being about $150,000.

If fiscal year 1963 moneys were not made available by Senate restoration of at least some EOC moneys, Watertown would be in a very difficult position. It would be necessary to pay for, and to wait for, a complete redesign of the projected city hall, to eliminate the EOC features. This would involve the loss of perhaps $15,000 to $20,000 to Watertown plus the loss of perhaps a month of time. (Time, especially, is critical, since the city council have been pressing all summer for an early start on construction.)

Watertown, in short, would have proceeded with the fiscal year 1962 design stages in good faith reliance on fiscal year 1963 moneys being available for construction. In view of Watertown's position, I should like to ask that every effort be made to secure, at a minimum, fiscal year 1963 moneys to complete the in-process Watertown EOC, as well as any others which may be in a similar split between fiscal years 1962 and 1963 funding. (I imagine that only a few projected EOC's in the country fall into this category.)

We both hope and expect that at least these moneys may be secured, though the final answer will of course not be known until the Senate has acted and a conference committee has adjusted House and Senate differences. In the event, however, that no EOC moneys whatever are approved, are there any fiscal year 1963 OCD moneys which might be used to fund the balance of the Watertown EOC project, roughtly $150,000?

I plan to meet with the mayor of Watertown, Mr. Robert White, on Monday, August 6, on his return to his office. The mayor, I understand, has scheduled a council meeting for that evening. I should therefore deeply appreciate your having one of your staff call me on Friday, August 3, with regard to the foregoing question as to whether the Watertown project might be salvaged even in the event no EOC moneys are approved for 1963.

I am sorry to be obliged to raise this matter at this extremely busy time, but as you will appreciate, the matter is of the most critical importance to Watertown, and of course to the whole civil defense program in Wisconsin. I might add that the cooperation of the region 4 staff has been magnificent throughout this whole EOC project; region engineers have made a number of trips to Wisconsin to give on-the-spot assistance.

We shall deeply appreciate whatever you can do to help in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
William K. Chipman,
Director.

Hon. W. J. Bryan Dorn's Outstanding Record of Service to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn has served in Congress for 16 years and has served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee for 10 years.

He has been a great friend of the veterans' hospital and medical program and has fought incessantly for better treatment for service-connected disabled veterans. It was Congressman Dorn's subcommittee that developed and reported the bill, now pending in the Senate, which would provide a cost-of-living increase in compensation for service-connected disabled veterans. Congressman Dorn's subcommittee has reported a bill which would increase payments to dependent parents, who lost a son in the war. His subcommittee has also passed out bills aimed at aiding paralyzed and blind veterans. Through his many years of outstanding service, Congressman Dorn has unfailingly supported the cause of the service-connected disabled.

The Greenville, S.C., News, has published an editorial entitled "Flagrant Grabs at Public Funds," in which they have given recognition to the efforts of Congressman Dorn in behalf of a sensible veterans' program.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News]

FLAGRANT GRABS AT PUBLIC FUNDS

We join with Representative W. J. Bryan Dorn of South Carolina's Third Congressional District and many others in opposition to the bill which would provide pensions for all veterans of World War I below a certain income bracket.

Amid all the discussion of high spending which the Nation can't afford and the many bills which would unbalance the budget further, this one has almost escaped public attention. Yet it is about the most flagrant and inexcusable grab at the Public Treasury we've seen in many a year.

The surprising thing is that there is a strong possibility that it may actually get to the floor of the House for debate when it deserves no better fate than to be buried in committee as unworthy of general consideration. As of a few days ago, a discharge petition which would force Mr. Dorn's House Veterans Subcommittee to bring it out, had been signed by 205 of the required 219 Members. Voicing opposition, Mr. Dorn who is himself a veteran of World War II, says the cost would be about $1 billion the first year and ultimately would cost the taxpayers $11 billion.

The country is about broke, Mr. Dorn said, and can't afford it. He didn't have to say that the bill was without justification and would discriminate against all other veterans even if it were economically and otherwise feasible.

The bill, H.R. 3746, was introduced by Representative Winfield K. Denton, of Indiana. It would provide for every veteran of World War I who spent as much as 90 days in uniform a monthly pension of $102.37, provided only that his annual income is less than $2,400 a year if single or $3,600 a year if he has dependents.

It also provides that any income from social security or any public or private retirement plan would be excluded from the income requirement. The pension would be over and above any retirement income the veteran already is receiving.

It should be noted that it is restricted to World War I veterans, and holds regardless of whether they were in combat and disabled or spend 3 months shuffling papers or on KP. All veterans of World War II, the Korean war and those who are in combat in hotspots of the global cold war would be excluded.

The bill is being pushed by an outfit called Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., which is conducting what Chairman Olin Teague of the Veterans' Affairs Committee calls a "vitriolic and abusive campaign" in its behalf.

Mr. Teague says there are 168 bills pending before his committee with proposals to expand non-service-connected pensions and benefits for veterans and that, of all of them, this one has the least merit.

The Denton bill is a conscienceless grab for the taxpayers' dollar which would add 631,000 to the national dole. Many of them already have incomes higher than some of those who would be taxed to give them a free ride.

The Nation owes no debt to any man merely because he wore the Nation's uniform for a few weeks.

It owes a vast debt to the dependents of those who have been killed in combat in all of its wars and of those who are being killed in jungle warfare in Vietnam and elsewhere. It is obligated to the widows and orphans of the men who have died in the line of duty in aircraft crashes and those who have been shot down by the Communists who accused them of violating their airspace.

It owes a great debt to the wounded and the totally or partially disabled veterans. It should offer some assistance to those who spend from one to several years in active service as they try to establish or reestablish themselves in civilian life.

But the whole concept of non-service-connected pensions and benefits is unsound and unfair to the rest of the population. Putting the thing in perspective, a large proportion if not a majority of the men, and many women, who are at the peak of their earning power now and who, therefore, pay most of the taxes, are themselves veterans.

So, the lobbies for the organized special interest veterans groups actually are setting out to pick the pockets of all veterans to line the pockets of the favored few.

That is patently wrong.

But even more disturbing is the underlying fact that these periodic flagrant grabs at the public pocketbook are symptomatic of the widespread idea that whatever an individual or a group can get out of the Federal Government is something for nothing and morally right.

Consider the Accident and H.R. 133

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker; the horror of the heavy toll of highway accidents in the United States is intensified by the failure to do something about it.

Pending in this Congress is a bill which would help reduce this mountain of misery and suffering.

I call the attention of the House to an editorial which appeared in the June issue of Health News, a publication of the New York State Department of Health.

I offer the article for two reasons. First, the arguments are cogent. Second, the author is a man for whom I have deep respect.

The article, written by Dr. Herman E. Hillsboe, New York State commissioner of health follows:

CONSIDER THE ACCIDENT AND H.R. 133

A car careens down a rain-slickened highway at night, suddenly spins out of control and rams into a tree with a sickening grind of metal; a 3-year-old toddles along an upstairs hallway, stumbles and topples headlong down a flight of stairs; a retired stone mason walks across a living room, trips over a light cord and hurtles sprawling to the floor.

Accidents. What could have prevented them? Multiply such scenes by thousands every year and they add up to the fourth leading cause of death in our Nation. Recent figures of the National Health Survey list 90,000 a year killed and 46 million injured. At a time when we are trying to increase our national productivity, we are losing almost 110 million workdays a year because of accidents.

These figures show that we do not yet have all the answers to the problem and those we do have are not being widely applied. Motor vehicle accidents offer a case in point. Each year we lose about 21 of every 100,000 Americans in this type of accident. We began losing this many as early as 1927. Improvement? Some, but not enough. There has been significant progress in highway design and vehicle safety but very little understanding of the human factors. This last is conceded by all to be of major importance in most such accidents.

In other accident areas there is scant evidence that we are making substantial progress in understanding the sources of the problem. We know too little about childhood accidents, falls among the elderly, drownings and sports injuries.

The modest accident research now underway on medical and human factors is almost totally uncoordinated. Research facilities and competent scientific personnel in this field are scarce. A generous estimate would be that no more than 50 such scientifically trained and experienced research workers exist.

There is not even a scientific journal devoted to accident research. The handful of small groups now engaged in accident research is insufficiently funded, short of professional personnel and without long-range support. These conditions hint at the gross inadequacy of our existing national resources for understanding and dealing with the problem of accidents.

Congress has before it a bill, H.R. 133. It calls for the establishment of a National Accident Prevention Center. The bill would set up an agency in the U.S. Public Health Service that would coordinate research in accident prevention. This agency would promote wider effort by public and private agencies in this field.

The Center would also: Make the research facilities of the Public Health Service available for accident studies; authorize research grants to public and private agencies; become a clearinghouse for pertinent information; get advice from experts in the field; and set up an Accident Prevention Advisory Board in the Public Health Service.

If H.R. 133 becomes law, it will represent a long stride forward in controlling the death, disability, and human misery caused by accidents. We heartily support the objectives of this legislation.

Commonwealth of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellently written editorial published in the Washington Post relative to the progress which has recently been made in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The editorial is entitled "Commonwealth of Hope," and I commend it to the attention of Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF HOPE

Remember when Puerto Rico was called the slum of the Caribbean, a stricken land and Uncle Sam's problem child? These descriptions seem remote and implausible as the island of Puerto Rico marks its 10th anniversary today as a Commonwealth freely associated with the United States. Thanks to the ingenuity of a gifted leader, Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, and the hard work and commonsense of the Puerto Rican people, the island serves as a living demonstration that an area without resources can lift itself by its bootstraps and become a billion-dollar market.

In 1961, within a decade after Congress passed th legislation permitting Commonwealth status Puerto Rico imported a total of $1 billion in goods. Of this, $833 million came from the United States, making Puerto Rico the fifth largest market for American exports—trailing only Canada, Japan, Great Britain, and West Germany. And Puerto Rico has a population of 2.3 million.

The Puerto Rican miracle is reflected in the current growth rate of 9 percent—one of the highest in the world. This growth rate has made it possible for the island to double its per capita income (now $621) and to increase industrial exports tenfold (from $33 to $391 million) in a decade. And all this has been accompanied by social reform measures that have given the islanders increasing self-respect.

Doubtless Puerto Rico has some special advantages (it is exempt from Federal taxes) but these must be measured against the island's distance from mainland markets and its lack of any real resources except manpower. As the United States touches the threshold of an Atlantic trading and political community, Puerto Rico's progress suggests the potential of liberal trade and the feasibility of close collaboration between markedly different ethnic communities.

Ten years ago, in adopting Commonwealth status, Puerto Rico declared its interdependence, exchanging certain political rights for mutual economic benefits. More may yet arise from the experiment than either Puerto Rico or the United States expected; felicitations are wholly in order.

The John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Creed" which appeared in the Elkhart Truth of Elkhart, Ind., on Thursday, July 26, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR., CREED

The Nation—indeed the world—owes a debt of gratitude to the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who devoted his life to giving away some of the money his father had received through oil.

As the National Observer points out this week, Rockefeller's philanthropy benefited several foundations and institutions, conservation projects and historic restorations.

Mr. Rockefeller on May 3, 1941, explained the creed by which he lived.

In our judgment, that creed is as pertinent today—and will be as pertinent in the future—as when Rockefeller enunciated it in a speech at Fisk University.

THIS IS WHAT HE SAID

"I believe in the supreme worth of the individual and in his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"I believe that every right implies a responsibility; every opportunity, an obligation; every possession, a duty.

"I believe that the law was made for man and not man for the law; that government is the servant of the people and not their master.

"I believe in the dignity of labor, whether with head or hand; that the world owes no man a living but that it owes every man an opportunity to make a living.

"I believe that thrift is essential to well-ordered living and that economy is a prime requisite of a sound financial structure whether in government, business, or personal affairs.

"I believe that truth and justice are fundamental to an enduring social order.

"I believe in the sacredness of a promise, that a man's word should be as good as his bond; that character—not wealth or power or position—is of supreme worth.

"I believe that the rendering of useful service is the common duty of mankind and that only in the purifying fire of sacrifice is the dross of selfishness consumed and the greatness of the human soul set free.

"I believe in the all-wise and all-loving God, named by whatever name, and that the individual's highest fulfillment, greatest happiness, and widest usefulness are to be found in living in harmony with His will.

"I believe that love is the greatest thing in the world; that it alone can overcome hate; that right can and will triumph over might."

Where tyrannies have existed, where people have been persecuted, where there has been injustice, unhappiness, and needless suffering, it is because—in our opinion—governments and people have ignored at least some, if not all, of those principles.

People do not—and need not—all think alike. The spirit of freedom properly provides for differences of opinion. Yet a general consensus of opinion on some vital, basic principles is necessary if people are to live in peace with one another—and if individuals are to be at peace with their inner selves.

Johnson Puts Space Effort on Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very timely editorial which appeared in the Fort Worth Star Telegram on July 25.

The editorial calls attention to our recent successes in the space effort and to the part played by Vice President JOHNSON in that effort.

The editorial follows:

JOHNSON PUTS SPACE EFFORT ON TARGET

On April 25, 1961, President Kennedy signed his name to a congressional act handing to Vice President JOHNSON one of the biggest and most important jobs in the country—the chairmanship of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. At that point, the burden of responsibility for America's gigantic civilian space program was thrust upon the Texan's shoulders.

That responsibility originally had been assigned to the President himself, in the 1958 Space Age which created the Council. It charged him to develop a comprehensive program of aeronautical and space activities, allocate responsibility for major projects, provide for effective cooperation among the various projects, and resolve the differences among the departments and agencies. In short, the assignment was to end the chaos that had prevailed in the national space effort ever since the Russians launched their first sputnik and to develop an orderly, smooth-functioning and broad-based space program.

Vice President JOHNSON's experience in space matters as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, not to mention the political skill that enables him to get things done in Washington, apparently has served him and the country well. For the frustrating indecision that characterized our space effort in its early days has all but vanished. So have the starts and stops, the delays, and the interagency bickering.

In the conquest of space, however, the real proof of the pudding is the pie in the sky. And since Vice President JOHNSON took over, the United States has put plenty of it up there. The pace of development has been so rapid and the projects so numerous, in fact, that a mere listing of all of them, with descriptions of their nature and purpose, would alone require more space than these columns allow. However, some accomplishments stand out as milestones in space exploration.

Among the 15 successful civilian satellite launchings in 1961, for instance, were explorers X and XII, soaring radiation and magnetism laboratories; Explorer XI, an orbiting observatory that delighted astronomers, 2 transit navigation satellites, and Tiros III, the weather-watching satellite that proved the value of such moonlets as storm-warning devices.

Most spectacular of all the space undertakings, however, has been the Mercury project. After a dramatic buildup with capsule tests, animal flights, the suborbital hops of Astronauts Shepard and Grissom and the orbiting of Enos the chimpanzee, the United States fired a man around the earth and returned him safely after three orbits. This flight by Astronaut John Glenn was followed in only 3 months by that of Astronaut Scott Carpenter.

The quickened pace in the Mercury program reflects some schedule tightening done under the direction of Vice President JOHNSON, but the rest of the space program also is moving forward at a much faster clip. The 1962 timetable calls for the launching of 200 sounding rockets and 20 instrumented satellites to explore such space mysteries as magnetism, meterorite concentration and radiation, plus 2 deep space probes. Already in orbit are the fourth and fifth Tiros weather satellites and the spectacularly successful TV communications moonlet, Telstar, the latter a demonstration of Government and private cooperation in space.

The primary objective of virtually all U.S. civilian space activity, of course, is to put men on the moon ahead of the Russians. Thanks largely to Mr. JOHNSON's guiding hand, evidence of a concerted effort to achieve that objective is beginning to appear.

The big obstacle, technologically, was the lack of sufficient booster rocket power. Tremendous strides have been made in rocket research, however, and monsters producing more than a million pounds thrust are coming to the fore. Saturn, a 1.3-million-pound-thrust giant, will be followed by Nova, producing some 6 million pounds.

But planning, coordination of research and development, and decisionmaking play a terrifically important part in the moon race. The smoothness with which the moon program operates under Mr. JOHNSON is demonstrated in the rapid order decisions on the rocket booster to be used in the moon shot, Nova; the type spacecraft, Apollo, and the technique, a direct thrust to the moon and a descent of two men in a "ferry capsule" to the surface.

From Texas point of view, a most important decision made under Mr. JOHNSON's influence was the choice of Houston as the site for the $90 million manned spacecraft center. There the Apollo mooncraft will be designed and tested and the three-man crew will be trained. It will be the hub of manned space flight. Since its operations will involve many thousands of firms, it doubtless will serve as a magnet drawing new industries to Texas.

There have been failures due to technical difficulties, of course—the misfire of the recent Venus probe, to name one. But even in this case, the rapid preparation of a second try is evidence of the sound planning and calm persistence of the space program.

Vice President JOHNSON deserves nationwide commendation for his role in getting the U.S. space program off its launching pad. From Texans he merits praise as a fellow-Texan doing his job well.

The Russian Mirage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Herald-Examiner, of Los Angeles, publishes daily an editorial column by Mr. George Todt, a dedicated American and a very able writer. I have been impressed with many of his columns, particularly one entitled "The Russian Mirage" dated July 18, 1962.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, July 18, 1962]

THE RUSSIAN MIRAGE

(By George Todt)

"COMMONSENSE IS INSTINCT AND ENOUGH OF IT IS GENIUS."—H. W. SHAW

Not long ago Secretary of State Dean Rusk emphasized that the main obstacle to disarmament and control of nuclear arms is Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's continued identification of inspection teams with espionage.

Actually, this makes sense when viewed from the perspective of Mr. K.—and perhaps he is wise to take this position.

For there is considerable doubt in the mind of this writer—and some down-to-earth military experts I know—that the Communist warlord has anything approaching the overall strength of which he boasts. Is he bluffing us?

There is a large amount of evidence that this is true.

And if such should be the case, then it explains in one easy lesson why Khrushchev cannot permit inspection teams to see what he has really got in military hardware.

TROOPS ARE GUARDS

Like the little man who wasn't there.

Sure, the Reds have lots of ground forces. But they are mainly useful to intimidate their own enslaved masses and those of the subjugated satellite nations of central Europe.

What good would they be in an aerospace-nuclear war that would likely be over in 2 or 3 days at most?

The real question here is how much nuclear hardware—and the means to deliver it—does Mr. K. have in reserve after test shots have been fired?

It is highly probable, in view of his phobia for denying inspection teams access to his nuclear stores, that he may not have much to show them. That could account for his reluctance. What else?

WHO CAN TRUST HIM?

Even Mr. K. must be realistic enough to know that he ought to expect none except those with holes in their heads to trust their national security to Communist promises.

A couple of years ago, a study was made by then Vice President Richard Nixon as to the correct amount of good faith reasonable persons might attribute to Red pledges over the long haul.

This study, which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, indicated that the Kremlin had broken its word on major treaties made with the West since Lenin's takeover in 1917 exactly 50 out of 52 times.

What realistic, practical American would say, in view of such facts: "We are now about to entrust our country's fate to your false promises?"

Is there any sane person among us who would keep on taking worthless checks from a man whose notes bounced 50 of 52 times?

Let's quit kidding ourselves.

Red propaganda has apparently convinced some of our noted biologists, Hollywood entertainers, Fabian Socialist philosophers—and others unaware of the elementary military facts of life—that the Soviets are as powerful as we are now.

Some of these impractical people would like us to disarm unilaterally, since the Communists show little likelihood of doing so.

In reality, we may have three or four times the aerospace-nuclear strength of our enemies—and they would run backward furiously if we took a tough approach.

Why don't we get hard boiled for a change, then?

Some experts have told me the Fabian planners want an apparent "stalemate"—so that "world government appears to be our only solution." This is a dangerous game to play. Let's wake up.

Students Sought for Communist World Youth Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, many of us in California have been disturbed for some time over the agitation on our college campuses by Communists, Communist sympathizers, or collectivists, who find ways to dupe well-meaning and dedicated American students into believing that Communists and their fellow travelers are "good people." One tactic utilized by Communists and Communist sympathizers to accomplish this has been international and regional youth festivals. Communist sympathizers on campuses have agitated to have philosophically uncommitted students attend these festivals so that they will have a "balanced" point of view or a "willingness to see the Communist point of view."

The majority of the students on our campuses are not taken in by these sugar-coated offers because they realize that one does not have to travel to these international festivals to learn that the Communist conspiracy in any form is not a desirable movement with which to work or coexist. One such alert student is Ross Hermann, of Stanford University. A former associate editor of the Stanford Daily, Ross became very disturbed at the quiet efforts by collectivist-minded groups to encourage Stanford students to attend the Communist World Youth Festival being held in Helsinki, Finland, during August 1962. Disappointed that some administrative officials did not recognize the cleverness of these programs, Ross decided to distribute a simple handbill to his fellow students, alerting them to the basic purpose of the Communist-sponsored World Youth Festival. It was not Ross' intention to try to prevent people from attending the festival, but merely to help them realize what its purposes are and why there are more worthwhile projects in which students can participate during the summer months. This is the kind of individual initiative on the part of our constitutionally minded students on the campus that I believe is to be commended.

At the time this handbill was distributed among the students, the administration of Stanford University had taken "no position" as to whether or not this would be a university-sponsored activity. Stanford University is to be congratulated for its decision to take no part in the sponsorship of this type of activity, and Ross is to be congratulated for his efforts to see that students and others on the campus were alert to the full meaning and purpose of the festival.

I believe Ross Hermann's handbill, the title of which is "Students Sought for Communist World Youth Festival," should be brought to the attention of my colleagues. Under unanimous consent, I place it in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

The article follows:

Students Sought for Communist World Youth Festival

(By Ross Hermann)

A quiet campaign has been carried on here at Stanford University for more than a week to recruit students to attend the Communist-sponsored World Youth Festival in Helsinki, Finland, this summer.

The official student newspaper, the Stanford Daily, traditionally an aggressive agent in the reporting of student affairs, has been silent on the matter, except for two small announcements buried on the back page. One told of the opportunity to sign up for interviews; the other announced the time and place of a meeting for interested students.

Neither article described the nature of the local project, gave details concerning the festival, nor mentioned that it is Communist sponsored.

There can be no doubt concerning Communist control of the event, as the festival is cosponsored by the International Union of Students, with headquarters in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and the World Federation of Democratic Youth, with headquarters in Budapest, Hungary.

Other signs of secrecy:

The application form, which students were to fill out and turn in, carried no mention of the International Youth Festival by name; the event was referred to only as "the festival."

Signup sheets posted in the ASSU office carried only the euphemism: "Special IIR Project."

Because the Daily has failed in its obligation to provide its readers with adequate information on a subject of considerable interest and because leaders of the project have sought to keep it out of the public eye, an interpretive article is presented here to answer some important questions which have been raised.

The leaders of the campus drive to send students to the festival are W. Scott Thompson, former president of Political Union and newly elected president of the Institute of International Relations; Joel Meister, outgoing president of IIR and an organizer of campus peace demonstrations, and Peter Grothe, an aid to Senator Hubert Humphrey and author of the Peace Corps legislation, who recently resigned as a recruiting officer for the Peace Corps.

To interview applicants for the project, they constituted a 20-member screening board, representing most of the political spectrum. The majority of its members, however, would probably place themselves somewhere to the left of Adlai Stevenson. Notable among these are Sandra Levinson, former chairman of the Socialist Caucus, and Dale Johnson, local organizer for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a recognized Communist front. (Documentation: Hearings of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, April 1961, "Communist Appeal to Youth.")

The project Thompson and Meister have initiated entails sending a group of between 25 and 100 Stanford students to the Helsinki festival as official delegates to explain U.S. foreign policy and hopefully to persuade anyone who might be as yet uncommitted in the East-West struggle. Beyond that broad purpose, no specific plan of action has been formulated.

The Americans would participate in many of the festival activities and try to counteract the barrage of Communist propaganda aimed at the "neutrals."

When questioned concerning the hush-hush nature of the campus operation, Grothe replied that publicity would alert the Communists and put the whole project in jeopardy.

Like so many American liberals, he seems to underestimate the effectiveness of the Communist intelligence apparatus in this country.

What is more absurd is his implicit contention that the Communists will have something to fear from a group consisting largely of leftwingers, except for the one or two conservatives who will be placed on the delegation for the sake of "fairness."

Actually, the lack of publicity has harmed rather than helped the project, as it has caused considerable suspicion in many quarters.

In the last week, action on the project has been so swift that it has even confused its leaders. Interviews were conducted last weekend and completed Sunday night, the administration was asked to approve the project and up to the time of this printing was still considering the matter, and the delegates have been chosen but their names not released.

As the drive, known as the Helsinki project, is an official IIR function, its leaders have appealed to Dean of Students H. Donald Winbigler, who has investigated the plan to determine if it is something the university can and should support.

If the project is approved, an excellent possibility exists that it will receive financial support from the university.

Funds will probably be donated by a "friend of the university" to be administered to the project, said Grothe.

All gifts, however, must be approved by the board of trustees. This fact may cause the project to be referred to the board for consideration at its next meeting on May 17.

Holding up the project that long causes considerable problems for the leaders of the drive, as applications from the persons chosen must be submitted to the U.S. Festival Committee by May 14, said Nancy Sherwood, a spokesman for IIR.

The sending of American students to a Communist-sponsored festival raises important questions which, having been overlooked by the student leaders involved, should be considered by the administration.

These questions concern the vital interests of the United States and the Western World and how these interests can be best served.

The purpose of the Helsinki project—to send students to the festival to argue for this country—is well intended and deserves serious consideration. Perhaps it can be best evaluated by compiling a score card of pros and cons oriented to the interests of the West.

Pro: A few uncommitted persons from "neutral" nations might be swayed to Western ways of thinking. The assumption here is that delegates chosen to represent this country will be articulate and also loyal to the political, economic, and cultural traditions of the West. (There is no assurance that this will be the case.)

The persons attending would receive an education in the nature of communism and its methods and then be able to impart this knowledge to their colleagues back home. The previous assumptions also apply here; otherwise students returning from the festival would be a positive detriment to this country.

Con: The chicanery that always accompanies such occasions would largely prevent American students from being effective. In a telephone interview Wednesday night with this reporter, Herbert Romerstein, a former Communist who attended the 1959 Vienna youth festival told of the trouble encountered by the non-Communist American delegates. These persons comprised the majority of the delegation, and Communist strength was restricted to a small but determined faction. When the non-Communists elected one of their own number to head the American delegation, the festival committee removed their credentials and installed a Communist delegation chairman. The Americans protested, but were told that democracy could be carried too far.

The presence of an American delegation would enhance the prestige of the festival, thereby promoting its overall effectiveness in gaining the allegiance of young people all over the world.

By giving added prestige to the occasion, American participation would tend to undermine and alienate the non-Communist and anti-Communist student movements in Finland, a country which is trying desperately to maintain its political independence and free itself from economic servitude to the Soviet Union.

The National Union of Students and the Council of Finnish Youth Organizations (which includes all shades of political opinion except Communist) have told the committee arranging the event that the festival is not welcome on Finnish soil. The only Finnish student organization that favors holding the festival in their country is the young Communists.

The position taken by the majority of the Finnish youth organizations is understandable in view of their nation's struggle with the Soviet Union, beginning with the invasion by the Red army in 1939 and continuing today in the form of economic oppression.

Where their elders have acquiesced in letting the festival come to Finland, these students have had the courage to say, "No."

In a few years, these Finnish student leaders will guide the political life of their nation; acts of support now from the Western World may give them the courage to break their unnatural ties with the Soviet Union and once again aline themselves with the West.

Is it too much to expect that they should receive a sympathetic ear from students in the United States? Perhaps it is, for the West seems to recognize neither its enemy nor its mission.

In comparing the pros and cons, I think we must conclude that the friendship of the vast majority of Finnish students is far more important than the possible conversion of a handful of uncommitted students (something that the Communists can easily prevent through their command of superior manpower and resources) or the benefits in terms of education and enjoyment accruing to a small number of Americans attending the festival.

Persons interested in doing something for their country, and not just in enjoying a free trip, should withdraw from the project and voice their support for the stand taken by the Finnish students.

Wisconsin's 32d Division Comes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the year ago Berlin crises, the Nation mustered thousands of its National Guard and other Reserves for a show of strength and firmness in the face of aggressive communism.

Now, a great many of these units are coming home, including Wisconsin's famed 32d and other defenders of freedom.

For their contribution to the cause of freedom—at great personal sacrifice—these freedom fighters deserve the gratitude of America and all the free world.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an article by Richard C. Kienitz on the demobilization of Wisconsin's Red Arrow Division as an elite fighting force. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, July 22, 1962]

RED ARROW DIVISION WILL HEAD HOME AS AN ELITE FORCE

(By Richard C. Kienitz)

"These are the men I would want to serve with in combat."

This is a supreme military compliment. It was made of the men of Wisconsin's 32d Infantry Division by their commander, Maj. Gen. Herbert A. Smith, of Oshkosh, for a job well done in 9 months of active duty at Fort Lewis, Wash.

Three times in 45 years, National Guardsmen wearing the red arrow shoulder patch of the division have been called upon to serve the Nation in crisis. They helped defeat the German Kaiser's military machine in one world war and to clear the South Pacific of Japanese invaders in another. There was no fighting this time, but they helped President Kennedy call an ominous Communist bluff in Germany.

Next month, the division will be coming home with their general's compliment and the satisfaction of a job well done.

ONE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED WERE COLLEGE STUDENTS

The 32d is 13,748 men. But what else are they? Their commander is assistant postmaster at Oshkosh. Col. Donald Radde published a newspaper at Sparta. Maj. Richard E. Peterson is a State assemblyman from Waupaca.

They are citizen-soldiers—1,300 college students, 450 teachers, 2,000 professional or businessmen, 1,200 farmers, 4.800 skilled workers.

Most of them—9,767—were National Guardsmen. The others came from the Army's Reserve manpower pools. Wisconsin is home to 10,450.

The division is a "family" of 20,000—including the wives and children that 3,686 of its 7,458 married members took to Washington with them. And in the family are 514 sets of brothers.

There were no end of hardships. Some farms and businesses had to be left in the hands of relatives or caretakers. Others had to be disposed of. New homes had to be found for many dependents—parents, wives, and children.

Out of 33 members of a Reedsburg Reserve unit, 17 were farmers and 1 had a milk route.

There will be additional problems of readjustment. These citizens turned soldiers left behind nearly 10,000 job vacancies which had to be temporarily filled. Some employers will absorb the returnees without discharging fill-ins. Others will not be able to. Trade and factory apprentices may have to make way for some.

The call to active duty last October, while not unbelievable, was a shock. Only two Guard divisions were summoned—the 32d and Texas 45th, chosen largely on the basis of readiness.

The men reported to their various armories with the confidence of trained men. But the tangled ways of logistics are never quite smooth. Their equipment was, in many cases, not adequate. There were gripes—an old Army custom—largely from the "fillers" from the Reserve pool.

Politicians reared their disturbing voices. Hard-pressed complaints by Representative O'KONSKI smudged the Red Arrow name and brought the division the label of "crybaby."

CRYBABY SLUR FADES

To be sure, quarters were not good at first—in a long-unused section of the Regular Army fort. But they improved when the Regular Army division there moved out and made room for them in better buildings. Better weapons arrived, and better clothes and better spirit.

Setting their jaws in determination, officers and men wiped out the crybaby slur with hard training. The division did the job it was called to do.

It takes weeks to put a fighting unit in proper order—to run through physical examinations, set records in order, fit clothing. The 32d did this while it trained.

Meanwhile, the Department of the Army learned some lessons in mobilization. Regulations even now are being rewritten because of them and Army Secretary McNamara has decided to put into play some new ideas about the National Guard.

At the outset, the division was what its function implied—a National Guard. Then it plunged into the first phase of a new role—intensified combat training for readiness to carry out a combat mission.

Individuals became teams, teams became units, units became a self-sustaining Army force.

Infantry squads began to dart through the escape and evasion courses of wet Fort Lewis forests. Artillerymen manned their guns endlessly. They trained at night, in the wet and through the winter. They sat in bleachers and watched the military manual explained to them on everything from first aid to hand grenades.

For some it was retraining. There were 941 veterans of World War II and the Korean war, 3,614 graduates of service schools.

The men learned to use modern weapons. Artillerymen fired huge Honest John rockets.

Teams became companies. Every company was thrown against an aggressor to determine operation readiness. Companies became battle groups and battalions and they were tested.

In March, a brigade task force went into California's uninviting Mojave Desert for the 7-day Exercise Bristle Cone. For the first time, part of the group was airlifted.

April brought counterinsurgency training against guerrilla operations in Exercise Mesa Drive. Mesa Drive at the Yakima firing center involved 26,000 troops on both sides, the largest Army exercise since World War II. It was the division's first battle situation since the fighting in the Philippines in 1945.

FIRST OF EXERCISES

Exercise Sherwod Forest in June was more of the same in Washington's rain-forested Olympic Peninsula. The foe was a band of 200 guerrillas. It was the first training exercise of its type for an Army division and special forces.

The Red Arrow went to Fort Lewis with two tasks assigned to it: To become combat ready as fast as possible, and to determine what kinks could be ironed out of mobilization.

It became combat ready in less than 3 months. General Smith called this extremely significant. He said: "Never before had an activated unit reached such a high state of readiness in such a short time."

In recognition of this, the 32d was named a component of the Strategic Army Corps on February 15. It was placed on the list of troop units available to the strike command, ready for joint Army-Air Force deployment to any trouble spot in the world. This is the Nation's elite force.

Last Wednesday, the division passed full strength in a farewell review before Army Secretary Cyrus R. Vance at the Gray Army Airfield at Fort Lewis. He hailed the Red Arrow Division's contribution to the defense effort and presented General Smith with the Legion of Merit medal. Thirty-one other division soldiers were honored with citations.

Next week, advance units will head home to prepare for the arrival of the National Guardsmen at their 72 communities.

This will only add to the all-embracing compliment of General Smith:

"These are the men I would want to serve with in combat."

Not Stalemate, Not Containment, but Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on July 27 I had the privilege of speaking at the State convention of the American Legion, meeting in Austin, Tex.

To this group I attempted to present a statement of our purpose, our progress and our problems in the cold war.

Because of a number of requests I have received for copies of this statement, I am including a copy here for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NOT STALEMATE, NOT CONTAINMENT, BUT VICTORY

(Remarks of Hon. JIM WRIGHT, State Convention, American Legion July 27, 1962)

There could be no greater honor than to speak today to this organization born of war but dedicated to peace.

My father was present in the American Expeditionary Force in France when the American Legion was born.

In the years between the wars, when it was stylish in some quarters to debunk our effort in that conflict and popular for women to say, "I did not raise my boy to be a soldier", more than once did I hear my mother reply:

"Neither did I, but I surely didn't raise my boy to be a slacker."

Today I would honor their memory, as jointly we honor the memories of those by whose sacrifice we have come to this hour.

World War I was fought by brave men with Springfield rifles and fixed bayonets in the slimy trenches of France.

World War II was fought with M-1's, flame throwers and 500-pound bombs all over the globe—in steamy jungles, blazing deserts, forbidding seas—and in the eerie blue nothingness on the fringe of the stratosphere.

Today we are engaged in what has been called a cold war. It is being fought as no other war ever was. Its offensive weapons are words, ideas and dollars. Their objective is to capture not merely territory but the hearts and minds of men.

In this conflict, our costly arsenal of military hardware plays only the defensive role of a holding tactic. Losses and gains are measured in terms of ideological offensives, economic growth rates, and political stability.

This war has been in progress for 15 years. It may last for another decade or another generation. But have no doubt that it is every bit as final and every bit as historically significant as any war that was ever waged. Upon its outcome will hang the fate of our children, and of generations yet unborn the world over. And the prize at stake is no less than the freedom of man.

Since nothing we do as a government or as a people can be considered apart from its effect upon this one overpowering central issue of our time, today I want to bring to you as one Member of the Congress of the United States a frank and candid appraisal of our purpose, of our progress, and of our problems.

I. OUR PURPOSE

At the very outset, I think we need to define our national purpose in this titanic worldwide ideological competition. Let us not mince words about our aim but declare it in the clearest possible terms.

Let the word go out that we have but one goal. It is not stalemate. It is not containment. It is not passive coexistence. Our national goal is nothing less than the ultimate and final triumph of freedom.

Just as Mr. Khrushchev was wholly candid with us in stating his aim and expectation that our grandchildren would live under communism, let us be equally candid with him in stating our hope and intent that his grandchildren and those of his people may someday know the blessings of freedom * * * to walk in the world without hatred or fear, to speak their own minds without terror, to shudder not at the knock on the door, nor cringe at the sight of police.

The Russian Premier has thrown down the challenge for a duel to the death between our political systems, by every means short of the weapons of war which he knows could destroy the human race. He believes in the inevitability of his philosophy. And so we accept the challenge, true to our past and with faith in our future.

We know that we could not long survive as an isolated island of freedom with only 5 percent of the world's population if we were surrounded by hostile forces bent upon our burial. We have seen that a potential aggressor can never be satisfied with half, or even 95 percent, a loaf. We know that the cells of cancer if merely left alone will spread.

And so we launch our own offensive. We seek to hold none in subjection, but we ask the aid of all who love their own liberty and wish to be masters of their own houses. For we cannot do it alone.

And these are our clear purposes: First, to strengthen freedom by weapon and will where it exists in the world and make it more secure from attack and subversion; next, to win the wavering and uncommitted more firmly to its side; and finally to pierce the Iron Curtain with infectious truth, that the menace of communism with its cruel repressions may disappear from the earth and oppress man no more.

This cannot be done in a day, nor in a year, nor in a decade, but it will be done because it must. Just as this Nation in Lincoln's time could not exist half slave and half free, this shrunken world of rapid change and awesome weaponry, in which we stand today less than 40 minutes by missile from Vladivostok, cannot indefinitely exist half slave and half free.

There may be those who would say that such a statement is too provocative. Lest we be accused of saber rattling, let us make it abundantly clear that what we brandish is not a saber but a torch. Ours is not the closed fist of threat, but the open hand of promise.

We shall never force freedom upon any unwilling person or nation by power of arms, for freedom forced is not freedom. To any who honestly doubt, if any there be, let us reiterate plainly that we shall never strike the first blow of sneak aggression. Were we to do so, we would cease to be America; and it would profit us naught if we should gain the whole world and lose our own soul.

But let any potential aggressor know that in our U.S.-based Strategic Air Command and in the 200 forward bases of NATO, the free world has the never-sleeping capacity to destroy him and his warmaking potential utterly and within minutes if he should be so foolish as to attack us—and knowing this, let him stay his hand.

We are spending 63 cents out of every Federal tax dollar this Nation collects to make sure that our arms are sufficient beyond doubt, for only then, as President Kennedy so well said, "can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed."

Thus far, it has cost $1.2 billion to develop the Nike-Zeus which last week intercepted and destroyed an ICBM in midocean. Its mission is not to destroy but to save human life. It is worth the price, and worth many times more if, because we have it, we never have to use it.

We know that military might alone will never win the cold war. We do these things because we would rather spend dollars than lives. We carry the sword in order that we may carry the word.

And this is the ultimte weapon with which we shall win the final victory—the word, the word of truth, backed by the deeds of truth—on the promise of Him who said "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

This is our purpose. And this is our policy. And this is our program.

II. OUR PROGRESS

Now, what of our progress toward this goal?

In the political and economic offensive which launched this cold war, we started out behind. We did not realize, in fact, what ruthless competition had been thrust upon us until the struggle was already well along.

During the first 2 years after Germany surrendered in World War II, Russia took over 9 countries with a total of 100 million people by economic and military pressures and through rigged elections supervised by the Red army. These are the captive nations, imprisoned today behind a barrier which seeks to shut out contact with the rest of the world.

We discovered too late that the agrarian reformers in China were not simple peasants, wanting a better life for their people, but hardened Communists, intent on overpowering all of Asia.

We awakened to the European threat only when Greece and Turkey were on the verge of falling before military onslaught and Italy tottered beneath political bombardment. We made some mistakes, let's not deny it. But let's not magnify our every error and minimize our own successes. For that would be selling America short. And we have in truth made some measurable progress.

Since those days, a striking change has taken place. Since NATO was organized 14 years ago, not a single inch of European soil has fallen to the Soviet. Look back and mark the changes of these 14 years, and we shall see that freedom in Europe has more than held its own, a direct result of our policies applied in the nick of time.

As the war ended, Europe lay in ruins, stalked by the specter of ravaging hunger, ruinous inflation and political turmoil * * * weary with war, devoid of hope, torn by mutual suspicion, lacking the economic foundation on which to rebuild * * * an overripe plum almost ready to fall.

In France and Italy, the strongest single political parties in the first postwar years were the Communists. In the 1948 elections, Italy almost slipped into the trap whose steel jaws were sprung open to receive them.

Then came the Marshall plan, the Greek and Turkish aid plan, NATO, the Benelux Pact, the Coal and Steel Community, and now the Common Market.

Look at Western Europe today—a modern miracle of economic rebirth. United as never before, prosperous beyond its fondest expectation, its Communist Parties steadily dwindling in numbers and influence. Western Europe has emerged as the third great center of power in the world * * * committed today as never before to the cause of freedom.

Not many of us realize it, but the last trickle of our economic aid money to the democracies of Western Europe ended 4 years ago. Today France, West Germany and England are not receiving foreign aid, but giving it—giving it to the underdeveloped countries of the world. A little-known fact is that West Germany today devotes just as big a percentage of its gross national product to economic aid as we do.

A few weeks ago, Italy repaid $180 million of Marshall plan loans. Early this month, De Gaulle and Adenauer, whose two countries twice in this century have been locked in mortal combat, conferred together in Paris about the future of freedom. Last month, in the Italian elections, the Communist Party took the worst political defeat it has suffered in that country since the war.

Or look elsewhere in the world. This month in Japan, the elections strengthened the hand of the pro-American Prime Minister who opposes communism.

In Bolivia, where we had been apprehensive of the outcome, the election results were better than we had dared to hope.

The Organization of American States, meeting this year in Punta del Este, voted unanimous condemnation of Castro. Just a few days ago, the Presidents of Costa Rica and Venezuela, two countries about which we had serious doubts only a few years back, jointly agreed to impose additional sanctions against Cuba.

None of these things could have brought much joy to the moon-faced man who sits in the Kremlin, especially coming as they have on top of the humiliation he suffered in the eyes of the world when we forced him to back down on his blustery ultimatum to throw us out of Berlin.

We all remember his threat. The Soviet Union was going to conclude a peace treaty with the puppet state of East Germany, and the Western Powers would be forced out of Berlin by January 1.

We all remember, too, the way the United States responded to the challenge. We sent a battle group to reinforce our garrison in Berlin. Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON flew to the beleaguered city, and as Germans stood in the street with tears streaming down their cheeks, he promised them that America would defend their city, the forward bastion of freedom, with our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor.

At home we increased our Army by 125,000 men, our Navy by 29,000 and our Air Force by 63,000. We doubled and tripled our draft calls. We called up some of our Reserve and National Guard units—including Texas own 49th Armored Division * * * and Khrushchev backed down from his rash ultimatum. How humiliating this must have been for the brash masters of the Kremlin in the eyes of all the world.

How humiliating it must have been, too, that they had to build the Berlin wall in the first place to keep their enslaved people from fleeing to the island of freedom that is West Berlin.

For these captive peoples had sampled the Communist utopia and were voting against it * * * voting the only way they were permitted to vote—with their feet. With their feet they strode in ever-increasing numbers across the border to freedom until finally the stream of refugees grew so large the Communists were forced to erect a hideous gray wall to halt the flow.

Ugly as it is, this wall speaks eloquently of our progress in the cold war. For passengers do not abandon a seaworthy ship, nor citizens a just and prosperous homeland.

Almost everywhere we look, we see a similar exodus of refugees wherever the Reds rule. Nearly 2,000 Cubans flee Castro's rule each week. In Hungary, Red China, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet, wherever the border is not securely sealed, the verdict is being made and the flow continues.

This is a crack in their armor, and the wavering nations are beginning to ask: "If communism were worth while, why do so many people want out?"

III. OUR PROBLEMS

So this is where we stand today. We have made some progress. There are signs of unrest behind the wall which separates the slave world from the free. Food shortages and growing dissatisfaction beset the satellites.

But it would be a grave mistake to conclude that the tide had turned in such a decisive way as to permit our relaxation. For the outcome is far from resolved.

The Russian leaders are still firmly convinced that they ride the wave of the future. Theirs is the self-assurance of men who have no doubt that communism is destined to supplant capitalism just as capitalism replaced feudalism.

They have made enormous strides technologically. In only 40 years they have come from an adult literacy rate of less than 30 percent to better than 90 percent today.

They have shown extremely impressive growth in heavy industry. While they cannot even begin to match us in consumer goods, and do not try, their people have never known a comfortable life, and the leadership is free to concentrate more and more of the national effort upon those things on which it places a premium. This is how a nation which rode oxcarts one generation ago could be the first in space 5 years ago and can today send rockets to the moon.

They spend almost twice the percentage of their national income on their military as we spend on ours. They spend at least 10 times as much on worldwide propaganda to spread hate slogans against our country and to portray us falsely as imperialists as we spend to tell the truth.

Russia, in fact spends more on jamming equipment just to prevent the Voice of America broadcasts from being heard in Eastern Europe than we invest in the entire worldwide effort. And this betrays their weakness.

They are deathly afraid of the free interchange of ideas.

Yet the amounts of money they devote to this global effort portray both their weakness and their strength. There has been a lot of loose talk about Russia spending us into bankruptcy. Yet economically we are far better able to sustain the prolonged effort than they.

With only one-fourth our per capita product and less than one-fourth our per capita income, the average Russian family pays proportionately about four times as heavy a tax as the typical American family, and has only a fraction of the buying power left after taxes with which to generate an economy. If any nations are being spent into bankruptcy, they would be Russia and Red China.

The difference is that their people do not know it. You never hear of the Russian populace crying for a tax cut * * * or a Russian steel mill demanding increased prices * * * or of workers in the Russian missile plants threatening to strike for higher wages.

Another advantage they possess is that of initiative and surprise. Look back over the past 10 years and repeat the geographic names that shattered our repose and punctuate the pages of recent history. Formosa, Suez, Lebanon, Tibet, Quemoy, Berlin. And now Vietnam, Laos, the Indian border.

It is a deliberate war of nerves in which their objective is painfully clear. They hope that our nerve will crack, our resolve will weaken, that we will lose faith in our own policy and purposes, fall to quarreling among ourselves, and withdraw from the continuing contest.

There was a time when international diplomacy could be played slowly and deliberately like a game of chess. Today it has the tempo of table tennis.

We have speeded up our reaction time in the military by unification. We need to do the same in our diplomacy.

We need to get our diplomacy out of the drawing rooms and into the streets and country roads—for that is where the people are.

We need to contrive our economic aid in such a way that it gets to the people themselves, and not just to governments. In most of Latin America, the average people are still mired in the futility of a 20th-century feudalism. The vast, preponderant majority have no land, no money, no source of credit, no hope. This is what gave rise to Castro. Change of one sort or another is inevitable, and soon. They believe in the Alliance for Progress. It has captured their imaginations. But if we don't make it reach the grassroots, we will be in trouble in our own backyard.

To see the problem in its total prospective, just take a look at who will populate tomorrow's world. There are 940 million people on earth between the ages of 5 and 20—the coming generation. Take a cross section of 100, and here is where they live: 56 in Asia, 15 in Western Europe, 9 in Africa, 8 in Latin America, 6 in the Soviet Union, and only 4 in the United States.

The great preponderance of them live in lands which are today awakening from a long slumber, stirring and stretching and reaching out for self-expression. Most of these people have never seen a doctor, never had enough to eat, never been able to read or write. But they know that there is a better way, and they are determined to get it—by the Russian route or by ours. This, in a nutshell, is our problem.

Having said something about our purpose, our progress, and our problem, I should like to say a very few words about our prospects.

I am convinced that we shall win this cold war. For there is in all men everywhere an innate desire for freedom which, if given the chance, will come to the fore.

We shall not win it by growing weary of the fray. We shall not win it by listening to the shrill voices of division, becoming suspicious of our neighbors, and dissipating our energies fighting one another.

We shall win it by being true to our own best traditions.

President Kennedy said: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty".

May we leave no doubt in our words or our deeds that we stand together, that the United States of America and its Congress, its total resources and its 180 million people stand behind him in that pledge.

New Steam Electric Plant Marks End of Hydro Dominance in Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following article, appearing in the July 19, 1962, edition of News Digest issued for the information of the members of the staff of the Federal Power Commission, discloses that the Northwest, no longer fat with undeveloped cheap waterpower sites, will begin turning to coal mined in central Washington with the cost of the power being competitive with the generation of most water-produced power. The article follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, July 13, 1962]

NEW STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT MARKS END OF HYDRO DOMINANCE IN NORTHWEST

(By Harold Hughes)

CLE ELUM, WASH.—The construction here during the next 3 years of the largest steam electric generation plant on the west coast marks the beginning of the end of hydroelectric dominance in the Pacific Northwest. The region, no longer fat with undeveloped cheap waterpower sites, will begin turning to fuels to solve its power problems, power engineers have pointed out. A beginning is being made at Cle Elum in central Washington. Bituminous coal mined here will be burned to produce power which will firm up enough production to equal the installation of a major Columbia River hydroelectric project. And the cost of this power will be competitive with most water-produced generation now going on the line. Washington and Montana, both far richer in coal deposits than Oregon, are expected to provide the bulk of future coal-fired steam generation plants as the end of the hydroelectric road is reached.

The Cle Elum steam generation plant is a joint project of the Grant County Public Utility District at Ephrata and the Kittitas County Public Utility District at Ellensburg. Kittitas will handle the coal mining end of the operation and Grant Public Utility District will dispatch the power. Construction of a 500,0000-kilowatt generation plant by the end of 1965 is now in the design stage. This plant, generating steam from pulverized coal burning like a gas flame, will be capable of firming up 700,000 kilowatts of power, nearly equal to the entire firm power output of the new Priest Dam built by the Grant County Public Utility District. Generation from the Cle Elum plant will be used specifically to firm up secondary power from Priest Rapids and Wanapum Dams, the latter still under construction. This is power that is for surplus and for the most part unsalable throughout the Pacific Northwest.

In order to build the steamplant, a bond issue of $90 million will be undertaken. The Priest Rapids bond issue was for $166 million or nearly 1.8 times as much. Exact cost of the steamplant will not be known until Sergent & Lundy engineers (who have built more than 70 steamplants in the Nation) complete their design. Bids on major components are expected to be asked in about 90 days. The Grant County Public Utility District said actual construction would begin by the middle of next year and that completion is scheduled by the fall of 1965. The revenue bonds, being handled by Chapman & Cutler, Chicago, will be retired from sale of power over a 30-year period. Coal source for the plant is the Northern Pacific Railroad fields at Lake Cle Elum which are being leased from the railroad by the public utility districts. The railroad, which mined the coal until the diesel locomotive replaced its coal-fired steam engines, will receive a royalty of about 25 cents a ton. Cost of the coal at the mine is about $4 a ton, which is about half present coal-using projects in Washington, such as the Hanford atomic plant, spend for coal.

The coal reserves in the Cle Elum field are estimated at 281.8 million tons, of which 91 million tons have actually been measured or blocked out and the balance is inferred from geological studies. H. Zinder & Associates, Seattle, engineering consulting firm for the public utility districts, report the coal rates high grade, up to 13,000 British thermal units per pound, and is of the nonslaking variety, which means it can be stockpiled above ground. In fact, stockpiling will be a key part of the operation, since mining will be continuous at an economical rate although power demands from the generation plant may be interrupted during good water periods on the hydroelectric system. The public utility districts estimate the coal mining operation will keep 400 to 500 miners employed year around, compared to some 115 now working in the mines.

Some 1,000 workers will be employed during the peak of steamplant construction, the public utility district estimates. In addition to the payrolls for the region, adjoining counties will receive substantial tax windfalls, amounting to some $1 million annually spread out among Grant, Yakima and Kittitas Counties by 1967 when Wanapum Dam is completed. This revenue comes from a 5-percent gross State electric revenue tax, levied against power producers under a formula in which the State keeps 4 percent of the total and returns 96 percent to the county where the generating plant is located and the rest is divided among bordering counties, but by law, 35 percent of each county's take must go to the school districts. Power costs at the busbar will be surprisingly low, ranging from less than 2 mills when the plant is integrated in a power system, to less than 4 mills when operated independently, Zinder & Associates report.

Explanation of these figures is important, a spokesman for Zinder reports. Secondary power, which the steamplant will firm up, has no value at all if it is being dumped or cannot be sold. Thus where a steamplant can firm this up as part of an integrated system, the cost of producing power is quite low. Also, capital costs of steamplants generally go up if fuel costs are high as engineers buy more hardware to increase efficiency in an effort to offset the high fuel costs. The Cle Elum plant will be, however, a high-performance steamplant, using only 9,000 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour, nearly equal to any plant in the Nation and far below the 15,000 British thermal units needed for such proposed steam generation plants as the Hanford atomic project. The plant will also operate at high pressures and temperatures, ranging up to 1,000 degrees at steam throttle and 240 pounds pressure per square inch at throttle.

During periods of "good water,'" the steamplant will be shut down, but coal will continue to be mined, available for periods of high intensity operations when secondary power must be firmed up by steam generation. Only during the great "brownout" of power in 1952 has there been much steam generation in the Pacific Northwest, a region that has depended in modern times upon the "white coal" from its great rivers. But this era is ending as the last damsites are developed. Fuels other than coal, such as oil, gas, and nuclear elements, are in the wings, waiting their day to satisfy the need for low cost electrical energy.

Foreign Procurement Ban May Adversely Affect Our Exports, Article Reveals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the space scientists and physicists impress on us the law of motion that to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction.

In the conduct of foreign trade and in worldwide procurement for the Defense Establishment we can be assured of a reaction—but frequently the reaction is not "equal and opposite."

This comment is not intended to be sweepingly critical of either our foreign trade management or those procurements by Defense which are intended to be in consonance with the Buy American Act. It does, however, underscore the fact that whereas in the field of science there can be brought about precise balances this condition is extremely difficult to achieve in dealing with problems in international economics.

A case in point has been developed commendably by Newsman Allen M. Smythe, a specialist writer in the field of defense economics who has been an enlightened and successful journalist in this complicated area of activity for many years. I refer especially to Mr. Smythe's article in the business section of the July 18, 1962, issue of the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star under the headline "McNamara's Foreign Buying Curb Cramps Efforts To Export Area Coal," and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 18, 1962]

McNAMARA'S FOREIGN BUYING CURB CRAMPS EFFORT TO EXPORT AREA COAL

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Defense Secretary McNamara's reported decision to restrict naval steel buying from Japan and Germany stunned the West Virginia congressional delegation who, with State officials, were in the midst of delicate negotiations with German and Japanese steel firms to increase their purchases of American coal.

The group thought Mr. McNamara should consult with the Commerce and State Departments before he took any drastic action.

"Let's not get emotional about the Navy occasionally buying a few hundred tons of steel from Japan and Germany when the sale of many millions of tons of coal is at stake," said Senator RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia. "After all, the Navy was carefully and properly obeying the Buy American Act. And, percentagewise, there have been substantial savings to the taxpayer."

Japanese steel mills have been buying their coking coal from neutralist India. Governor Barron and other West Virginia officials, climaxing a 3-year effort, visited Japan in April in an effort to increase West Virginia coal sales there. A trial order of 50,000 tons has been shipped from West Virginia to Hampton Roads and loaded on the SS *Nini* for Japan.

Virginia's Congressmen are strongly supporting their West Virginia brothers. Representative DOWNING, of Newport News, stated that "if Japan shifts her coal buying to America, it will also mean a great deal to the State's railroads and the Hampton Roads area."

State officials of Virginia and West Virginia, together with leaders from the miners, railwaymen, and dockworkers unions attended a ceremony Monday to mark the loading of a record tonnage of coal which might prove to be the initial order for many millions of tons.

The Commerce Department reports that Germany will buy this year over 5 million U.S. tons of coal, mostly coking coal from West Virginia, for their steel mills out of an import quota of 6 million tons. This will cost $70 million. In 1958, the Germans bought over $300 million worth of American coal.

Senator RANDOLPH noted that a recent statement in Congress complained that 300 steelworkers would lose a month's work because the Navy gave 4 orders totaling 3,600 tons of steel to Germany. "It takes 40,000 miners 1 month to produce the 5 million tons of coal Germany will buy from us this year. We are trying desperately to get back to the 1958 level," said Senator RANDOLPH. "If Japan decides to buy the best coal in the world and Germany increases her purchases, then we can celebrate."

Mr. McNamara's action took a number of high Pentagon procurement officials by surprise. One pointed out that Germany pays "hundreds of millions of dollars" for American-built weapons for her new army. Among these are the F–104 fighter aircraft, and the Bullpup and Sidewinder missiles. There are many other weapons bought that are in the classified category.

A Navy official said that the 3,600 tons of steel bought for three new frigates to be built on the west coast cost less than $500,000. This was 30 percent less than the lowest U.S. bid and included duty and transportation to the west coast. Some 5,100 tons of West Virginia coal were used to smelt the steel.

Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Supreme Court decision with regard to the banning of prayer in our public schools is receiving more and more attention, and is arousing greater and greater concern among the thoughtful people of the Nation. It has been the subject of many fine editorials throughout the Nation, an outstanding one being the editorial which appeared in the Staunton, Va., Leader on July 31, 1962. This constructive editorial also refers to the work of the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON, who is very active and most effective in focusing the attention of the Nation to this problem, and in suggesting remedies.

As an additional related thought on this same subject, recently brought to my attention have been excerpts from the proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, 1915–18, and an article therein entitled, "Religion in Early Ohio," by Margaret J. Mitchell, from which I quote the following:

> We usually say the church and school go hand in hand but in the case of Ohio one would rather say the church was the power behind the earlier educational enterprises. From the very inception of the plan to colonize Ohio, Manasseh Cutler (a Congregationalist minister and chief officer of the Ohio Co.) had planned to found a great institution of learning in which morality and religion should be a part of the curriculum since, as he puts it in his sermon, "that was the only way to make citizens conform to law."
>
> At every meeting of the Ohio Co. they considered the expedience of some religious person as a public teacher. When the settlers came they brought the schoolmaster, often he was the minister, with them and the school building of the week day served as the place of worship upon the Sabbath.
>
> The curriculums of the elementary schools of southern Ohio included the New Testament, Bunyan, and the American Preceptor, a Congregational magazine.

I cite this article because it shows so clearly that in the development of the entire country, our schools and religious training have gone hand in hand, one with the other. They have not been antagonistic to each other, but have, in fact, been supplemental, and each has helped the other and played an important role in the history of our Nation.

Mr. President, I think this valuable editorial should have the widest circulation and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Leader, Staunton, Va., July 31, 1962, be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Staunton (Va.) Leader, July 31, 1962]

ROBERTSON ASKS ACTION

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, who has made strong appeals to Congress to reverse the Supreme Court ruling against prayer in schools, had the full text of the Pike address inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27. He advises that the bishop has agreed to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee concerning his proposed amendment.

Senator ROBERTSON says the Pike amendment would "make it crystal clear" that the constitutional provision against "an establishment of religion" means "the separation of church and state and nothing more." He doubts Congress will act at this session. The session should be nearing adjournment but has a heavy load of unfinished business.

"Among those who think something should be done, there is no agreement," Senator ROBERTSON advises the Leader. "There are others who think the decision is right. That apparently includes the President of the United States. There are a large number of congressional Members who reflect a large segment of this constituency who don't give a kitty about the matter one way or the other."

It remains for the God-fearing people of this Nation, which was founded as a Christian republic and has acknowledged its dependence upon and trust in God throughout its history, to exert the power which is theirs. Those who think the Court was right in outlawing the school prayer because its text was written by an official body, and those who are indifferent to the ruling and think it strictly limited in effect, should join in the fight for a clarifying amendment to the Constitution. They should do so if only because the Supreme Court has again arrogated the lawmaking functions of Congress and the supposedly sovereign people.

Every candidate for Congress in the November elections should be put on record as to his support or nonsupport of the Pike amendment or one to the same effect. Those in favor of an amendment which in this case at least would smack down the Supreme Court for lawmaking should if necessary ignore party lines on this issue. Keeping God in the American Government and moving to stop juridical arrogation of the legistive function are far more important than a party label.

The National Lottery of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Norway. In addition to the lottery, Norway also benefits from semiofficial football pools, which I would like to mention.

In 1961, the gross receipts of the national lottery came to over $16 million. The Government is obliged to pay out about two-thirds of the gross receipts in prizes, so that the Government's net profit in 1961 was over $5 million.

Norway's football pools are controlled by the Government. They are operated by a semipublic company. The football pools are not an end in themselves but a means for benefiting science and sport.

Interestingly enough, the football pools are supervised by the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Church Affairs. In Norway, it is recognized that the best way to control gambling is to admit its existence and seek to channel it. Are we too firmly in the clutches of hypocrites to escape the same realization?

Mr. Speaker, if we could only wipe out hypocrisy we could raise over $10 billion a year in new income to our Treasury which could help bring tax relief to our wage earners and start reducing our ever-growing national debt.

What You Can Do for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Mrs. George N. Crocker, a very prominent individual in San Mateo County, is not only good partisanship but embodies the best of Americanism.

It is a real pleasure to insert this speech in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The speech follows:

WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR AMERICA

(An address by Mrs. George N. Crocker before the San Mateo County Federation of Republican Women, May 22, 1962)

My subject, "What You Can Do for America," instantly calls to mind the oft-quoted words of our President, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country," a statement which he followed by going to Congress with 93 proposals of things their Government could "do" for them.

It is this very trend, the ever-increasing power of Government, which I feel should concern us most today. This subtle increase in our citizens does, in equally subtle and indirect ways, reduce our freedom. I am convinced that this gradual transformation in our system of government cannot be reversed, it can only be halted, and it is incumbent upon us Republicans to do it.

Now why can't it be reversed? Because in a democracy, a people who have become accustomed to the favors of a paternalistic government are not likely to vote for the candidate who proposes to withdraw them. Others put it more simply by saying, "You can't unscramble the egg." And because such demagogic governments have a tendency to perpetuate themselves in power, to become entrenched, it becomes increasingly difficult to defeat them. Remember, after 20 years of Democratic rule it took the most popular candidate since George Washington to put a Republican in the White House. We weren't so successful with Congress. So it is encumbent upon the Republicans to halt this process before it's put into effect, and yet we sit, disorganized, unsure, divided. The Democratic Party with the liberal-labor coalition behind it, is the recognized advocate of increasing State control, all in the name of human welfare, and so far the Republican Party has failed effectively to oppose it. This lack of effective opposition not only demoralizes our party, but by giving freer reign to the Democratic administration, makes it possible for them to create this monster which we will never be able to slay even if we gain the power, and with which we will be unable to cope because it is contrary to our basic concepts. We must, therefore, halt it now.

So, what can we, you and I, do about it? First and foremost we must learn what it means. We must study the various aspects of different forms of government; the many ways in which society has been ruled. We must acquire a really sophisticated knowledge of both economies and the nature of man. It simply will not do to point to a bit of social legislation and call it Communist inspired, or resort to cliches about our traditions. We must "get the facts" and evaluate them. For example, what is constitutional republicanism? What is socialism? What is communism, both in theory and in practice. What are their methods, what are they trying to achieve; how have they succeeded and how have they failed? Now you may wonder what communism and socialism have to do with our immediate problems in Washington. Well, for one thing, they are systems which have become increasingly prevalent in this world. Secondly, they have been, in one form or another, our avowed enemies for 45 years and have made frightening gains. Third, Khrushchev said to us 5 years ago "your grandchildren will live under socialism," and, not that I put much faith in his predictions, I am at least willing to heed the danger. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, the chairman of the Communist Party in the United States, conceded to a group of newspaper reporters that communism would not be possible here until we had first accepted socialism.

Khrushchev said much the same thing when he declared "we cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly awake to find they have communism."

Now, although we don't call social welfare legislation socialism in the country—the electorate wouldn't tolerate it—there is something of the same end in view. And that is a perfectly natural, humanistic aim of a more equitable distribution of goods among the citizens. It aims not just for equality of opportunity, but greater equality in the economic results of that opportunity. Now, there is no conceivable society in which man can be both economically equal and free. Economic freedom obviously reveals the natural inequality of our abilities or our energies. We are not all equally able. It takes rigid Government control to counteract this natural inequality; Government must be given the authority to tell us what we can and cannot do. This is big business, and just as in industry where management must have the power to tell the employees what and how to produce, so must Government have such power in a controlled economy. Thus, in the name of social welfare, we destroy the foundations of our freedom.

Now, traditionally, we felt that freedom fostered the maximum productivity in the individual, he was free to produce whatever he could sell, and because of it we achieved the highest standard of living in the world. Contrast this result with the failure of socialism for the last 150 years. Back to our Pilgram fathers who had a communal system where they produce was distributed from a warehouse "according to need." After 3 years of disease and starvation, Governor Bradford said "we will now adopt the system of 'each according to merit,'" and they prospered. Or take the dismal failure of Robert Owen's "New Harmony," or the 41 other Socialist experiments in this country. Or present-day Russia; after 45 years and it still has one of the lowest standards of living in Europe, with rigid Government control, and not a pretense of having achieved equality. Or take China, facing famine. We could go on and on describing he materialistic failure of that economic system, but it would leave out the most important point, and that is the tragic shortsightedness of these advocates of economic reform in confusing the "abundant life" for the "good life." Because greater economic equality, or even a high standard of living, is not alone sufficient for man's happiness. Man needs more than just his material welfare. He most needs the things of which these reformers must deprive him: His freedom, his self-respect, his sense of individual worth. Their cure for our economic ills is to amputate our soul.

Now, you're saying to yourself, "Oh, come now, we needn't go that far. We can create a little more social justice without losing our freedom." Well, I hope you're right. I merely ask you to study so you can determine how far taxation can go without destroying incentives, just how much social welfare will undermine our integrity, and at what point man will lose his moral autonomy, and at what moment will the power of Government tend to become corrupt.

That was my first point: To study and learn. The second point is to care. Today it is so fashionable to act as though nothing matters. It's not only impolite to express our convictions, but awfully "square" to have them. Today's philosophic relativism precludes thinking in terms of black and white, right or wrong; good or bad. Everything is somewhere in between. This fashion has had a noticeable effect upon our morals, but more importantly, it has robbed us of a sense of resolution, of purpose. We were shocked to learn that over one-third of our boys taken prisoner in Korea were brainwashed into cooperating with the enemy. But we should be more shocked to learn that, upon investigation, it was discovered that it wasn't the techniques of brainwashing that were so remarkable, it was the absence of any convictions, and consequent lack of moral stamina on the part of our boys that caused their defection. Any country's survival depends upon the motivating convictions of its citizens. If one has no devotion to one's way of life, obviously one is not willing to make any sacrifice on its behalf.

Yet here we have an economic system so superior that we, 6 percent of the earth's population, have been able to produce nearly 50 percent of the earth's goods and services; yet we apologize for capitalism here and throughout the world. And we, who have achieved greater freedom for our people for a longer period of time than any nation in history, discredit "patriotism or national pride as the embarrassing hallmark of the extremist." We not only fail to "sell" our system with the contagious enthusiasm it deserves, most of us can't even explain it.

And that brings me to the third point: The necessity of discussing with young people the merits of a free versus a collectivist state, the connection of freedom and private property, of liberty and responsibility—the whole unique nature of the American system. Our students today are often lured by the idea of security, planned production, and universal welfare. And I fear they are getting this rather warped picture in our schools.

Which brings me to point 4—know your schools, the curriculum, the teacher's competence, the content of the textbooks. I don't mean just those of you who have children in school, but all of you who have an alma mater, or who are taxpayers for this public education system. My husband recently discovered that all the required and recommended reading in the economics department of the University of California at Berkeley were books advancing at Keynesian concepts of increased Federal power; that nowhere were the students ever hearing the opposing views of noted economists such as Hayek, Von Mises, or Hazlett. This is an example of indoctrination, not education, and it abounds. The State of California has a law that all schools will teach, among other things, the concepts of our American political tradition. So there is a book of that name, "The American Political Tradition" being widely used in our public schools which disposes of the Founding Fathers in the first chapter by contending that they believed, erroneously, that man was by nature competitive and suited to free enterprise. It states that modern humanistic belief denies this and, I quote, "can expect no answer in the philosophy of balanced government as it was set down by the Constitution makers of 1787." So much for the Constitution. Then it continues to "explode" other myths, such as Lincoln's failure to realize that this free system would build "oppressive business corporations," and that his own party would become "the jackal of vested interests, placing the dollar far, far ahead of the man." So much for the Republican Party. This is what your children are being taught.

Point 5 is to encourage religious faith, whether it be Christian or Jewish or Mohammedan. Religion teaches us that our rights have been endowed by our Creator, not by our Government. It gives us a greater sense of our own dignity, of our individual worth, and helps counteract an unscientific but popular notion that man is merely a pawn of his environment. This idea was originally propounded by Karl Marx, but is held today by many liberals here and abroad; that the only reason why these Socialist schemes don't work out as planned is because human nature isn't ready for it. So human nature must be changed. They've been working on this for 45 years in Russia, by constant indoctrination, by eliminating religion, by refusing to admit any foreign books, papers, movies, or radio programs which would undermine their propaganda, by removing children from their parents and boarding them in state schools, so like Pavlov's dog they will learn the proper responses to the proper stimuli. All this, and more, in an effort to change human beings into satisfied machines for the state. Two noted psychiatrists, the Overstreets, call this "the most colossal trespass upon the human mind the world has ever witnessed," and does it work? They still have to post tommyguns at the borders, and permeate their society with secret police.

And this brings me to point 6: In the Soviet-controlled society no one dares to speak out against the basic tenets of the system. But in our free society it's fundamental that we speak out. Our philosophy of subordinating government to the consent of the governed makes our fate dependent upon our active concern with it. We are the molders of public opinion. We have a free marketplace of ideas where the best ones are snapped up; and the poor ones are left on the shelf. So make your opinions known. Talk with the taxi driver, the grocer, the hairdresser. Discuss issues with friends and acquaintances. But first, learn how to do it effectively. It isn't enough to rely on epithets and slogans, or to resort to emotion. Even mere opinion, alone, doesn't carry much weight. Arm yourself with facts and prepare a logical presentation. It takes work and practice to become an articulate spokesman for your views. It requires a certain awareness of psychology to keep from alienating your listener, or putting him on the defensive. And particularly important is developing an approach suited to younger people who feel our ideas are outdated. They like to think of themselves as "liberals" or "progressives," and fail to realize that many of their proposals demand a strong centralization of authority which is actually a regression from true "liberalism." The constant accretion of power in government is what the true "liberals" who founded this country so strongly opposed and so effectively prevented in the framing of our Constitution. This can be explained, but it must be explained wisely and dispassionately.

Then, once you've developed this knack of expression, start writing letters. This is the seventh point in the list. Write letters to the newspapers and magazines; did they leave out or distort an important fact? Write to radio or TV stations; was a panel debate balanced, or was it 3 to 1? Were the debaters of equal caliber, or was your side represented by an unfortunately incompetent spokesman? Write the sponsor, not just the station, and be sure to give praise where it's due. Thank a company for a public service, or recommend one if you have a good idea. Write to friends, and give a little less detail on who wore what where, and more on what you're thinking about these days. Enclose a clipping that interested you. And most important, write your Congressman. Have you told him how you felt about all these bills he's voting on as your representative? You think that your wee voice doesn't count among all the others, and that's so wrong. It may be an unfortunate fact, but so few of us are actively concerned with our Government that each letter or telegram has an effect totally out of proportion to the number it represents.

Point eight continues on the subject of your personal influence on the affairs of state. Most of you belong to clubs or organizations which have speaker's programs. Are you active in their selection? Another unfortunate truth today is that liberal spokesmen far outnumber the moderates and conservatives. So program chairmen who follow the path of least resistance obviously end up with a preponderance of "liberals" on the platform. Work for a better balance, and then, when a speaker representing your views is selected, phone your friends and drum up a good audience. Or perhaps you belong to a club which is suffering from lack of purpose. Lack of challenge to the membership. Start a study group to research and report on national or foreign affairs, urge discussion groups. So much of our apathy today stems from lack of information, and a study group is an easy "fun" way to get it.

Furthermore, bring young people into your organizations. Political activity must not be the exclusive domain of those of us over 40, yet so many of our clubs have a mere sprinkling of members in their twenties and thirties. Yet this is the age group which can be inspired into dynamic participation for a cause. It's up to us to find ways to arouse that interest. Not only do our present goals require their assistance, our future depends upon them.

Now, my last point, but certainly not least to this audience, is vote. And work to get out the vote. I needn't remind you of the preponderance of Democratic registrations in most of our areas. Fortunately for us there are a lot of fence sitters and people ready to be swayed. Now, we can't put all the burden of influencing these "undecided" folk on the shoulders of our charming candidates. It has been statistically proven that the number of votes cast in any precinct is in direct proportion to the number of precinct workers volunteering to get out the vote. And it's a shocking percentage. The most successful precinct in a certain area was found to have one worker for every five votes cast. And the proportion never gets too much better than that. Fifteeen to one is average. So find out how many Republican votes you will have to get in your district to beat the Democrats. Divide by 15, and you will have the number of volunteer workers necessary to win the election. A colossal job? Yes, but it's a colossal cause and worth every bit of effort it takes to win.

And that's a pretty good summary of these nine points on what you can do for America. You can put your heart and mind and your muscle into this great cause—a cause which today surpasses the preservation of our Nation, and has become essential to the future of human liberty.

I thank you.

Address by Senator Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, Before National Waterways Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on July 24 I had the extreme pleasure of being present when the able and distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] delivered an excellent address at the second annual meeting of the National Waterways Conference relating to the effects of a proposed user charge on inland waterways.

Since I believe that the penetrating analysis of Senator ELLENDER's address merits the consideration of all of us, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE NATIONAL WATERWAYS CONFERENCE, TUESDAY, JULY 24, 1962, AT MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I am delighted to address the National Waterways Conference, for I know your organization shares my dedication to the promotion of efficient and economical water transportation, and the necessary public works which that promotion calls for.

Before moving on to my main topic, which will be the question of waterway user charges in the form of a fuel tax, let me express my appreciation of the effective work accomplished by your predecessor. That small, informal group was ever alert to the danger of any serious proposal to impose some form of service charge or toll on the Nation's waterways. Because that nucleus organization was already in being, the National Waterways Conference as we know it today is able to be effective in its current program of educating the public, and the Government, on the evil effects of waterway tolls.

As all of you know, my home State of Louisiana can be said to be a product of the Mississippi River. Our productive delta land—a great part of the State itself—is the accumulation of soil from Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, Wisconsin—in fact, almost every State between the Appalachians and the Rockies has given some of its best topsoil to make what is now Louisiana. But we Louisianians are a generous people, and for the last 25 years I have been working to keep that land upriver where it belongs. I can only hope my efforts are appreciated, but I fear that sometimes they are not.

Be that as it may, the fate of Louisiana and of its Queen City, New Orleans, have always been bound closely to the Mississippi River. Even today, when people from other sections of the country think of New Orleans, they think of the river; when they think of the river, they think of New Orleans. Indeed, many Yankees are often surprised to find that New Orleans is not the only city in the State, and that people who live in Louisiana do not necessarily either live in New Orleans or have webfeet.

But to return to my main topic, it may interest you to know that a form of user tax or toll, was in no small way responsible for the Louisiana Purchase, back in 1803. Even then, the Mississippi was the main highway of the Nation, and even then Mr. Jefferson realized that whoever controlled New Orleans controlled the river and a great part of the American destiny.

You may recall that both the Spanish and French Governments had talked of taxing the boatloads of merchandise—mostly corn, in one form or another—that floated down from Tennessee and Kentucky. At one time, the French did attempt to collect such a user tax, which caused a small war to break out. It was about this time that Jefferson began negotiations for the purchase of New Orleans, and when Napoleon offered to throw in the whole of Louisiana, the bargain was simply too good to be passed up.

I do not know how many miles of navigable waterway that purchase gave the Nation, but today we have more than 22,200 miles of inland waterway, without counting the Great Lakes. Since 1824, about 85 percent of those water routes have been improved and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, and they are in constant use in carrying commercial freight.

An outstanding example of industrial expansion resulting from this network of navigable waterways is found in the lower Mississippi Valley, where a vast complex of petrochemical plants has developed in the area from Baton Rouge to New Orleans. Another example is the spectacular growth of industry in the Ohio River Valley, where since 1950 more than $17 billion have been invested in new industrial developments. Such growth was largely the result, of course, of the presence of the waterways. These few examples show, therefore, that modern waterways give rise to industrial development which in turn creates traffic for all modes of transportation.

A recent report by the corps revealed that intercity freight transportation is expected to double between now and 1980, and to reach four times what it is now by the year 2000. This increase will require enlargement of capacity of railway systems, additional pipelines, increases in truck transportation, and further improvement and extension of the inland waterway system. Improvement and enlargement of existing waterways will undoubtedly be needed if the increase in traffic is to be handled in the most efficient way.

THREEFOLD WATERWAYS PROBLEM

This current review of our navigation facilities clearly shows the need of appropriating adequate funds to reestablish the original concept of knitting the Nation together through a system of waterways. Today, however, the problem is threefold: (1) We must develop new arteries of waterborne transportation; (2) we must redevelop obsolete waterways; and (3) we must properly maintain existing works.

My record in the Congress, in support of the free use of our waterways, as well as in support of adequate appropriations for water resource projects, speaks for itself. I believe it is a fairly good record.

USER CHARGE ON WATERWAYS

For the past 6 or 8 years, as you know, the waterway operators have been faced with the threat of tolls or of a destructive user charge on the waterways. I have consistently been in the forefront of those who oppose tolls or user charges in any form. Two years ago the Democratic nominee for President, John F. Kennedy, took a forthright position in opposition to tolls. His statement at that time included the following:

"The national interest demands adherence to established national policy for waterways maintenance and improvement, a continuing responsibility of the Federal Government. We must reject all proposals such as those of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget."

This was a very positive statement. And he continued:

"* * * for imposition of burdens upon the use of the waterways—including tolls, toll equivalent taxes, and the so-called user charges—which would destroy the values of investments heretofore made in such facilities.

"Such restrictive policies could not fail to increase the Nation's transportation cost burden and to deprive shippers of the advantages and economies of low-cost water transportation of basic commodities as an important element of a coordinated national transportation system."

I supported that position then, and I support it now.

In his early days as President, his concern for the decline in the common carrier inland waterway traffic was clearly expressed in his message to the Congress on regulatory commissions in April of 1961. The President at that time stated in part:

"The Transportation Act of 1940 sought, so far as surface transportation was concerned, to describe as a goal a national policy that would give each method of transpotration its appropriate role in our economy. It is disturbing, however, to note that, for example, our common carrier inland waterway traffic, our Great Lakes traffic, our intracoastal and coastal traffic, have been withering away at a pace far more rapid than appears desirable, in the light of the low-cost nature of this method of transportation and its potential role in the event of war."

In view of these statements I was surprised at the change in the President's attitude as reflected in his budget message for fiscal year 1963, at which time he proposed, in discussing tax reforms to be recommended for the consideration of Congress:

"To extend the principle of user charges to inland waterways, a tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels used in transportation on these waterways, effective January 1, 1963."

Until April 5, when the President submitted his message on transportation to the Congress, it was not too clear exactly what he had in mind.

In the meantime, on January 30, 1962, I addressed the Wabash Valley Association in Lafayette, Ind. It was expected that I would comment on the President's proposal for a fuel tax on waterways. At that time, I made the following statement:

"The President's program contemplates extending to the waterways a fuel tax now imposed on the use of highways and airways. So long as this is a general tax on fuels, the amount of the tax is reasonable and it is equitably apportioned among the various modes of transportation. I think it would be unrealistic for the waterway operators to take the position that they and they alone should be excluded from the general application of a fuels tax.

"If, on the other hand, when the details of the President's recommendations are made public we find that coastal ports, the Great Lakes, and pleasure craft are excluded from the tax, we are faced with a different situation. The gas tax would then become a toll on our inland waterways in the form of a user charge. This would destroy our time-honored principle of toll-free waterways. At this point, regardless of the amount, I will oppose the measure in principle."

I was criticized by some of the navigation interests for the statement I made in Lafayette, but I desired to make my position clear.

The proponents of water transportation could hardly expect their friends in Congress to secure an exemption for them from a general tax on fuels for the purpose of raising revenue. At that time it was inconceivable to me that the President would actually recommend a toll in the form of a user charge.

In a period of 2 short years, what occurred to induce him to reverse himself completely? I have never received an answer to that question.

RECOMMENDED TOLL WOULD BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Let us now consider what was actually recommended in the President's message on transportation. In the section on inland waterways he stated:

"Also in the interest of equality of treatment and opportunity, the principle of user charges should be extended to the inland waterways. A tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels in transportation on the waterways."

In other words, this was a toll in the form of a user charge which would be limited to commercial transportation and would exclude recreational use of the waterways. The President went on to state that the new tax should include an exemption similar to the current exemption from taxation accorded to gasoline and ship supplies for vessels employed in the fisheries, foreign trade or trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States, or between the United States and any of its possessions. Vessels in domestic trade using facilities and routes similar to those engaged in foreign trade and vessels in coastal trade which are too large to use the intracoastal waterways should also be exempt. In other words, the exemption would also apply to all shipping on the Great Lakes.

When we pause to reflect on the implications of the President's recommendations we find that there are not only some rather weird conclusions to be drawn, but that they contravene, first, the covenants of the Northwest Ordinance, approved on July 13, 1787, which proclaimed the freedom of our inland waterways, in these words:

"The navigable waters leading into the Mississippi and St. Lawrence and the carrying places between the same, shall be common highways, and forever free, as well as to the inhabitants of said territory as to citizens of the United States, and those of other States that may be admitted into the Confederacy, without any tax, impost or duty therefor."

The first part of that ordinance deals with certain administrative matters; the second part, articles I through VI, are by virtue of section 14 established as a solemn compact:

"It is hereby ordained and declared by the authority aforesaid, that the following articles shall be considered as articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the said territory, and forever remain unalterable except by common consent."

Here was the cornerstone of our waterway policy.

Second, the President's recommendations violate the organic acts of the various territories, and the acts of Congress admitting the various States to the Union, which contained declarations that the navigable waters should be common highways and forever free (Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, California, Oregon, Ohio, Mississippi, Wisconsin, and Alabama).

Third, the President's recommendations violate the Constitution itself. The restrictions in section 9 of article I of the Constitution, for instance, declare that "No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State." Further, that "No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another."

How would the President's proposal be applied on the Mississippi River? Take, for instance, an oil refinery located on the river in the general vicinity of New Orleans. A barge loaded at the refinery and proceeding up the Mississippi River and Ohio River would have to pay a tax on the fuel it used; however, if that same barge were dispatched in the opposite direction, down the Mississippi, through the gulf, and across to, say, Tampa, there would be no tax on the fuel used.

The unconstitutional implications of the proposed user charge are further exemplified by the fact that the export of grains from the upper Mississippi Valley through New Orleans is in direct competition with the movement of grain through Duluth and Chicago via the St. Lawrence Seaway. Prior to the opening of the seaway in 1959 the lake ports shipped very little grain for export to oversea destinations, as most of this movement was out of New Orleans. In just three seasons the tonnage through the St. Lawrence grew to well over half the New Orleans export tonnage. It is obvious that tolls imposed on the inland waterways which carry that grain to New Orleans but exclude the Great Lakes would handicap New Orleans very seriously in its competition for this tonnage.

In its impact on domestic commerce the President's proposal would be essentially the same in its economic effect as a system of internal tariff barriers which the Constitution specifically forbids.

I suppose we have an equally incongruous situation when you consider the major ports along the Texas coast. For instance, foreign ships or large coastal vessels utilizing 50 miles of the deep-draft portion of the Intracoastal Waterway in entering the port of Houston would not have to pay a tax on the fuel they use; however, a shallow-draft barge traversing this same portion of the waterway in operating on the intracoastal canal would have to pay a fuels tax on the fuel it utilizes.

WHY EXCLUDE THE GREAT LAKES OR COASTAL HARBORS?

The present proposal is submitted as a user charge—if such be the real intent, what possible justification can there be for excluding the Great Lakes?

We are currently completing a major project for the connecting channels of the Great Lakes at a cost of some $110 million to provide 27-foot channels comparable to the depth of the St. Lawrence Seaway. In order to utilize these channels to the 27-foot depth, substantially all of the major ports of the Great Lakes will have to be deepened.

So far we have received the price tag for only a few of these; namely, the 18 projects authorized in the 1960 authorization act at an estimated cost of $77 million. Since that time the Board of Engineers has acted favorably on a report recommending the improvement of 17 other harbors at an estimated cost of $75 million. Presumably, authorization for these harbors will be included in the next omnibus authorization bill. Reports on three additional harbors are under study at the present time, so it is apparent that the Federal Government will expend in excess of $260 million in order that the connecting channels and major Great Lakes ports may accommodate the larger vessels that utilize the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Again I ask, can there be any justification for excluding the Great Lakes and coastal harbors from the proposed fuels tax?

Nor can I see any sound reason for imposing tolls on waterways and excluding harbors. The former are used exclusively by American commerce and industry which pay taxes and return benefits to the general economy of the country. On the other hand, coastal harbors are used to a large extent by foreign ships which, aside from nominal port charges, pay no taxes to the United States.

TOLL WOULD BE BACKWARD STEP

The proposed imposition of a toll in the form of a user charge would be a backward step, especially serious at this time of heightened international competition of our industry for the markets of the free world. We must recognize as a fact that the European Common Market is booming. The cost of labor in many countries in Europe is roughly one-third of the cost in this country. Those countries have plants of modern design built with our assistance under the foreign aid program, many of which are located on the waterways of the Old World to take advantage of low-cost water transportation. I need not tell you that we as a Nation must do all we can to meet the ever-increasing competition from foreign manufacturers. Make no mistake about it, transportation costs are a part of any selling price, and to the degree that American industry is assisted in its competition for business, to that degree we assist in providing jobs for the American people and taxes for the Government. That this is a practical problem facing us today is best illustrated by the following headline in the financial section of the New York Times of Wednesday, July 18, 1962:

"Imports of Steel Advance Sharply—May Level Is Highest in More Than 2 Years; Reduced Prices Noted; Western European Groups Planning Brussels Plant."

When you consider some of the implications of the proposed user charge, it is no wonder that the House Committee on Ways and Means decided not to consider the proposal during this session of the Congress. In my opinion, it was a sound decision to make at this session and I sincerely hope that the committee will be consistent and will arrive at the same conclusion in the next and in succeeding sessions of the Congress.

It is important that you do not consider this action of the Committee on Ways and Means as a victory, or as a signal to relax your campaign against this measure. Actually, it is an opportunity for you to inform yourselves, the rank and file of the people in your area, and your Congressmen further of the evils of this proposal.

You can depend upon those of us in Congress who have previously fought for the principle of free waterways to continue the fight. I must caution you that a final victory is dependent upon the extent to which this and other similar organizations can arouse the general public to the inherent dangers involved in the abandonment of the principle of the free use of our waterways. It is important for both management and labor to be alert to the great economic disadvantage which will accrue to industry in the heartland of our country, in contrast to the coastal areas and the Great Lakes.

Again let me say that it was a pleasure to speak to you, and to tell you that I expect to continue my efforts to assist you in every way possible.

Use of the Mails for Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], and his amendment to ban free or subsidized delivery of Communist propaganda were the subject of a column in the New York Daily News on Sunday, July 29.

Richard McGowan wrote of this amendment in his column "Capital Circus," a regular feature of the Daily News, which has a circulation of nearly 2 million or twice that of any other newspaper in the country.

I think our colleagues will find this review of interest. Mr. McGowan has summed up the issues exceptionally well and points out that the basic principle behind the action taken by this House last January is simply this—if we are going to raise postage rates for the American people, is there any reason why we should not charge the Russians more postage, too?

The McGowan column follows:

USE OF THE MAILS FOR COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

(By Richard McGowan)

WASHINGTON, July 28.—The first piece of Kennedy legislation to clear the House—the bill to boost postal rates—has been bottled up in the Senate ever since and will soon touch off a Donnybrook because it carries a provision that Communist propaganda cannot be mailed at the taxpayer's expense.

The provision was the brainchild of Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska, a rugged battler against Commies, particularly when the taxpayer's money is involved. But oddly, the amendment was generally distasteful to the Kennedy administration.

CUNNINGHAM says that opponents of his proposal "fail to understand or choose not to understand the basic principle that if we are going to raise postage rates for the American people, is there any reason why we should not charge the Russians more postage too?"

He points out that his amendment does not deny Communist propaganda to anyone; it merely ends the subsidy and free delivery given such propaganda.

The Commies refuse to allow free circulation and sale of American publications on their side of the fence. Yet pro-Red groups spend an estimated $2 billion a year spreading their doctrines in magazines and newspapers in this country. A Customs Bureau official estimates that Commie literature flows in at the rate of 20 million pieces a year.

The controversy started just before adjournment a year ago, when the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported out the new rate bill. First class mail would go up a penny to 5 cents; second class mail would get a 5-percent hike in each of the next 3 years, a total of 15 percent. Third class would be upped in about the same ratio as second class.

The committee bill also carried the Cunningham amendment—and the battle was on. In early 1961 Kennedy had eliminated a Truman administration order controlling delivery of Commie literature within the United States. Cunningham's amendment was a substitute for the order Kennedy revoked.

IT SEEMED LIKE A SIMPLE OPERATION

The postal bill was the first test for new House Speaker John McCormack. It all seemed fairly simple until Cunningham offered his amendment. Republicans opposed to the bill declared they would not support a postal rate increase as long as the Communists mailed below cost.

The bill was taken up by the House January 23. Chairman Tom Murray, Democrat, of Tennessee, of the Post Office Committee proposed an amendment which would sharply increase second- and third-class rates.

Second-class profit publications would have to pay a 1-cent surcharge on all copies mailed outside the country. This provision supposedly eliminated the committee's heavy increases for weekly newspapers, which have the most political influence on House Members.

Third class mail was jumped a penny-apiece minimum, from 2½ to 3½ cents. But the surprise of the Murray substitute was that it includes the Cunningham ban on Commie propaganda. The bill sailed through the House by voice vote.

MAGAZINES AND SMALL PAPERS CLAIM HARDSHIP

When Senate hearings began, publishers protested the increases in second- and third-class mail would drive many of them out of business. One magazine said its profits over 3 years would not pay for 1 year of postal increases under the House-passed bill. Other so-called cultural magazines joined the fray and the administration embarrassingly found it was threatening the existence of the very publications that normally supported it.

Then oversea circulation of the weekly and small daily newspapers proved to be substantial. In the face of 100 to 150 percent increases in postage, the smaller newspapers poured on pressure. A few weeks after the hearings got underway, most Senators on the committee agreed the 1-cent surcharge would not be retained by the Senate.

Staff members report a heavy volume of mail, most of it against the Red prohibition. It comes largely from college professors, according to one source. And one Senate Democrat said he would fight to kill the bill entirely if the anti-Red provision is kept.

SENATE'S TIME IS GETTING SHORT

Liberal publications have editorialized against it. Those editors, and the administration, argue that the amendment shows a complete lack of faith in the American people, who can digest or reject propaganda intelligently.

But Cunningham argues that the critics miss the point.

"My constituents," he said, "just can't understand why the U.S. Government should pay to deliver Communist propaganda."

He suggested that the Commies use fourth-class mail, which pays its way.

Time is beginning to run out on the Senate committee in the rush for adjournment. In addition, a postal rate increase and a tax cut—now under study—at the same time just doesn't make sense, according to some critics.

But one thing is certain, Cunningham is prepared to fight for his amendment and he will testify before the Senate committee.

The administration may have to decide how badly it wants the rate bill. The wage hike for postal workers is a popular proposal on the Hill, so the bill should get passed if the administration accepts the Cunningham amendment.

Sources said the best estimate now is that the new rate bill, if it gets out, will have the 1-cent increase in first class; three 10-percent hikes over 3 years in second class, and probably a half-cent increase in the minimums for third class from 2½ to 3 cents.

Darrington's Community Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, there are many small towns in America whose residents have at one time or another wanted to improve their community centers or to build a medical clinic. Darrington, a logging town in my district is one of these, but it differs from most because its citizens decided to do something about needed improvements instead of just talking about them.

Today, Darrington has a new community center and a clinic with a total assessed value of about $100,000. The people of Darrington built these facilities with their own hands and their own money. Their spirit, desire, willingness to work, and their resourcefulness make them stand head and shoulders above others in less spirited places.

In this day when many communities look to the State or Federal Government to finance improvements, it is refreshing to learn about Darrington and how its citizens financed its community center and its clinic.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include an article by Mr. Larry Mull which tells the story of Darrington. This article appeared in the June 21, 1962, issue of the Everett, Wash., Daily Herald. I am sure that Members of Congress who read it will understand why I am proud that Darrington is in my district and that I have the privilege of representing its 1,275 industrious citizens.

The article follows:

COMMUNITY SPIRIT BUILT NEW CENTER AND CLINIC

(By Larry Mull)

Darrington.—Darrington's new community center and the Darrington Clinic, together assessed at nearly $100,000 are examples of what a community can do when a cooperative spirit exists among its population.

When the new high school was completed recently and the grammar school was enlarged to meet the increasing demands, citizens in this little logging town became concerned over athletic activities for the two schools.

A survey was made and the new community center was engineered by Bob Jones of Three Rivers Lumber & Plywood Co. Sauk River Lumber Co. donated $2,000 in cash and gave 20 acres of land. The Darrington Loggers came to the rescue and staged a giant timber sale which netted $35,000 and business establishments and individuals made contributions.

There was not a man, woman, boy or girl in the community who did not take part in the construction of the building. As many as 90 women were working at a time, laying shingles, driving nails, sawing lumber and cooking for those who contributed their time and labor.

Lt. Gov. John A. Cherberg, in the absence of Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, dedicated the center following its completion.

The school system pays a rental fee of $5,000 a year which helps pay upkeep of the building. It is a four-part center which serves the purpose of all conventions and meetings of the area.

The women of Darrington also sensed the need of better medical facilities. They decided to do something about it.

Mrs. Ed Hunter, Jr., and Mrs. Helen Lemmon first conceived the idea of a modern clinic and another physician to service the medical needs of the community.

They next contacted the Arlington Clinic and asked for help in organizing a guild. Mrs. Helen Berger, Marylyn McClure and Marianne Forsythe came to their assistance and outlined the details.

On August 22, 1957, with Mrs. Hunter, Mrs. Lemmon, Mrs. Clara Heil, Mrs. Ruth Jones and many other women present, the Darrington Hospital Guild was founded. Letters were sent to physicians and universities throughout the country outlining the needs.

Mrs. Helen Lemmon became the first president, followed by Mrs. Ed Hunter, Jr., now of California, Mrs. Clara Heil, Mrs. Ruth Jones, and the present president, Mrs. Marjorie Merritt.

Dr. N. C. Riddle broke ground for the new clinic April 27, 1960. Dr. Robert Koop became the new physician while attending Doctor's Hospital in Seattle.

The Darrington Gyppo Loggers could never be thanked enough for the tremendous help they gave in raising thousands of dollars through a giant timber sale. Several more thousand dollars were raised through bond subscriptions and business and individual donations.

Governor Rosellini was a visitor just before the dedication August 20, 1960. Mrs. Roy Loughnan presided and Dr. E. Raymond McKeon of Coos Bay, Oreg., a member of the Board of American Medical Association, gave the dedicatory address for the nonprofit organization.

The clinic has a board of five trustees and five advisers who are responsible for the money being returned to the bondholders.

The clinic is assessed at more than $35,000.

Other members of the hospital guild include Lillian Neff, Helen Caley, Florence Woodward, Audrey Jones, Kathryn Bates, Helen Johnson, Gloria Hunter, Irene Larsen, Betty Irelan, Alice Forrester, Marney Betty, Shirley Smith, Annetta Bodthe, Clara Boyd, Priscillo Simmons, Anne Wilburn, Lois Romaneski, Eva Dickson, Evelyn Hansman, Alberta Saxton, Katherine Vivig, Helga Edwards, Alta Gilbert, and Mildred Koop.

Charles Haslet

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a very outstanding member of the Washington press corps, Charlie Haslet, who hails from my congressional district, the First Oklahoma District.

On Saturday, July 28, Charlie celebrated his 38th anniversary with the

Associated Press, he is the AP's representative for the Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma region.

It has been my privilege to know Charlie for many years. I have never in all this time ever known Charlie to take advantage of any friendship. He has always been fair and honest and has a great dedication to reporting the actual facts to the people. I consider Charlie Haslet a wonderful Christian gentleman, a great reporter, and a credit to his profession.

Charlie, please accept my sincere congratulations and best wishes for a job well done and many more years of service.

The Real Liberal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention and the attention of my colleagues, Dave Heyler's column appearing in the Hollywood Citizen News, July 27, 1962. Dave Heyler is the Citizen News' publisher and has done a remarkable job of giving Los Angeles a third metropolitan newspaper. His analysis exposes a myth that many liberals in our society continually try to promote. I recommend that every Member of the House study its contents.

The article follows:

THE REAL LIBERAL

It is amazing how leftwing elements try to tag every conservative, from middle of the road to John Birch members, with the title "Fascist" or "Nazi."

Actually communism, fascism and naziism are one and the same thing: A totalitarian government dedicated to the destruction of the freedom of the individual and the regimentation of all manpower and materiel for the benefit of the state.

Each, in its own way, tries to conquer the world through its own ideology and even each other. The dictatorship is the modern version of emperor-dictators of old, such as Napoleon, etc.

Most of the time, the "for the state" is for the dictator and his select henchmen. Still, power is the overall aim of such men.

Fortunately for the world, these dictators have to keep going; neither the conditions they have wrought, nor their own egos will permit them to rest on their laurels, thus they pyramid until their "empire" cracks up under its own weight.

Don't be fooled by this carping. Actually the conservative is the real liberal and not the pseudo one so much in the news and so popular today.

All he insists on is that we live by our Constitution and our Bill of Rights.

He doesn't want anything else.

He doesn't want to be saddled with the responsibilities of other people and he is willing to be taxed on a pay-as-you-go basis but objects to saddling his children and grandchildren with huge debts in the name of social advances or taking care of everyone from the womb to the tomb.

He is willing to pay his way but expects everyone else to do likewise.

He is willing to help the down and out, but doesn't want to help someone able to help himself.

He is more interested in a sound and strong America than he is in helping Yugoslavia.

He believes in a sound dollar, a balanced budget, and as little Government interference with private enterprise consistent with commonsense.

He doesn't believe it is bad to become rich honestly and diligently, and believes a man should give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.

He believes he should respect the rights of his neighbors and they should respect his, and he doesn't want a world government or our Armed Forces turned over to the U.N. or any similar organization.

His only crime is he is old fashioned and believes the standards which made America the greatest power in the world and the mecca for all downtrodden peoples everywhere are good enough for him, his children, and theirs.

Key to the Coercive State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy says the voters in November must choose between sailing or anchoring. An editorial in the National Observer suggests that the choice, instead, is between extending the scope and compulsion of the Federal Government or holding the Government in check.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks the editorial follows:

[From the National Observer, July 30, 1962]

KEY TO THE COERCIVE STATE

Not so many years ago the word "liberal" was still applied to a man who stood for individual rights against the encroachments of state authority. Today it usually means one who is primarily concerned with what he considers the general welfare—which he usually wishes to see expanded through expanded activities of the Federal Government.

Much of the current political and economic debate in this country revolves around those two views. As President Kennedy implied at his press conference last week, the choice between sailing or anchoring is really the choice between extending the scope and compulsion of the Federal Government or holding the Government in check.

Now the modern liberal's longing for ever more government is not necessarily a totalitarian urge; in fact, it could be argued that his attitude toward and aspirations for people in general are idealistic and even noble. Yet if we look a little more closely, it is plain that a connection between contemporary liberalism and totalitarianism not only exists but is inescapable.

The world is full of problems and unhappiness of all sorts (and the liberal's vision does not end at our shores but embraces the downtrodden elsewhere). In this country most human problems are traditionally handled by individuals, families, communities, and, in important degree, private philanthropic money. Among other things, such money has spurred the medical research that has done so much to conquer disease and lengthen life.

It is all very well to say that more must be done. But the point is that if you turn all human woes into affairs of state, you radically alter the nation's political framework. What happens is succinctly described by K. R. Minogue, a political science lecturer at the London School of Economics, writing in the American Scholar Magazine.

Liberalism, he explains, "has come more and more to see politics simply as a technical activity like any other. We first decide what it is that we want, how we think our society ought to be organized, and then we seek the means to our end. The politician must be an expert skilled in political means, and his ends must be democratically supplied to him by popular demand.

"This view of politics introduces a novel inflexibility both into the actual work of politicians, and into the hopes we have of it. It means, for example, that all widespread problems turn into political problems, inviting a solution by state activity. It follows logically that peoples commit themselves to long-term planned objectives roughly as individuals commit themselves to New Year resolutions. But while individuals may break their resolutions if they change their minds, peoples cannot be flexible this way.

"Faced with backsliding, governments must coerce. They must control the climate of thought in which people live, and if necessary they must engage in large-scale and protracted repression to keep a populace consistent with what it seemed to want sometime in the past."

Plainly enough, we have not yet gone that far in the United States. Yet the signs are equally plain and multiplying, that we are far along the road. There is scarcely a problem, no matter how local or personal, that the officials in Washington do not consider to be their proper province—juvenile delinquency, medical aid for old folks, smoking. At the same time we have seen the thunderous force of Presidential power used to reverse a price decision, followed by more than a few hints that direct wage and price controls may be in the offing. For the long-subsidized farmer, the planners would tighten the Federal leash.

And since the essence of liberalism is the assertion of Federal responsibility for everyone and everything, it is difficult indeed to see what is ultimately to prevent the full flowering of the all-encompassing, coercive state.

This trend puts two basic questions squarely before the country. If unlimited expansion of Government is what we the people really want, how do we propose to pay the enormous cost? It can only be done by much higher taxes or inflation or the two in tandem. However done, we suffocate the drive and ingenuity and progress that come from the free play of individual decisions.

The second question is why, in the land of liberty, we should want it. Why trade individual responsibilities and freedoms for the stale regulations of bureaucracy and the faceless conformity of collectivism? Why tear, and perhaps ultimately destroy, the precious fabric of our economic and political institutions that has clothed us so warmly? What kind of response is that to the threat of international communism?

It is not as though there were no alternative, that we are willy-nilly propelled along liberalism's illiberal road. The alternative is to check the headlong rush of Government, just as Jefferson and the others intended, and release into the Nation the powerful energies that lower Federal spending and lower taxation and greater freedom bring.

Admittedly, for the alternative to be practical it would have to be espoused by one of the parties or at least an important section of one of them. Perhaps most of all, it requires the ordinary commonsense to see through the intellectual and moral pretensions of contemporary liberalism and perceive its inevitable political destination.

Is There a Need for Medicare for the Aged?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, medicare for the aged has been of grave concern to me in all of my years in Congress. Truthfully, it has been uppermost in my work, my thoughts and my wishes. When I first came to Congress in 1943 my efforts succeeded in getting allotments from the Government for parents of sons and daughters in service. There were thousands of such cases. From these cases I learned of the sad condition facing many aged mothers and fathers and about their inability to afford proper medical care because of lack of money. Way back then I wondered what would happen to these mothers and fathers when these allotment checks stopped coming.

Whenever I toured the highways and byways of northern Wisconsin, the elderly were always among the first in the community to meet me. I have been in hundreds of their homes by invitation. They would talk over with me their problems. They would particularly mention how difficult it was for them financially whenever serious sickness struck them and they needed medicine, a doctor or a hospital bed. They worried about how they could hang on to their last possession—their home. Two out of every three of these elderly people had no income outside of social security or old age pension. These are the people who really made our Nation great. When I left their homes, I wondered why this should be in a Nation that plays Santa Claus to the rest of the world.

I know from seeing that many present State laws for help for the aged are old fashioned and just plain heartless. Nobody likes to be classed as a pauper. Yet, many of our State laws—Wisconsin has about the worst—compel the aged to become paupers before they can get an old-age pension or money for medicare. Yes, in a country that dishes out billions of so-called foreign aid to every Hottentot in the world our own aged must become paupers before they can get financial help. I have hundreds of cases in my files from the elderly which read something like this:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI: We are elderly people. We have a jalopy worth about $200. We have a home worth about $2,000. We have a garden for ourselves. This is all we have.
>
> My wife is ill and needs an operation. The doctor bill and hospital bill will be about $400. We applied for aid but they told us that unless we sell the jalopy and give up our home we cannot get any help.

Tragically, this is the law in about one-third of the States. We compel them to give up their last possessions—a home and a jalopy—before they can get financial assistance for medicare. To get medicare help the aged must become paupers in these States. Thus, they lose their last possessions; namely, their home, their dignity and their self-respect. Why should this be in a nation that gave away more than $130 billion in the last 17 years to bums, politicians, and plain grafters all over the world? Yes, even Communists all over the world got many of these billions of dollars. Just a few days ago Congress passed a foreign aid bill that provides money for Communists.

From personal experience I know of the need of medicare for the aged. My wife and I did not inherit any money. The fact is we had to pay the medicare bills of our mothers and fathers. We were lucky that we were able to do so. But as I paid those bills I often wondered what happened to mothers and fathers whose children had a hard time taking care of themselves and their own young children. So I know from personal experience how rough the cost of medicare for the aged is, not only on the elderly but on their children who themselves are having a rough time of making things go with taxes being what they are.

The average aged couple who retire find that the first operation, doctor and hospitals usually use up their savings. The second operation, doctor and hospital, usually uses up their insurance. The third operation, doctor, and hospital, usually uses up their home, their pride and their dignity, and they are wiped out completely and become wards of charity from then on. Medicare is expensive and the better it gets the more expensive it gets. Something must be done and done at once to meet these medicare costs for our aged people.

This country of ours which plays Santa Claus to the world is the only modern country in the world that doesn't have a complete plan of medicare for the aged. In fact our country has given billions of dollars to help other countries finance a medicare plan for the aged. Yet, our own country is backward in providing for our own aged. Is this not ridiculous? Yet it is the truth, sad as it seems.

In 1947 I gave my first speeches in Congress advocating a system of financing a medicare plan for the aged. That is 15 years ago. The Milwaukee newspapers labeled me as a socialist, a fanatic, a dreamer and a rabble rouser. Today, every Congressman, and Senator and the President realize that something must be done. In the last 2 years, more than 50 bills have been introduced in the House and Senate to bring medicare to the aged. This is a far cry from 15 years ago. Yes, it took 15 years for the Nation to wake up to the fact that there is a "must be done" on the problem of medicare for the aged. And, it will be done if the people separate the sheep from the goats—namely, those who really want medicare for the aged—from those who want to use the aged as a political football year after year.

WHAT ABOUT THE KING-ANDERSON BILL?

The most discussed plan has been the President's King-Anderson bill. This is the bill most publicized and the most discussed. Let us examine the President's King-Anderson bill.

Who would be covered? All those over 65 who are under social security; all those over 65 who are under railroad retirement.

These are the only people who would be covered by the President's King-Anderson bill. The King-Anderson bill would not help one iota where the help is needed most.

There are about 4 million over 65 who are in the worst financial shape who are not under social security or railroad retirement. These are the people who are the worst off of any people. Their only misfortune is that they were born too soon. None of these people would be covered by the President's King-Anderson bill. I feel that those over 65, not under social security or railroad retirement who are the worst off of any aged people should be included in whatever medicare plan that is passed.

WHAT BENEFITS WOULD THE PRESIDENT'S KING-ANDERSON BILL PROVIDE?

First. Hospital care up to 90 days. But the patient must pay $10 for every day of the first 9 days or $90. If patient stays in hospital 1 day he must pay the minimum of $20.

Second. Nursing home care, 120 days.

Third. Home health service, 240 visits a year.

Fourth. Outpatient diagnostic service, but patient must pay first $20 of every diagnostic study.

These are the only benefits that would be available under the President's King-Anderson bill. That is all. There are no other benefits in the bill whatever and anyone who says otherwise is deceiving the people. Doctors, dentists, surgeons, physicians' costs are not covered by the King-Anderson bill. Not one penny of King-Anderson money would be available for a doctor, dentist, surgeon, or physician. The patient would have to pay that, every penny of it. If the patient did not have the money the King-Anderson bill would not help him with these bills one iota.

Not one penny of King-Anderson bill money would be available for medicine and drugs outside of the hospital. Medicine and drugs used at home are not covered by this bill. The only medicine and drugs that would be paid for under this bill are the medicine and drugs used while you are in the hospital. After you leave the hospital you pay for medicine and drugs yourself under this bill.

To give you an idea of just what the President's King-Anderson bill would do for the aged, let us take an average elderly person. Based on the best figures available, here is what today's average medicare costs are for the aged each year and how much the President's King-Anderson bill would pay.

	Average each year	King-Anderson bill would pay
The average elderly person spends each year for—		
Physicians	$75	0
Hospital care	65	$40
Medicine	50	0
Dental	15	0
Diagnostic and other	20	0
Total	225	40

From a study of these figures one can see that the average elderly person over 65 who spends about $235 a year for medicare would be reimbursed by the King-Anderson bill to the tune of about $40. That is all. Even in the most catastrophic cases where there is a year-round patient and in need of medicare the year around under the King-Anderson bill only about 25 percent of the costs would be reimbursed by the King-Anderson bill. People who have studied the bill found it disappointing. Several who first wrote me thought that all their medicare costs would be taken care of. They were disappointed when I sent them a copy of the bill with proper explanation. It is interesting to note that those who actually studied the bill all wrote me that they were disappointed in the bill after hearing so much about what it would do. The King-Anderson is not a medicare bill at all. It is merely a partial hospital bill and nothing more.

WHO WOULD PAY THE COST OF MEDICARE UNDER THE KING-ANDERSON BILL?

Under this bill there would be a half-cent increase in railroad retirement and social security taxes. That is one-fourth of a cent payroll tax would be paid by the employee and one-fourth of a cent payroll tax would be paid by the employer.

Under the King-Anderson bill, 90 percent of the almost $2 billion needed would be paid by the working people of our country. Ninety percent of this $2 billion would be paid by those whose salaries are below $12,000 a year. The poorest people would pay the lion's share. The rich would escape completely. The following people would not pay a dime in taxes for this program under the King-Anderson bill:

One. Those who inherit fortunes.

Two. Those who clip coupons and live on big, fat dividends.

Three. Those who make thousands in tax-exempt Government bonds.

Four. Three million Federal Government employees including Congressmen and Senators, Cabinet members and other high paying officers, including the President.

Five. Those who make millions on the stock market.

Six. Speculators and manipulators.

Seven. Those who make fortunes on appreciation of holdings and hundreds of thousands of others, most able to pay.

In short, only the poorest people of our country would be taxed. The richest people would go scot free. Only those workers under social security and railroad retirement would be taxed for this program. Everyone else gets by for free.

WHAT WOULD TAXES BE LIKE

Here is what the taxes on the working people would be like if the King-Anderson bill were to become law:

If the King-Anderson is enacted

[$5,200 earnings base]

Year	Total rate per employee	Tax paid by employee	Tax paid by employer	Total tax per employee
	Percent			
1962	6¾	$175.50	$175.50	$351
1963	7¾	201.50	201.50	403
1966	8¾	227.50	227.50	455
1968	9¾	253.50	253.50	507

In an interview published recently in U.S. News & World Report, Secretary Ribicoff was quoted as follows:

> Under the tax schedule of the present Social Security Act you will get up to 9¼ percent for the employer and the employee combined in 1968. You add to this one-half of 1 percent for medical care for the aging under social security, and you've about hit the top of 10 percent. I don't think people will go for more than 10 percent.

The railroad retirement tax would be increased on the working people from 14½ to 15 percent—7½ percent to be paid by the worker and 7½ percent to be paid by the employer.

Few people realize that social security tax and railroad retirement taxes are the most undemocratic taxes in America. A workingman with four children who earns $4,000 a year pays no Federal income tax. Under the King-Anderson bill, this same workingman in 1968 will be paying $190 as his share of social security taxes. The social security tax would be levied upon the first $5,200 of worker's earnings. The social security tax allows no deductions or exemptions. Social security taxes in 1968 for a workingman will be far more than his income taxes. A workingman making $5,200 a year will pay the same amount of social security taxes, namely $253.50, as a Ford, a Rockefeller, or a millionaire making a million dollars a year. The social security tax is a tax on those least able to pay and a bonanza for those most able to pay. Yet, the King-Anderson bill would load the cost of medicare on the backs of these same working people in order that the rich and those who inherit fortunes can "steal home" free again.

MEDICARE SHOULD BE PAID BY ALL

Medicare for the aged is a national problem, a problem of all the people. Medicare for the aged to me is as important as national defense or education. Yet, we do not tax just the working people to pay for national defense or education. Of course not. We tax everybody for these purposes and tax them on a real democratic basis—the ability to pay. Medicare for the aged should be put on the same basis and not forced on the backs of just the working people of our country.

SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD BE PRESERVED FOR RETIREMENT ONLY

There is a serious question if the social security program can be harnessed with medicare. Just for the inadequate retirement benefits under present social security program, the social security taxes by 1968 will reach 9¼ percent of wages earned. Yet, everyone who knows wants to be honest about it, that there must be increases in social security benefits to keep up with the cost of living. Present minimum social security benefits of $40 per month are ridiculous. Who can retire on $40 a month? Yes, many wives, survivors and dependents are getting even less than $40 a month. Some social security checks are so small they are hardly worth the cost of issuance and cashing.

There is no question whatever that benefits under social security should and must be increased to really make it a retirement program. To be anywhere near adequate social security benefits should be raised to $75 a month minimum. If we look ahead we also know that soon social security retirement eligibility with full benefits will be reduced to 62 years for men and 60 years for women. Also, we must realize that disability benefits under social security are too strict. One must be almost three-quarters dead and call the undertaker before you qualify for social security disability benefits under the present law.

Just these improvements under social security retirement will mean increased social security taxes. In the near future to make social security a really and truly retirement program, these things must and will be done. To accomplish this social security taxes just for retirement purposes are going to be raised to 10 percent of wages earned. This is the maximum tax that social security can stand. Every expert agrees that if social security taxes exceed 10 percent the system is in danger of breaking down completely and will meet with strong resistance from workers under social security system.

The truth is that our social security system must be preserved for retirement purposes only. If we saddle the social security program with medicare and other things we are endangering the whole retirement system. If we leave politics out and really examine our conscience these are truths that are so clear that only the stubborn and selfish politician will deny.

MEDICARE MUST BE FINANCED OUTSIDE SOCIAL SECURITY

Medicare, therefore, must be financed separately from our social security program. It can be done and it must be done. Only the stubborn and selfish politicians will deny this. And if reasonable people whose true interest is medicare and not selfish politics will demand honest effort in this direction, this can be accomplished without delay. Under all considerations, it should not take longer than next spring of 1963 to adopt an honest, all-coverage plan of medicare for our elderly citizens.

And we can do it, for the most part, by reducing taxes and not increasing taxes. Everyone is now talking about tax reduction. There is no question but what there will be a program of tax reduction. There is no better time to consider medicare than now. Tax reduction and medicare for the aged can be accomplished in the same bill. And it will be adopted if the people get busy and demand it. Now is the time for you who really believe in honest medicare—not politics—to hit and hit hard.

MEDICARE FOR THE AGED MUST BE ACCOMPLISHED IN SEVERAL WAYS

Here are just a few of the ways it can be accomplished:

First, give tax exemption to sons and daughters for every dollar they spend for medicine, hospital, nurses, dental care, or doctors for their parents. Right now I have in my files more than a hundred cases where the Internal Revenue Service is denying tax exemption to sons and daughters who paid medicare bills for their parents and demanding additional taxpayments. Under present law, unless a son or daughter provides at least 51 percent of the living costs of a parent they cannot deduct such payments as deductions. If a son or daughter pays a parent's doctor bill or a hospital bill of $400, they cannot deduct this for tax purposes unless they prove they contributed at least 51 percent to the support of that parent. Therefore, if that parent gets an old-age pension or social security check of $40 a month, the son or daughter must pay income taxes on the $400 they pay on the parent's medicare bills. While we are now in the process of reducing taxes a change in the law giving sons and daughters a tax reduction for every dollar they spend for medicare for their parents; it will go a long way in helping aged parents in getting help for medical expenses. There are many sons and daughters who want to help their parents. The least the Government can do is to give these people proper tax deduction for these payments. Presently these sons and daughters are harassed by the taxmen for helping their parents. That is the injustice in the present law.

Second, why not permit aged parents to deduct cost of hospital and medical insurance from their tax due the Federal Government? Under present law it can be used as a deduction on income. Why not change the law to give a deduction from income taxes due? This will go a long way in enabling the aged to pay for their own hospital and medical insurance. This can be done in the present tax reduction bill now being considered.

Third, why not permit sons and daughters to deduct cost of hospital and medical insurance for their parents from their tax due the Federal Government? Under present law, they cannot even deduct it from their income unless they contribute at least 51 percent to the support of their parents. Why not change the law to give a tax deduction from income taxes due to all children who buy a hospital and medical insurance policy for their parents? Any son or daughter worth his or her salt would rather buy a good medical and hospital insurance policy for their parents than give it to Uncle Sam who fritters money all over the world like a drunken sailor. This can be done in the present tax reduction bill now being considered.

Fourth, there are too many shyster insurance companies in existence that should not be in existence. I have several score cases in my files where aged people carried a hospital and medical insurance policy for years. Then when they reach 65 and need it most these companies raise the rates beyond reason hoping the policy will be dropped and if not dropped, these insurance companies cancel the policy. These insurance companies should be closed for the good of all the people. The Federal Government should take a hand in this and weed out these insurance companies who are in business not to serve the public but only to make money. Any insurance company in business that insures only people who they think a safe risk medically should not be permitted to bamboozle the aged people.

Fifth, why limit aged people to earning only $1,200 a year above social security or other retirement benefits. Some of these aged people could and want to earn more so that they can pay for their own medical and hospital expenses. If we would raise the limit to $1,800 for single people and $2,400 for a married couple, there would be a great number of aged people who could and want very much to pay their own way. There is no reason under the sun why these limits should not be raised to enable these aged people to earn more. It is sheer foolishness for the Government to limit the income of the aged to a point where they cannot afford to pay their own way. There is no reason under the sun why these limits should not be raised to enable these aged people to earn more. It is sheer foolishness for the Government to limit the income of the aged to a point where they cannot afford to pay for their own medicare. It just does not make sense.

Sixth, present minimum social security benefits are not adequate. Who can live on $40 a month minimum? Many wives of elderly people receive even less. In fact so much less that it is hardly worthwhile. These low payments are a sad reflection on our social security system. Minimum social security benefits should be near $75 a month. If this were done, many of the elderly would be glad to pay for medicare and most of all they could afford to pay for their own insurance. If we made a truly adequate retirement plan out of our social security system and railroad retirement system it would go a long way in enabling many of our elderly to buy medical insurance and meet the costs of medicare. We are going to have to raise these minimum benefits eventually—why not do it now to help the aged. This would have an immediate and instant effect in enabling the elderly to meet the costs of medicare. These benefits could be immediate and direct without setting up another bureaucracy.

Seventh, all States should repeal the pauper law or what they call the lien law. Wisconsin has about the worst law of this kind on its books. This is a hangover from the poor farm days. Congress should withhold every dollar of aid from any State until they repeal these vicious and Judas regulations. I am glad that Congress has started in this direction. In 1960 Congress passed a law giving additional millions to States for medicare for the aged. Wisconsin could get many millions of dollars from the Federal Government to help aged people with medicare. But Wisconsin would have to repeal its vicious lien law in order to get their money. If Wisconsin would repeal its lien law—or pauper law—Wisconsin could get 55 percent of every dollar they spend for medicare for the aged as a free grant from the Federal Government. The State of Wisconsin has done nothing to get these Federal grants. Millions of dollars are waiting in Washington for Wisconsin. But Wisconsin fiddles and faddles while their State officers shed crocodile tears for the aged.

Eighth, many States have liberalized minimum standards so that aged people need not become paupers to get medicare financing. Some States permit the aged to keep a $7,000 home; another $2,500 in personal possessions such as furniture and a car; a $1,000 insurance policy for burial purposes; and an income of $1,200 per year if single and $1,800 a year if married and still get State help for medicare. This is a humane pattern that more and more States are switching to. Every State in the Union should work in this direction. If Wisconsin does this, the Federal Government stands ready to pay 55 percent of the cost of such a program. That money has been available in Washington, D.C., since September 1960. But the State of Wisconsin has not lifted a finger in this direction. People of Wisconsin better do something about this and the sooner the better.

Ninth, the State of Colorado has a medicare system for the aged that has worked wonders. The State insures those aged who cannot afford medical and hospital insurance. This insurance covers, medicine, hospital, doctors and nurses and dental expenses. The State of Colorado insures with a nonprofit insurance company. The entire cost of the insurance is paid by the State. Under this program 53 percent of the money spent is a grant from the Federal Government. Wisconsin can and should do the same. If Colorado can do it, Wisconsin can if the citizens demand that it be done. Wisconsin used to be a progressive State. Wisconsin usually took the lead in humane treatment of all its people. But the past few years Wisconsin has been on the tail end of progressive laws. Colorado gets 53 percent of the cost from Washington. Wisconsin can get 55 percent of the cost from Washington.

Why tax retirement benefits, annuities and pensions the way we do? Present Federal tax laws are so high that aged people must pay income taxes on retirement benefits, annuities, and pensions. After these taxes there is little left for the aged to live on let alone pay medical bills. Why not permit the aged a tax exemption on pensions, annuities, and retirement benefits of $2,000 if single and $3,000 if married beginning with age 65. If we did that many millions of our aged would be left with enough money to buy real medicare insurance and pay the rest of their medicare expenses. Why not do this in the tax reduction bill now being considered?

There is no reason in existence why every aged person who needs medical or hospital insurance should not be provided with that insurance if they are not in a position to finance it. And they should not give up their last possessions such as a home, a jalopy or their meager life insurance to get it. Since September 1960 the Federal Government has been ready to foot 55 percent of the cost of such a program for Wisconsin. The leaders of some States who shout loud and long about the needs of the aged have done nothing about it. It is time they did something besides talk.

IT'S A SIN TO DECEIVE THE AGED

But the thing to remember most is this: it is a sin and a shame to mislead aged people to believe that if the King-Anderson bill is passed all of their troubles are over and all their medicine, doctors, hospital, nurses and dental bills will be paid. It is the worst kind of deceit preying upon the miseries of the aged. It is deceit that is not worthy of men in public office. Because it just is not true. At best the King-Anderson bill would pay only 25 percent of the hospital expenses of the most catastrophic cases—and not one penny for home medicine or doctor's or dental services. And even for these meager benefits the King-Anderson bill would not cover in any way the 4 million elderly who need help the most. Their sin is they were born too soon to get under social security or railroad retirement.

Medicare for the aged must be approached from all sides as outlined above. Any politician who stubbornly says you take the King-Anderson bill or you get nothing is putting politics first and the welfare of the aged last. Any politician who is not willing to change the King-Anderson bill so that all aged people are covered is playing politics and has no real concern for the aged. Any politician who is not willing to change the King-Anderson bill so that all people pay taxes for the program, not just those under social security and railroad retirement, is thinking of politics—not the aged. Any politician who does not want the King-Anderson bill changed so that doctor bills and medicine will be paid, not just part of the hospital bill, is likewise thinking more of deceiving the aged rather than helping them.

Why should just working people be taxed to pay for 90 percent of the cost of medicare? How about the rich? Is it not their responsibility too? Any politician who is not willing to compromise in order to get all the aged covered, in order to get wider benefits, in order to get those who can afford taxes to pay taxes to support the program is really not interested in medicare. Such people are interested only in creating a political issue, a political football, so that they can prey upon the miseries of the aged because there are 20 million of them and that is a lot of votes. Their hearts would be broken if a real plan of medicare for the aged really became law. What would there be to talk about in the coming election?

I say medicare for the aged is a must. It is long overdue. I have been advocating such since 1947. I want medicare for the aged. I do not want the politics behind it. No one single plan or bill is going to do the job and do it right. It must be achieved by a combination of plans as I outlined above. If the people stop being fooled and insist that the job be done, it will be done. Make no mistake about that.

Multer, Martin, and Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him on the House Committee on Banking and Currency are aware that, on the subject of money, few men are as knowledgeable as our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. MULTER]. I believe the recent article which appeared in the Weekly Bond Buyer presents a searching and balanced review of a contentious problem on which Mr. MULTER is especially well informed. I am pleased to insert it for the information of the membership:

[From the Weekly Bond Buyer, July 30, 1962]

WASHINGTON PERSPECTIVE—THE RESERVE RATIO: A MONETARY GNAT

(By John Gerrity)

WASHINGTON.—For the past 3 years—since gold and its undulations achieved a point of primacy in the concerns of money managers here and abroad—omnipresent has been the knowledge that sooner or later changes in the rules governing the gold cover were inevitable.

Like youngsters hard at play but ever watchful for that inescapable curfew that marks the end of a day, monetary experts have known that their "day," as it now exists, must also come to an end.

In the case of gold and the professional money managers who deal in it, one "curfew" is the reserve ratio—the relatively obscure statistic that reflects this Nation's gold stocks in relation to Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities—that by law is now set at 25 percent.

Today that ratio is 33.9 percent—some 8.9 percentage points above the legal limit, and presumed by many to be still a safe and comfortable margin.

A year ago, however, the ratio was 37.9 percent, and the cushion then of 12.9 percentage points was even more comfortable and reassuring.

THREE AND ONE-HALF POINT SHORTFALL

Two months ago, it was 34.4 percent, a shortfall in comfort, in a manner of speaking, of 3.5 percentage points in the space of less than a year.

In the last 2 months—and during a period when for 7 consecutive weeks the Nation's gold stocks remained virtually unchanged—the ratio has declined by 0.8 percentage point, or roughly two-tenths of a percentage point each week if proper allowance is made for the nearly 2 months during which the United States lost no gold.

If a rate of decline of two-tenths of a point each week were to continue for, say, a year, the actual ratio between gold stocks and Federal note and deposit liabilities would pierce the legal limits, sliding to a level of 23.8 percent, or roughly a full percentage point below the legal limit.

If, on the other hand, this same rate of decline were to continue only for 6 months, the ratio would inch so close to the legal limit that an alarm, in effect, would be automatically sounded.

Here at home, monetary officials would be constrained to act, either by suspending temporarily the legal ratio, as the Federal Reserve Board is empowered to do, or by banishing the ratio entirely through act of Congress.

DECLINE TO CONTINUE

That the ratio will continue its inexorable downward march, which began just about a decade ago, is virtually an absolute certainty.

The reserve ratio declines when gold stocks decline. It also declines when Federal Reserve liabilities rise. When both forces are at play, the rate of decline in the ratio is, of course, accelerated.

Even if gold losses were to cease entirely, a pleasant but implausible possibility should the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit be supplanted by a balance or a small surplus, the decline in the reserve ratio would continue, though doubtless at a slower rate.

For there is no gainsaying the fact that, in secular terms, it may be assumed the Nation's economy will continue to grow. And, with that growth, there is bound to be an increase in the magnitude of Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities against gold reserves, which, though not static, are added to by new supplies at a very slow rate.

Consequently, there has arisen among knowledgeable experts in the domestic and foreign money markets considerable discussion over how long the ratio, as it now stands, will continue to exist.

CHANGE IN SIGHT?

They are convinced that by one method or another the United States will change the present legal requirement well in advance of the actual time of arrival of the 25-percent limit. In short, they contend that the United States cannot wait until the absolute final moment before adopting some alternative.

Some conjectures place this moment of action at the time when the reserve ratio reaches 30 percent—a scant 3.9 percent distant from today's ratio of 33.9 percent—or, said another way, about 4½ months from now, if the rate of decline of 0.2 percentage point per week continues unabated.

Others say that the United States may safely wait until the ratio reaches 28 percent. And still more, others say that the time to act is now, particularly if the rate of decline were to be accelerated for any reason, with the result that the so-called danger zone might be entered at a time when Congress was not in session.

Several weeks ago, in one of his press conferences, President Kennedy called for vigorous dialog among disputants on the major issues of the day. Of itself the reserve ratio, a mere statistic in a welter of others, and its ultimate fate, is not a major issue.

But the implications and conclusions that would be drawn from changing or eliminating the reserve ratio, both at home and abroad, do constitute major issues.

To many foreigners, and to many domestic money managers, alterations in the legal requirement would tend to sustain other reasonings that bespeak a lack of confidence in the dollar.

MANAGED MONEY STANDARDS

To Americans primarily, the total abrogation of the reserve ratio would be the final fillip of a movement started nearly three decades ago, when the United States went off the gold standard. To them it would mean the unclouded dawn of the day of managed money, albeit that day has, in fact, long since dawned in many respects.

Every American official of notable stature—the President, his Secretary of the Treasury, his principal economic advisers, the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, and Members of Congress who devote much of their energies to money matters—are in general agreement that the reserve ratio is not very useful and that in time it should be abolished.

When and how to abolish it, however, is quite a different matter.

Until recently, the Treasury has gingerly sidestepped the question whenever it arose, saying, in effect, "This is not the appropriate time to consider this reserve ratio; it doesn't enter our current planning; and at another time, when other more pressing matters relating to gold movements and the balance of payments are resolved, then the question of the reserve ratio may be considered.

MARTIN-MULTER COLLOQUY

Two weeks ago, at a hearing of the House Banking Committee, a brief colloquy sprang up between Chairman William McChesney Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, and New York's Abraham Multer, one of most respected students of finance in Congress.

Under discussion was a bill to permit commercial banks to pay higher interest rates on the time and savings deposits of foreign central banks and foreign governments.

"I don't suppose," said Representative Multer, "that you would care to recommend enlarging this present bill by the inclusion of the provisions relating to the reserve ratio, now contained in H.R. 6900."

"No," said Mr. Martin, "this is not the time, nor are other related conditions such that it would be wise to take up the reserve ratio now."

With that brief exchange the colloquy ended. Talk turned to the bill at hand, and neither Mr. Multer explained why he raised his question, nor did Mr. Martin volunteer any more information as to why he did not think this was the proper time to consider the reserve ratio.

Accordingly, what follows below represents what President Kennedy might call a useful dialog—a continuation of the colloquy that met a swift elliptical hiatus at the hearings:

MULTER'S VIEWS

To Mr. Multer, the reserve ratio is little more than a fiction—a needless fiction that serves more to confuse than it does to safeguard the domestic currency and economy from manipulation, or as an effective brake on the outflows of gold.

"Once," he says, "U.S. gold reserve laws had meaning when the Nation operated under the gold standard, and individuals could own gold. Actual boxes of physical gold were shipped in and out of the country, depending on prices offered for the gold in the various markets.

"This movement, in turn, affected bank reserves, the volume of currency, and the country's economic position.

"But for years, we have not operated under the gold standard," he continues, "and today our gold reserve laws are a meaningless economic fiction.

"Today, there are outstanding Federal Reserve bank obligations, exclusive of capital accounts, of $29.8 billion against which the Federal Reserve banks have a gold reserve of $16.3 billion. Under existing law, the Federal Reserve System could run the total of currency and deposits up to more than $65 billion on the basis of the $16.3 billion gold reserve.

"In other words," he says, "the Federal Reserve notes could be increased from $29.8 billion to $65.2 billion.

"No one has suggested that that be done. I am certain that there is no intention to do so. Imagine what would happen to the value of capital and labor if we suddenly increased the quantity of currency in circulation by $35.5 billion.

"This, then, is the case against requiring a gold reserve on the domestic scene, and in favor of repealing the law requiring it."

FOREIGN CLAIMS

As for foreign claims against the dollar and a possible adverse effect on the balance of payments, Mr. Multer says categorically that repeal of the reserve ratio law would "neither affect the balance of payments nor cause a run on our gold."

He points out that no individual and no corporation—American or foreign—can demand gold from the United States.

"Foreign governments and foreign central banks, that is, government banks, have a right to demand settlement of their claims against the United States in gold.

"We can satisfy such claims with gold or with the currency of that country making the claim," he says. "By repealing a sterile and useless domestic gold reserve requirement, we have available to meet foreign claims a total of about $16.298 billion.

"The total amount, private and government, of foreign claims," he adds, "is only $20 billion, and not more than half of it is foreign government. Our gold stock is almost double that amount. In addition, we have a right to call on the International Monetary Fund for the use of $4.125 billion in gold.

"That much we can get as of right now. We can borrow as much more, if necessary. But how could we possibly need it? And for what?"

Mr. Multer contends that the current obsession in respect to gold movements has completely obscured other factors relating to the balance of payments and to our economy that are of far greater significance.

"Over and above foreign claims against the United States," he says, "Americans own investments in foreign countries in excess of $50 billion. All of it is earning profits for Americans. Some of the earnings and of the capital is being repatriated every year.

"Those who argue we must have a gold reserve to prevent printing excessive quantities of paper money, completely ignore the fact that it is the law, as made by Congress and approved by the President, and not the quantity or quality or fineness of gold, which determines how much and what kind of paper money should be issued in this country."

SCOFFS AT GOLD STANDARDISTS

He scoffs at those who argue that the United States should return to the gold standard and devalue the dollar; "that is, increase the price of gold from $35 to $70 an ounce, or to any other figure." And, if this were tried, he says, it could not be done unilaterally but only in accord with the major "hard currency" nations of the world "else we upset the world currencies."

"If that is what we must do, why waste time with such mathematical gymnastics?" he asks.

"If we double the value of gold and thereby cut the dollar in half, and do the same to the British pound sterling, and the German mark, and the French franc, and the Italian lira, what have we accomplished?

"Look at the windfall we create for the country that will not enter into so foolish an international agreement—'fiasco' would be a better word.

"Would the Swiss bankers join us in such a move? I doubt it," he states.

"Would the Russians? You can bet your last dollar they would not.

"Half the world's gold is owned by the Russians. For every dollar we add to the price of gold, we add a dollar to the value of the Russian hoard.

"Double the world price of gold, and the Russians can buy or destroy the economy of the free world with the gold they now have on hand."

REPEAL LONG OVERDUE

Mr. Multer says that the time for repealing the gold reserve ratio law is long overdue. Not now, nor in the future, he says, does the economic stability of the United States depend upon so fragile a device as the reserve ratio, or indeed, gold itself.

"Our economy, every sound economy," he says, "must depend upon the production of our farms and our factories. The dollar protects itself, when we protect our economy."

Accordingly, he disputes the contention of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System that the United States should bide its time and delay abolishing the reserve ratio, until a happier picture in the balance of payments is at hand.

He points out that last year, when hearings on his bill, H.R. 6900, were postponed because the "balance-of-payments deficit and the factors affecting it were too sensitive" to permit any tampering with the reserve ratio, the deficit was running at an annual rate of $2.5 billion.

"Now," he says, "we have about halved that annual rate. Yet the time is still not ripe to abolish the fiction of the ratio."

Mr. Multer echoes President Kennedy when he says, as he did at his latest press conference, "We can end our balance-of-payments deficit any time we choose, simply by cutting back the outlays for military and foreign aid to the point where they don't exceed our trade surplus."

In fact, Mr. Multer goes even further: "We hold now—and will continue to hold—total control of our balance of payments. We can exercise that control whenever we choose to. We are the most powerful, the healthiest economy in the world. No single nation in the world today nor any likely concert of nations would be willing—or able—to deny us whatever reasonable course we decide to adopt.

"To discuss the importance and usefulness of the reserve ratio in the same breath as we discuss the power and real strength of the U.S. economy is to speak of giants and pygmies.

"They are incompatible."

MARTIN'S VIEWS

So far as the general strength of the economy is concerned, and as for the relative unimportance of the gold "cover," Mr. Martin is substantially en rapport with Mr. Multer.

In only two areas does he disagree sharply with the New York legislator. One has to do with the actual timing of the repealer for the reserve ratio law. The other—and here Mr. Martin speaks mainly as a technician—relates to the probable size of future gold movements and what their overall import may be.

He, too, dismisses any talk of devaluation or reevaluation as being nonsense. Similarly, he agrees with the President and with Mr. Multer that the balance-of-payments problem, as it is now understood, could be erased almost overnight, should the United States decide to do so.

He also agrees that vast improvements have been made in the past year in eliminating the illiquidity in U.S. accounts, although he retains some reservations as to whether the deficit at the end of 1962 will be something less than $1.5 billion, as the President, Mr. Multer, Treasury Under Secretary Robert V. Roosa, and other experts now confidently predict.

TIMING THE REPEALER

As for the timing of the repealer, the Chairman says: "Under our present system, of our total gold stocks of some $16 billion plus, roughly $11 billion is earmarked as cover for Federal Reserve notes and deposits.

"The balance, or about $5 billion, is several times more than we would require under the most strained circumstances we can foresee or imagine now that would arise if foreign claimants were to demand gold.

"I think," the Chairman says, "we would be remiss, if we were to permit ourselves to become overly optimistic, however, over the results of our performance in respect to gold in the past 2 months.

"After all, we owe a good deal of the robustness of our current gold situation to the fact that earlier in the year we acquired $300 million in gold from Canada. We exchanged dollars for that gold for the simple reason Canada at the time preferred U.S. dollars to gold, and so we bought it.

"Now, however, it would be worse than naive to ignore the strong probability that the reverse will soon be the order of things. U.S. tourists by the thousands will be visiting and spending in Canada. The number of Canadian tourists visiting the United States will be meager by comparison.

"U.S. exports to Canada will certainly dwindle, while Canadian exports to the United States will increase tremendously. The movement of capital will be reversed—and all the factors that heretofore tended to build a surplus for the United States, in United States-Canadian trade and transactions, will now work in favor of building a Canadian surplus."

REVIVAL OF GOLD OUTFLOWS

Mr. Martin points out that the next 6 weeks—"and this is invariably the case before International Monetary Fund and World Bank meetings"—will most certainly produce a revival of gold outflows, and in very sizable proportions.

"I'm not anticipating a run, but I would most certainly be derelict in my present job here," he says, "if I were to rule out the possibility of a gold run on the United States within the next couple of months or so.

"While dollar conversions will be large, particularly by the Swiss, Belgians, and very possibly the Germans and the French, they will not be so large as to force us to change our present calculations to cover the probable losses."

Mr. Martin contends that the question of when the gold "cover" should be abolished by law can only be a matter of "judgment." He concedes that time may prove Mr. MULTER's judgment of today to be better than his.

But, by the gentlest of implication, he suggests that if Mr. MULTER were to enjoy the same technical advantages that are his solely by virtue of being the head of America's central bank, Mr. MULTER's judgment might veer closer to Mr. Martin's than his would toward Mr. MULTER.

"Suppose," says Mr. Martin, "that the committee decides to tack on to the bill making higher interest rates on foreign deposits permissive, the repeal of the reserve ratio at a time when the demands on our gold stocks are heaviest.

"To propose such legislation at such a time, with its certain adverse effects on foreign confidence in the dollar, would be little short of being irresponsible.

"I have no doubt," he adds, "that to propose a repealer for the reserve ratio at that time would add greatly to the confusion and do much to generate a new wave of lack of confidence.

REPEAL NEXT SPRING?

"This is especially true," he continues, "in light of the fact that we certainly have ample gold stocks to withstand virtually any sort of drain until such time as we can take up the repealer in an orderly, deliberative manner—say, next April or May, when the temper of Congress will be far different than it is now at the tail end of a session."

He makes another point, a rather unusual one from a professional banker, who, without batting an eye, disavows solemnly any real awareness of the fine art of politics.

"Suppose again," he says, "the President were to send up a request 3 weeks or a month from now for the repealer, and then consider the way this Congress has been behaving.

"They have set him back on his heels on several occasions. This is an election year. No matter the merits of any issue, there is always the possibility that a balky, noncooperative Congress might just seize upon the President's request as another fine opportunity to rough him up a little.

"Then, imagine the results, especially from the perspective of foreigners. The risks and difficulties would be more than doubled. They would be compounded.

"Not only would the President's request be interpreted in many quarters as being tantamount to an admission of the growing weakness of the dollar, but a refusal by Congress to go along with his request would be further interpreted to mean that Congress lacked faith in his custodianship of the economy and the worth of the dollar.

"This is not merely a matter of Republicans opposing a Democratic administration, although there would be a large element of that in it, if only for political reasons now," he says.

TAFT'S LEADERSHIP

"In less tense political times, when the climate on the Hill is more serene than it is today, I have no doubt that many Republicans will support the President in this. After all, you must remember, it was Senator Bob Taft who led the fight to cut the reserve ratio from 40 to 25 percent.

"Given the best possible circumstances—and they can be attained—Congress, I am sure, will approach this issue largely in a nonpartisan way."

Mr. Martin adds another observation, so obvious that it is often overlooked.

EUROPEAN PRESS HOSTILITY

He points out that the hostility of the European press—"not just the London press, in Paris, in Rome, in Brussels, in fact everywhere"—to American efforts to right their financial difficulties is "downright rampant."

He has every confidence that "our educational efforts in the past few years" have convinced the central bankers of Europe that the United States is following the right course.

But, Mr. Martin is not so naive, nor are his thoughts disguised when he talks of this, to assume that the central bankers of Europe are any less impregnable to domestic internal pressures than are bankers anywhere.

Try as they will and do to remain aloof from such pressures, "the almost constant drumming," as he says, "of the assertion that the United States is going to devalue in 90 days or 100 days or in 180 days is bound to have some effect.

"We would do ourselves little good and much harm if we were to help feed those propaganda fires now by so unwise an act as to try to eliminate the reserve ratio at this untimely moment.

"This is not the time, nor is the atmosphere favorable to run the risk of a storm that will most certainly result if we strive for a repealer of the reserve ratio now."

Philippine Rehabilitation Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11721) to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73 million for that purpose.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I voted in favor of H.R. 11721 and I am pleased that the House passed this bill that would discharge a moral obligation under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946.

The previous legislation, H.R. 8617, could well have provided an unjustified windfall and might not have accomplished the purpose for which it was intended.

H.R. 11721, on the other hand, overcomes this objection and requires that the beneficiaries must give proof that they already have or intend to use it in the rehabilitation of the Philippines. This is the heart of the problem.

We are fortunate to have the friendship of the people of the Philippines, who supported us so valiantly in the recent world conflict and this action on the part of the House will convey to them, in some small measure, our feeling of friendship and an example of our adherence to right moral principles.

Mexico and the Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent request previously granted, I am including an article which appeared in the News of Mexico City on July 18. This newspaper is an English-language daily published in Mexico City. The author of the article, Mr. Romero, comments upon our recent agreements with Mexico under the Alliance for Progress program.

UN MOMENTITO WITH PEPE ROMERO

MEXICO CITY.—Despite the time that has elapsed and despite the confusion which has arisen from the many different versions of the true nature of the supervised agricultural credit $20 million loan to Mexico by the United States, recently signed during President John Fitzgerald Kennedy's official visit to this country—the real story is still to be told.

It is that medium and long-range loans will be made to the agricultural sector in Mexico, and very important that Mexico will contribute one to one point five billion pesos, as its contribution to this program.

Published reports as far as I have been able to notice have made no mention whatsoever of Mexico's tremendous contribution to this program. Nor is it true that this important loan is simply routine. It is actually the result of many months of work between specialists of the United States and Mexico, to bring about an impact and immediate project under the Alianza Para el Progreso Pact—which Mexico and the United States signed at Punta del Este. The true spirit of the loan itself was lost in the shuffle of the varied interpretations. The truth is that it was inspired by the desire of the United States to put into effect a much needed project which will benefit the small Mexican farmer, and if I may say so, to provide work to thousands of hands who for so long have had to cross into the United States as wetbacks in search of harvesting employment. With this kind of spirit of cooperation under J.F.K.'s Alliance for Progress in reality and not in words alone, the $20 million U.S. agricultural loan and Mexico's cash participation will be an example to the free world of what such international teamwork can accomplish.

It seems also that the true nature of the Alliance for Progress has also been misunderstood. Each country which signed the Punta del Este agreement is called to mobilize every possible resource within its own country combined with external financing in order to complete the economic development plan of each Latin American country. Therefore, those who believe the Alliance for Progress is an all-year-round Christmas present from Uncle Sam—are distorting the facts and throwing a monkey wrench into the understanding of public opinion, which harms the dedicated efforts of specialists of the two countries who are working around the clock to crystalize the Alliance for Progress projects already on the march.

It is a source of pride that in this case, Mexico is in a position to provide part of the financing and the technical know-how, which will undoubtedly help make this venture a mutually successful completed action.

The realization of this agricultural endeavor—means that the authentic yet small Mexican farmer will be in a position to not only obtain credit to improve his farm but also for loans to harvest his crops. This farmer will be able to bring in irrigation and drainage; secure new equipment; obtain fertilizers and insecticides, etc., etc., etc., etc.—many dreams come true.

But hold your horses. Stop that tractor and listen: The great big thing about this loan is that it will get to the Mexican farmer at the low interest rate of 6 percent, a luxury which he has never been able to obtain before. Arriba the Alliance for Progress.

UN MOMENTITO.

Profits Are Not Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it has been my opinion that to get our economy growing and to improve the overall well-being of everyone, a better appreciation of our economic system would be helpful.

The Delaware State News, Dover, Del., on July 31, 1962, carried a guest editorial by Mr. Charles G. Mortimer, chairman of the General Foods Corp. This editorial was entitled "Profits Are Not Bad." I believe this editorial makes a valuable contribution to a better understanding of our economic system and the significance of profits.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFITS ARE NOT BAD

(By Charles G. Mortimer, chairman, General Foods Corp.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is a collection of statements made by Charles G. Mortimer, chairman of the board of General Foods, during his address at the annual General Foods stockholders meeting. The statements were chosen out of context to form this guest editorial. General Foods has proposed a 1,200 employee, multimillion-dollar plant just west of Dover, but no final decision has been made by the company as yet. Mr. Mortimer's remarks:)

What I want to talk to you about today transcends the interest we share as stockholders of General Foods in our own company's well-being. It is the stake we all have—186 million Americans—in bringing about a prompt turnabout in the widespread fallacious notion which persists that while our American profit system is good, the profits which make it possible are, somehow, bad if they exceed a bare minimum.

My remarks are dictated by my considered conviction that this misunderstanding and the consequent stigmatization of adequate profits constitute a grave and growing threat to the entire economic structure of our country and, therefore, to our very survival as a nation. This concern is by no means unshared. My point is that it needs to be shared much more widely and with more conviction by the American public.

It should be clear that I am not indulging in a lament about our own company's profit situation. Rather, I want to delineate the indispensable function of profits—and I use function in the most active sense of the word—in helping our national economy retain its outstanding and traditional characteristic of consistently being a rising economy. There can be no standing still—for nations any more than for individuals or businesses. Our national economy must move ahead or it will fall behind.

We need to dispel the most harmful of all the myths that have been handed down from the past—the myth which holds that conflict must exist between economic groups under capitalism. This belief is founded on another century's concept of capitalism. It utterly ignores the simple fact that what we have in the United States today is what has been aptly called a people's capitalism. Ours is a system in which the savings of millions of men and women in all walks of life provide the capital for investment in the various industries and businesses of America.

Like it or not, our profit system is on trial before the world today. To prove it is successful, we must shake our economy out of its current sluggishness. This will be a do-it-yourself job, and it begins with understanding.

We can do it if each of us will see clearly that he plays more than one role in our economy. I invite every American—regardless of his economic status—to look into what I visualize as a three-way mirror of good citizenship in which our over-all well-being is reflected.

The consumer is primarily interested in prices. He lives by them.

To the worker, wages are all-important. He lives on them.

The investor looks to profits. He lives because of them.

Business must live with, on, and by all three—prices, wages and profits.

Despite the fact that profits are generally regarded as merely something left over after consumption has been taken care of by production, that's not the way our economy works. Profits are vital to investment, and we must invest before we can produce and we must produce before we can consume.

Our economy moves forward only when both the investors' money and the workers' labor are combined efficiently to produce profitably what the consumer wants. This combination must provide:

Prices that represent value to the consumer.

The wherewithal for good wages for the worker.

An adequate reward for the investor for risking his funds.

And—of great importance—the capital so necessary for business expansion.

The simple truth, as we all know, is that profits—and only profits—provide the incentive for investors to continue investing and that undistributed earnings must be available for plowing back in the interests of keeping business modern and growing.

Unfortunately, John Q. Public is far more concerned about holding prices down and getting more wages for himself. He is not at all concerned about the level of corporate profits because he is looking into only one panel of the citizenship mirror. He does not understand that the favorable level of price he pays for a wanted item has frequently been made possible by the efficiency of the machines which made it. Nor does he grasp that it is only a sufficient profit which has made it possible to buy modern machines to replace obsolete ones.

Loose thinking about America's economy—especially with respect to the profit picture as it has deteriorated in the last 10 years—is as dangerous to our Nation's well-being as loose talk was during World War II.

For a short and long pull revival of the desired rate of economic growth, attended by growth in jobs and a better state of economic health, we need, of course, the currently promised fundamental revision of our tax laws. Such a revision will stimulate consumer confidence and spending on the one hand, and business confidence and investment for both the short and the long term. But this alone won't do the job. Combined with tax reform, we must also have an administration-sponsored drive to reduce Government spending in a sincere effort to cut costs.

In addition—and I think of transcendent importance—it is essential to accomplish a turnabout through understanding in the American public's attitude toward the essential function of profits in a growing economy.

Only through such an understanding can we bring about a lasting change in political policies, thus enabling us to end the profit anemia which has sapped our corporate vigor. A changed public attitude on this score will provide a turning point from which we can resume the lusty economic growth of which this Nation is entirely capable—beginning right now.

I would like to close with an analogy from our own food industry. We all know that the food the human body requires must contain a balance of certain basic nutrients if good health is to be maintained. When we fail to get enough of any important one, the result is ill health.

The economic body cannot survive without a balance of nutrients any more than the human body can. Profits are the protein of our national economy. Profits revitalize our economic body and insure its future growth.

We must bring about public understanding that a healthy, growing economy requires a balanced diet of competitive prices, good wages, fair profits, and sound investment.

To get our economy rolling, all we have to do is free profits from the isolation ward of American economic thinking.

Independence Day of Niger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excelleny the President of the Republic of Niger, Hamani Diori; and His Excellency the Nigerian Ambassador to the United States, Issoutou Saidou Djermakoye, on the occasion of the second anniversary of Niger's independence.

On August 3 we celebrate the second anniversary of the independence of Niger, a country south of the Sahara Desert which has been known to history since Roman times. Many peoples have lived in Niger during the past thousand years, forming great empires and kingdoms in a territory which extends from present-day Nigeria to the new state of Algeria. In the 17th century the Djerma migrated to Niger from the north, to mention only one of the illustrious tribes which successively inhabited the region. In the 19th century Europeans arrived on the scene, and the French civil administration was established in the 1890's. The combination of many different peoples who inhabit Niger is typical of the newly independent nations of Africa. The new nation is striving to preserve the identity of its peoples within the framework of a modern democratic state.

The final process leading to Niger independence started on September 28, 1958, when the peoples of Niger voted in favor of the constitution which offered it a choice of statuses. The political representatives of Niger chose to become a state in the French community, under the leadership of Mr. Hamani Diori. After the French community was transformed into a contractual association in 1960, the leaders of Niger signed agreements with the French Republic providing for its unconditional international sovereignty, and on August 3, 1960, the Republic of Niger proclaimed its independence. Niger took its place in the United Nations on September 20, 1960.

During the last 2 years this immense country in the heart of the African Continent has been striving hard to achieve political unity and national consciousness, to strengthen in its diverse peoples the idea of nationhood and a sense of common destiny. At the same time, spectacular progress has been made in social and cultural development. Elementary education has been made available to an increasing number of children who never before enjoyed the benefits of school. Medical facilities are being expanded, the battle against famine and malnutrition is pursued with vigor, and special attention is devoted to the agriculture and stockraising from which 94 percent of the people of Niger derive their income. Thus the difficult problems of industrialization are gradually being overcome.

The Republic of Niger is demonstrating to the world how a colonial administration can be succeeded by a modern democratic state. The Constitution of Niger reaffirms the Republic's attachment to the principle of democracy, human rights, and civil liberties. We in the United States welcomed the establishment of independence in Niger and we congratulate the young Republic on the second anniversary of its independence.

Independent Offices Appropriations Bill, 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12711) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, let us look at another aspect of FAA management.

The flying public has become quite accustomed to the commercial jetliner, and accepts as routine the fact that a passenger can have breakfast in New York and lunch in Los Angeles, with time to spare. We would feel inconvenienced to make such a trip in a DC-3, for example.

Yet, the air traffic control system, which grew like topsy around the DC-3, is still clumsily trying to grope with the problems introduced by modern jets—using DC-3 era equipment and procedures, and guided by unimaginative and stultifying DC-3 type management.

It is true that radar is being extensively used in air traffic control, thanks to the development efforts of our military services. However, the end product of radar is the display, and controllers today must attempt to track aircraft and avoid collisions using radar display equipment that was discarded by the Navy in 1945 as obsolete. Why? What has happened to the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated by Congress since 1957 to improve and provide ATC equipment? Why does FAA spend $3 million to build radiation proof, bomb proof showplaces—one of which was abandoned before they moved in—to house ATC centers, and then equip these centers with radar display equipment which was declared obsolete in 1945? What are we getting for our research dollars in air safety? Is there nothing better available? I think there is. I have personally visited military radar installations on land and sea, and observed vastly superior displays. Duplication by FAA of the research which went into this superior military equipment would not be so bad, if FAA had anything to show for their R. & D. efforts over the past 5 years.

I cite as another example of obsolete ATC equipment a device known as a mechanical interlock, used to provide coordination between traffic control centers and towers. This equipment first appeared in 1948, and was still in use as a means of passing information between the New York center and the Idlewild tower in December 1960. Indeed, this obsolete equipment appears to have played a key role in the midair collision between the DC-8 and Constellation over New York, December 16, 1960. The mechanical interlock equipment failed—but the failure was not apparent to the controller. As a result, valuable seconds were lost by the Idlewild tower controller, as he attempted to verify by telephone what the mechanical interlock equipment had failed to provide. What difference those precious seconds might have meant in the course of the ill-fated DC-8's flight must be left to history. The accident report, issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, leaves much to be desired, in the treatment of FAA's responsibility. Curiously enough, CAB permitted FAA to conduct its own investigation of the air traffic control role in this accident. The report dismisses the failure of the mechanical interlock as unimportant. Equally curious was the subsequent action of FAA in quietly removing this particular piece of obsolete equipment from service.

The approach of present FAA management seems to be one of insuring air safety by providing one FAA employee for each aircraft in the United States using the air traffic control system. In fiscal year 1963, FAA requested a total personnel strength of 47,751. Recent figures show that the commercial airline fleet now numbers approximately 1,800. We know that there are thousands of pleasure aircraft that never use the services of air traffic control. We also know that the commercial airline fleet comprises the majority of the workload in ATC. Does it really require 25 FAA employees for each commercial airline aircraft in this country?

The attitude of FAA management seems to be that aviation problems can be solved best by brute force. We know that FAA's research program, involving hundreds of millions over the past 5 years, is conspicuous by its lack of achievement. But is it not just possible that there are tried and proven equipments, developed by the military, which can be used in lieu of sheer manpower? Must FAA persist in clinging to outdated procedures and antiquated equipment?

In an effort to add more and more personnel, FAA has added to the terrific burden of the controller by increasing the coordination workload. The process of attempting to keep an excess number of controllers informed on the progress of flights, utilizing obsolete procedures and equipments, breaks down daily. Near misses are occurring daily as a result of this overstaffing—and yet the management of these 47,000 FAA employees is so inept that many controllers are still required to put in a full 8-hour day, without benefit of a scheduled lunch period.

I propose to continue my examination and discussion of this Agency in the hope that it can receive some much-needed attention in the interest of improving the development and safety of air travel in the United States.

The Long Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Post of July 31. The editorial wisely distinguishes the Senate communications satellite bill filibuster from the Southern intransigence on civil rights. The New York Post points out that the real purpose of the satellite debate is to obtain "reasonable time on a measure that deserves far wider national understanding and debate."

THE FUTURE OF THE SKY

The case made by a lonely bloc of liberal Senators in favor of public ownership of the communications satellite system is a compelling one. It has received far too little national attention.

Their effort to delay a vote on the issue raises other questions. The indignantly uninformed, some newspapermen among them, charge that they are engaged in an old-fashioned filibuster, manipulating Dixiecrat means to their own ends. If one looks at the record, and particularly that part of it not chronicled widely in most of the press, that issue becomes much more complicated. More about that in a moment.

We find no great complexity in dealing with the substantive issue. We agree with the liberal holdouts that a publicly developed and financed technology should not be used to orbit a private monopoly into space. Our earlier convictions have been reinforced by the report that there is already a cold war dispute over the assignment of satellite frequencies. Shall the profit position of A.T. & T. be a major element in delicate international negotiations on such problems? (The suggestion of A.T. & T. influence is not farfetched; there are already reports that one Government program was canceled because it did not fit into the private plans of the corporate giant.)

Despite our commitment to public ownership of the system, we would not gaily support a conventional filibuster to win the point. When a minority paralyzes the democratic process, that is bad news, whether the willful band is Dixiecrat or liberal. But the tactical issue in this case is not a simple matter of filibuster and the true details have been widely unreported.

Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, a leader of the liberal dissenters, has consistently made it plain that he and his colleagues are not seeking to block a vote indefinitely on the administration bill. They want time for public debate. They see no rational argument for a legislative stampede on so great a question. They have promised that they will make no move to avert action on the measure immediately after the fall elections. This is something less than Dixiecrat-style intransigence.

MORSE also contrasts the leisurely bankers' hours observed during the debate over discriminatory voting literacy tests with the current frenzy of the Democratic leadership. Whether Negroes would be deprived of the vote this fall was a question which could not legitimately wait. But it did. The shape of the sky to come is a matter for serious legislative reflection. The Senate is treating it as if the heavens might vanish during the night.

Finally, perhaps most important, the liberals have repeatedly offered to join an effort to change the filibuster rule right now. They declare they would be willing to undercut their own parliamentary position if this would result in the long-sought democratization of Senate procedure. Again, this is hardly the usual attitude of a diehard, obstructionist minority resolved to rule or ruin.

We hope the real point of the liberals' case does not get lost in the course of pious and often ignorant denunciation of their tactics. The Senate is determining the human and political dimensions of the vastness of space. We are making decisions which concern light years of time. We dare not rush; we must think, with utmost seriousness. And that is very different from saying that the bill must be talked to death, now and tomorrow and tomorrow.

This filibuster can be stopped by the simple administration gesture of allowing for a little more debate or by a general Senate agreement to revise the rules. The liberal design is not an attempt to kill a bill for all foreseeable time. It is a fight for reasonable time on a measure that deserves far wider national understanding and debate. What is the pressure that gives this legislation so high a priority? Is there some fear that the country will begin to glimpse the real nature of the giveaway?

City of Bell, 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif., Resolves Supporting Voluntary Public Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call your attention to the following resolution of the city of Bell, Calif. This is one of the very important municipalities incorporated under the laws of the State of California in the great 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif.

RESOLUTION 1811

Resolution relative to the Supreme Court's decision on prayer in public schools

The City Council of the City of Bell does resolve as follows:

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States of America has recently decided that the use of prayers in the public school program in the State of New York by State legislation is unconstitutional; and

Whereas the City Council of the City of Bell is concerned lest this decision may affect the present attitude of the city council with reference to the use of prayer in public meetings:

Now, therefore, in order to clarify the position of City Council of the City of Bell on this subject, it is hereby resolved:

1. That divine guidance in our governmental affairs be invoked by public prayer in which any person may participate or join, as he desires.

2. That the recognition of the basic American way of life under God, as set forth in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, be continued.

Adopted and approved this 16th day of July 1962.

JAY B. PRICE.

Attest:

WM. H. POOLE,
City Clerk of the City of Bell.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Los Angeles,
City of Bell, ss:

I, Wm. H. Poole, city clerk of the city of Bell, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution 1811 was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Bell, signed by the mayor of said city, and attested by the city clerk, at a regular meeting thereof held on the 16th day of July 1962, by the following vote, to wit:

Ayes: Councilmen French, McKnight, Simmons, Treder, and Mayor Price.

Nays: None.

Absent: None.

WM. H. POOLE,
City Clerk of the City of Bell.

Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell Sun, one of Massachusetts' leading newspapers, has taken note editorially of the 10th anniversary of Puerto Rico's commonwealth status with the United States. The editorial, appropriately entitled "Success Story," gives expression to the feelings of all Americans on this significant occasion. In order that I may share it with my colleagues in the Congress, I am pleased to include it in the RECORD.

SUCCESS STORY

Hearty congratulations are going out to the people of Puerto Rico on the 10th anniversary of the island's association with the United States as a commonwealth.

Puerto Rico's democratically chosen status is not that of an independent nation, nor yet a state but something unique. It has been, both economically and politically, a highly successful experiment.

Twenty years ago the island was an American scandal. That is, it would have been had more people been aware of conditions there. At the time, it seemed to be drifting aimlessly in the backwaters of administrative neglect.

After World War II, thousands of Puerto Ricans streamed to America, particularly New York, in search of a better life. Puerto Ricans are American citizens and subject to military service, but do not pay Federal taxes and cannot vote for President unless they move to the mainland.

Today, people the world over know the story of the commonwealth's rapid rise in living standards from an average $121 per capita a year in 1942 to $622 in 1962.

Much of the credit goes to Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin, who has held office as Governor continuously since 1948. He has spurred the new housing, schools, industries, and improved sanitation that are remaking the island.

The job is far from over, of course, and many still emigrate to the mainland, for

$622 a year still classifies the land as underdeveloped in American terms. But Puerto Rico has already become a bigger market for American goods than Argentina and Brazil combined.

More important, it has become an impressive example to the millions of Latin Americans still struggling under the twin burdens of poverty and tyranny.

Politics of Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House and, I dare say, an individual in this Nation who does not realize that the State of West Virginia and bituminous coal are synonymous. Much has been said from time to time about the depressed economic condition of my State and the poverty which exists. Much could be done about our economy, if there would be some action in the field of curbing the residual oil imports. If a carefully administered program were in effect, my State of West Virginia would not be the No. 1 welfare State of our Nation, but it would prosper, along with its sister States, if this flow of residual oil were curbed. This not only adversely affects the coal miner and his family, the coal industry, but, also, touches very definitely the railroads and their employees in our State, as well as a number of other industries and their workers that are identified with our coal industry.

Very recently at the Governor's Conference in Hersey, Pa., there was a joint release by the Governors of Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and West Virginia, citing the threat of residual oil to the coal industry. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include that release with my remarks.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit along with these remarks, an article appearing in the Grafton Sentinel, Grafton, W. Va., which is entitled "Politics of Coal."

GOVERNORS AT HERSHEY CONFERENCE WARN THAT RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS THREATEN THE COAL INDUSTRY

WASHINGTON, July 8, 1962.—Governors from three coal States have issued a warning that residual oil imports pose a serious threat to the U.S. coal industry.

The warning came in a joint statement issued at the Governors' conference in Hershey, Pa., last week by Gov. Bert Combs, of Kentucky; Gov. David L. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania; and Gov. William Wallace Brown, of West Virginia.

Their statement said: "The resolution on world trade will be most helpful to our efforts to restrict the importation of residual oil which is a serious threat to the prosperity of the coal industry of our States."

The statement was issued after the full conference of Governors passed a resolution pointing out that "the employment, security, and job opportunities of America had been seriously affected by excessive imports." It urged President Kennedy and the Congress to give full effect to provisions of trade acts designed to prevent excessive imports of any goods or commodities which would endanger the national security or the domestic economy of the United States.

Joseph L. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, said that the fact that the coal State Governors took the lead in drafting and supporting the resolution, and that it was approved by the Governors' conference, is indicative of the Governors concern of the flood of residual waste oil from abroad.

"The Governors are close to the severe economic and social problems which excessive imports create," Mr. Moody declared. "It is, therefore, not surprising that they should take the lead in pressing for the protection which domestic industry must have to exist in the fact of mounting imports from low-production cost areas.

"If the administration would take such action as requested in the resolution, the coal industry could be relieved of the residual oil import threat within a matter of minutes."

The coal industry has repeatedly appealed to the administration to stabilize the importation of residual oil for 5 years which would permit the coal industry a chance to orderly develop its resources.

POLITICS OF COAL

When Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah Republican, attacks President Kennedy's indifference to the plight of jobless coal miners, it is political news in at least 10 States where coal is a dominant economic factor. And when John L. Lewis declares that Kennedy did not honor his promise to "put some commonsense in the way this country handles its fuel supply" then the miners may be expected to show their displeasure at the polls this fall.

Utah is 10th among the States producing coal. Key States that might have raised the question even before BENNETT are Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama. Defection in these States could be costly to the Democrats. Instead of doing anything to restore coal to its place of preeminence as fuel, as the President promised in his primary fight in West Virginia, his administration has twice raised the residual oil quota. The last increase was 10 percent of 507,000 barrels a day, equivalent to 44 million tons of bituminous coal on an annual basis.

The residual oil is a low-cost fuel that comes mostly from Venezuela. It is used mostly in New England, in place of coal. With 150,000 miners out of work, and their leader blaming their idleness on the residual oil policy of the Kennedy administration, the election in the 8 or 10 coal-producing States can be strongly affected by their disaffection. Kennedy will have to take the consequences this fall for favoring his own region of New England against these coal-producing States.

Aircraft Noise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would require the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct or support scientific research into problems associated with aircraft noise.

The problem of aircraft noise, especially the unearthly racket often produced by jet-type engines, is a continuously serious one in the district I have the honor to represent. Many of my constituents live in the immediate vicinity of La Guardia Airport. The volume of air traffic through this airport is so great that the noise level frequently approaches the unbearable at many residential locations.

Now I am aware that there is a definite relationship between the flight pattern followed by the aircraft and the noise level that results. I recognize also that the primary consideration in determining the flight pattern is safety, and I agree that safety should be the paramount consideration at all times. It is for this reason, for example, that I recently insisted that the Federal Aviation Agency and the New York Port Authority investigate complaints of helicopters flying in and out of LaGuardia Airport at altitudes reported to be unsafe and dangerous to residents in the vicinity.

But I have come to the conclusion that aircraft can be constructed so that they are less noisy and they can be operated in flight patterns that are both safe and relatively quite. However, at the public hearings held by the Federal Aviation Agency at La Guardia Airport and elsewhere, and in the course of private conferences with officials of the Agency, it has become apparent, to me at least, that FAA simply does not assign a sufficiently high priority to the problem of what I would term "racket research."

Only today the FAA announced that it is allocating $3,500,000 for extensions to certain runways at La Guardia Airport. These improvements will make it possible for La Guardia to handle heavier aircraft, and perhaps jets as well. While we welcome FAA's interest in improving and maintaining La Guardia, we recognize also that today's action makes it likely that the racket around La Guardia Airport will in all likelihood increase in the coming years, rather than diminish.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose that Congress make it plain to the FAA that this problem—which the FAA itself admits affects "thousands of families in hundreds of communities"—should be given a higher priority in the FAA research program. The FAA contends that legislation of this type is unnecessary, that it already possesses ample power to conduct research into aircraft noise and that it is in fact presently conducting and supporting a variety of research on this problem.

However, it seems to me that the Federal Aviation Agency is perhaps not best qualified to judge which legislation is necessary and which unnecessary. Those Members of Congress who, like myself, have received numerous valid complaints from sleepless citizens, might perhaps have a better opinion of the desirability of legislation such as I am proposing. Certainly, it is of significance that the U.S. Conference of Mayors believes that a bill such as I have introduced should be enacted because, in the words of its spokesman, "we believe it will clarify the authority of the Federal Aviation Agency to continue and expand its research for the solution of noise abatement."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of Congress and the mayors of our large cities are perhaps in a better position to judge the effectiveness and scope of the FAA's racket research than the Agency itself. I therefore commend my bill to the attention of my colleagues and urge their support in bringing about its enactment.

The Supreme Court Prayer Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Paul Revere Ladies of Mississippi. The resolution follows:

The Paul Revere Ladies of Mississippi, noting with consternation and deep concern the nefarious Supreme Court decision revoking the right of the American schoolchildren to verbally acknowledge, in the schoolroom, their dependence on Almighty God, and recognizing this decision as the "handwriting on the wall" warning us that the next decision of the Supreme Court may order that Lenin's Manifesto declaring that "Christianity must be destroyed" is the law of the land, we Christian women of the Paul Revere Ladies of Mississippi, offer the following resolution:

"Whereas the Constitution of this Nation, founded on the principles of religious freedom, has for more than a decade been sabotaged piece by piece by the ungodly decisions of the apparently godless Supreme Court of these United States; and

"Whereas by their recent decision of June 26, 1962—with the exception of one number—children of this Nation are denied the right simply to voice their dependence on God in the schoolroom, and the privilege of asking His protection for themselves, their parents, teachers, and their Nation; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has gone on record as stating that since the Supreme Court has made their decision, "it should be respected whether we believe in it or not"; and

"Whereas by the same token we must assume that, should the Supreme Court decide to abolish free enterprise and order this Nation to adopt communism, the President would again say that, since this was the decision of the Supreme Court, "it should be respected whether we believe in it or not"; and

"Whereas numerous pro-Communist decisions of the Supreme Court have dangerously subverted our Constitution and imperiled our Nation; this blasphemeous one offers an insult to Almighty God and invites His wrath upon the people of this Nation; and

"Whereas by two late decisions, one barring prayer, the other allowing free distribution of obscene literature, the Supreme Court of the United States of America has declared two of the major strategies of the Communist conspiracy for the overthrow of the U.S. Government—destruction of Christianity, and the debasement of moral character—the law of the land in America and the President of these United States has said that these decisions "should be respected": Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Paul Revere Ladies of Mississippi,* That we do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to institute legislation to salvage the Constitution of this Republic, to restore to America her religious freedom, and to erase the stain the Supreme Court has placed upon her face; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we do hereby beseech the Congress of the United States—in which the power is vested—that they enact legislation to take from the Supreme Court, the President of the United States, and the Attorney General (the troika), the powers they are utilizing to debase this Nation and to destroy the God-given liberties of the American people."

Voters Want First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Roscoe Drummond entitled "Voters Want First Things First," which appeared in the Washington Post on July 27.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON FALLACIES—VOTERS WANT FIRST THINGS FIRST

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Two of the fashionable political opinions now sprouting in Washington need to be questioned.

One such opinion is that the American people are indifferent to social reform and that this is the reason President Kennedy is having such a hard time getting his domestic program through Congress.

The other is that the President has made the great mistake of trying to twist the arms of Congressmen.

I wonder if much of this isn't just conversational fluff. Anyway, I would like to look at some counteropinions and examine the other side of the coin.

It strikes me that the controlling reason the great body of American voters do not leap to the typewriter to tell Congress they want what Mr. Kennedy says they should want is not that they are indifferent to new social legislation, but that they are applying a sense of priorities to the legislative timetable, while the White House seems to be asking for everything at once.

In due course there will be a medicare program for the aging which Congress can approve. There will be new farm legislation which the country would like to have cost less than $7 billion a year. There may very well be a Federal Department of Urban Affairs.

But there is no evidence that the voters are either desirous or demanding that these things happen over night or that they are annoyed at Congress for indicating to the President that he ought to slow down.

Is this because the American people are indifferent to social reform?

I suggest that the answer may well be that instinctively the voters—and the taxpayers—are intent upon putting first things first.

The thing they put first is the military, economic, and political conduct of the cold war. In this field, public opinion strongly backs everything the President has asked Congress to provide and Congress has provided the President with just about everything he has asked. These include very sizable economic-aid funds, substantial increase in the defense budget, support for U.S. cooperation with the European Common Market, whatever is needed to draw even with and, if possible, pass the Soviets in outer space.

Nothing is being held back where it is most needed. But on controversial domestic matters, such as the medical care bill, public opinion is not demanding hurry-up action, and by refusing to push at Congress it is applying a sense of priority different from that of the President.

The suggestion that Mr. Kennedy ought to go to the country to generate heat under Congress implies that he hasn't been doing so. If he hasn't been doing just that, I don't know what he has been doing. If he has failed, it isn't from lack of trying. He has been steadily using his weekly press conferences for this very purpose. He is the most fully reported, most widely, and frequently TV-exposed President in American history. He doesn't limit his press conference to questions. He initiates a veritable stream of statements dealing with issues before Congress. To galvanize congressional support for medicare, the President addressed a massive rally in Madison Square Garden and it was nationally televised.

Can President Kennedy make Democratic votes this fall by attacking the Democratic Congress for not passing the medicare bill? President Truman made votes for himself by attacking Congress in 1948. But he was attacking a Republican Congress, not a Democratic Congress. When he did help elect a Democratic Congress, it did not pass any more of his controversial domestic bills (like a compulsory FEPC and repeal of Tart-Hartley law) than the previous Republican Congress.

Mr. Kennedy's dilemma is this: How can he persuade voters to defeat Republican opponents of medicare without simultaneously persuading them to defeat Democratic opponents of medicare?

I think the country broadly supports some kind of medicare and other social reforms, but the priorities of the cold war unquestionably come first.

Lost Continent of Mu—Current Oceanographic Studies Bear Out Ancient Pacific Legends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an article, "Lost Continent of Mu—Current Oceanographic Studies Bear Out Ancient Pacific Legends," by Comdr. Wendell Phillips Dodge, explorer-ethnologist who sailed the Pacific Ocean aboard the square-rigger *Alexander Gibson* as a very young man, at the beginning of this century. In his study of Eastern religious and legendary beliefs he was aware that he might be sailing over a vast sunken continent of the past, and throughout his lifetime the thought of it has fascinated him.

A constituent of mine, Commander Dodge did pass within sight of Christmas Island, one of the Line Islands in the central Pacific Ocean south of Hawaii and 160 miles southeast of Fanning Island, in about 1°57′ N. latitude and 157°27′ W. longitude. This largest atoll in the Pacific, 234 square miles of land, was discovered by Capt. James Cook in 1777. Long a British possession, the United States in 1936–38 looked upon it as being an important airbase. But Commander Dodge only dreamed that he must be passing over a great sunken continent of the past.

The article, which appeared in the company magazine, the Compass, published by the marine sales department of the Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., Socony Mobil Building, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y., for March–April 1962, edited by Mr. K. V. W. Lawrence, follows:

Lost Continent of Mu—Current Oceanographic Studies Bear Out Ancient Pacific Legends

Was there ever a vast, lost continent known as the Land of Mu, the Motherland, locale of the original Garden of Eden? This is a question which has captured man's imagination since the dawn of recorded history, a question which is currently far along the road to solution. The major difficulty faced by man in seeking a positive answer has always been, where does fable end and fact begin? Now, through fantastic advances made by oceanography and related sciences, both fables and facts are being reevaluated and more in the way of solid information added to the overall picture. A pattern is forming which seems to indicate there was such a land.

Some of the legends handed down for thousands of years among the different peoples of the Pacific's myriad islands have strains running through them which indicate there once was a vast land out on the "Great Sea." More than this, ancient stone and clay tablets, carved with decipherable drawings and attributed to the early sagas of the East, known as Naacals, even bear maps strangely like very recent ocean bottom profiles made by oceanographers with modern sounding devices. These Naacal tablets, inscribed by an unknown scientist some 70,000 or more years ago, provide what appears to be far more definite information than as yet has been brought up and sifted from the ocean bed ooze or from the sands of time.

Classic Greek literature has also added a speculative item or two. For example, Homer provided us with a casual phrase about the "Ocean being the origin of all," while other Greek philosophers and historians continually refer to the origin of Elysium with much concerning the doings of the sun god. These writings might well have had the Lost Continent of Mu in mind, the same continent mentioned on numerous stone tablets found in various parts of the world as the "Empire of the Sun." One such tablet from Central America even goes so far as to state: "Mu, the Motherland, the Lands of the West."

And one must not overlook the Bible. Topographical data in Genesis 11, verses 10–14 which has supplied material for countless unsuccessful attempts to locate the Garden of Eden, may well be describing a land long since engulfed by the all-powerful sea. This could also be true of Hindu writings in the Rig-Veda and the Vishnu Purana. No one knows how much is fact, how much is accepted belief. One thing is certain, the traditional preoccupation of writers, both known and unkown, with the location of a "lost land," a "paradise on earth," has kept the mystery alive; but the possibility of scientific agreement as to where, or if, such a land existed, is still as far away as the stars.

There is much on the side of fact to support the contention that a lost continent did actually exist. So much so that it moved one of the world's outstanding oceanographers, Dr. Ferdinand C. Lane, to write ("The Mysterious Sea," Doubleday & Co., Inc., New York, 1947): "So as we sail along the coast we may be passing over scenes that excel in grandeur our wildest mountain gorges * * *. The most arresting features are vast submerged plateaus * * *. Popular fancy has long pictured these immense areas as the graves of drowned continents. Thus the Azores have been called the mountain peaks of a lost Atlantis * * *. In the Pacific Ocean the vanished world of Mu has intrigued even such hardheaded scientists as Charles Darwin. Coral atolls may fringe subsiding mountain peaks, while the weird stone faces of Easter Island, called the strangest skyline in the world, hint at a larger population than could have been supported on isolated islets * * *. Easter Island's forest of stone faces, sometimes 20 feet high, staring across an empty sea, have hinted at more extensive populations and territories."

W. J. Thomson's deciphered translations of two of seven carved stone tablets found on the same island state: "When this island was first created as part of the great Motherland of Mu, the land was crossed with broad roads beautifully paved with flat stones * * *. Remains of these roads are to be seen on Easter and many other of the South Sea Islands."

What about these roads? Where did they go, what area did they cover? This is far from easy to determine but small sections of the one referred to in the Easter Island tablets have also been located on Rarotonga Island and on Mangaia Island, southernmost of the Cook group. As Prof. J. Macmillan Brown, of Christchurch, New Zealand, eminent authority on the Pacific Ocean observes ("The Riddle of the Pacific," Small. Maynard & Co., Boston): "The immense drystone monuments of Easter Island could not have been raised by an insular people, but must have taxed the capacity of a great contiguous archipelagic empire, maintaining thousands of people." To which might well be added, nor could an island people have been well enough equipped either technically or mechanically to build such remarkable interconnecting highways. These monuments seem to point up the fact that there was indeed a "Lost Continent of Mu."

He goes on to say, "Other mysterious cyclopean ruins besides those of Easter Island are encountered in the widely scattered archipelagoes of the Pacific, and equally important are the theories of submergence with them at Ponape in the Caroline Islands."

Professor Brown devotes a full chapter to "A Hypothetical Pacific Ocean Continent," saying: "Most geologists who study the whole surface and crust of the earth assume a hypothetical Pacific continent from the latter part of the primary period to the end of the secondary, ringed round by an ocean that communicates to the north with the ancient Arctic Ocean and on its east and west with the narrow and shallow Mesogean Sea, the Tethys of Suess * * *. By the end of the secondary period the Pacific continent is in process of foundering * * *. Polynesian cosmology is not without consciousness of such great areas of land: for example, in the Tahitian Ru, the god of the winds broke up the fenua nui, or single continent, into existing islands."

On Tonga-Tabu, a coral atoll of the Tonga Islands group, without a particle of natural stone upon it, nothing but coral, is an immense stone monument set in the form of an arch. Its two huge uprights must weigh around 70 tons each, with the top stone of the arch weighing about 25 tons. It is unlikely that such enormous stones were transported and landed on the island in the light of what is presently known about the size, shape, and carrying capacity of prehistoric boats. Hence it is reasonable to assume that a good part of the vast Pacific was indeed a continent or if this was an island empire, it had a merchant marine the like of which we are presently unaware. Then, too, the civilization must have really been advanced since it had to have machines or contrivances to lift these giant stone blocks into place.

Present-day scientists probing the Pacific's floor for answers to these perplexing questions will surely be indebted to a lone-wolf geologist-explorer, Col. James Churchward, for some vital historical and scientific information that he felt proved a vast continent called the Motherland of Mu actually did exist. It was during his service with the British Army in Central India, 1868, that he discovered the first clue that eventually led him to study man's most ancient civilization. Through a close association with a high priest, a Rishii, he learned how to decipher and interpret ancient stone tablets long believed indecipherable. Armed with the forgotten language, he spent many years in the South Seas, Tibet, Central Asia, Siberia, Australia, and Polynesia, in search of further proof of the existence of "the Lost Continent of Mu." As a result, years later he wrote a series of books, published by Ives Washburn, New York, during the early 1930's entitled "The Lost Continent of Mu," "The Sacred Symbols of Mu," "The Children of Mu," and "The Cosmic Forces of Mu," the latter in two volumes.

In his "The Children of Mu" (pp. 108ff) Col. Churchward wrote, "I will first take you to one of the most inaccessible valleys of central Asia. In this valley springs one of the headwaters of the Brahmaputra River. On a large spur from the main range of mountains there is a large secluded monastery. In this monastery there are a great number of ancient tablets of clay. These tablets have been divided into sections, one of them being on geology and history, going back to the time before the foot of man trod the earth * * * with a queer map on a tablet about 2 feet square."

On the accompanying map is shown what Colonel Churchward termed "the Great Central Gas Belt," running from "the Lost Continent of Mu," called the Motherland, to Asia Minor. Says Churchward, "Two parallels or divisions proceed in an easterly direction under the Pacific Ocean until Yucatan and Central America are reached. Then both divisions split into parallels before passing under America. The northern passes under Yucatan, the southern under Guatemala and Honduras. From America they pass out under the West Indies and close in together again to form two trunklines. The northern division passes under the Atlantic Ocean to the Azores. There it splits into seven parallels. Leaving the Azores, these parallels pass on to enter Europe under Spain and Portugal. From the West Indies the southern division proceeds under the Atlantic until it reaches the Canary Islands, where it splits into parallels and enters Africa near Morocco, forming the Atlas Mountains. The two divisions of the Great Central Gas Belt evidently were not forged at the same time, the southern being formed later than the northern. Neither are they at the same depth from the surface of the earth. The southern is thousands of feet farther down in the bowels of the earth and possibly miles. This difference in their depth is confirmed by the fact that when Atlantis was first submerged she only went down deep enough to be awash at low tide so that at low tide, mud banks appeared with masses of seaweed which made the northern Atlantic Ocean impassable to shipping. This fact is recorded in the temple histories of Egypt. It was only after the southern division had been forged, which sank her to her present level, that ships could again cross the Atlantic."

What seems to confirm Colonel Churchward's description of "the Great Central Gas Belt," a drawing of which he discovered on one of the ancient Naacal clay tablets of 70,000 or more years ago, appeared in the Scientific American of October 1960. In an article entitled "The Rift in the Ocean Floor," Dr. Bruce C. Heezen, assistant professor of geology at Columbia University and a senior research scientist of Columbia's Lamont Geological Observatory, wrote, in part: "Deep earthquakes * * * are associated almost exclusively with the area of the highly seismic submarine trenches and island chains that surround the Pacific Ocean. By the mid-1950's, however, seismograph recordings traced a 40,000-mile-long belt of mid-ocean earthquake epicenters along the bottom of the Atlantic, Indian, South Pacific, and Arctic Oceans, with branches reaching into the western Pacific and into the continents at several places * * * Maurice Ewing (professor of geology at Columbia University) director of the Lamont Geological Observatory and I predicted in 1956 that a continuous rifted ridge would be found to coincide with the midoceanic epicenter belt and its branches throughout the world. * * *"

Dr. Ewing and Dr. Heezen made their startlingly important announcement of finding a huge crack in the earth's crust at the bottom of these great oceans early in February 1957. They stated that it ran around the earth in a continuous line for some 40,000 to 45,000 miles, extending southward along the Atlantic from 0° longitude in the Arctic, bisecting Iceland, and running approximately midway between North and South America on the west and Europe and Africa on the east. The great trench rounds the southern tip of Africa, then forks into two branches. The northern branch runs into the Arabian Sea and loops sharply south through the Belgian Congo, Northern Rhodesia, and other areas of Africa. The southern branch continues eastward through the Indian Ocean, passes south of New Zealand and crosses the Southern Pacific, forking into two branches near Easter Island. The northern branch of this fork runs up the Gulf of California, passing Cape Mendocino toward Lynn Channel, Alaska. The southern curves down past the Straits of Magellan, passing between Antarctica and New Zealand, running toward the Marquaine Islands into the Pacific Ocean.

Both scientists theorized that the rift was caused by a series of earthquakes which pulled apart the earth's crust. They based their theory upon data compiled from seismic activity in various parts of the world which shows that practically 100 percent of the earthquake shocks along this 40,000 to 45,000 mile rift valley line occur exactly within the limits of the rifts.

In the first chapter of his third book, "The Children of Mu," Colonel Churchward sets forth that the land of Mu was a large continent situated in the Pacific Ocean between America and Asia, its center lying somewhere south of the Equator, stating: "Basing its area on the remains which are still above water, it would have been about 6,000 miles from east to west and about 3,000 miles from north to south. All the rocky islands, individually and in groups, scattered over the Pacific Ocean were once part of the continent of Mu—Easter Island, Tahiti, the Samoas, Cook, the Tongas, Marshall, Gilbert, Caroline, Marianas, Hawaii, and the Marquesas are the pathetic fingers of the great land, standing today as sentinels to a silent grave * * * At the time of Mu's destruction her people were in an exceedingly high state of civilization; as regards science, far ahead of the present time."

While Colonel Churchward was writing his first books on the "Lost Continent of Mu," the U.S. Navy made an extensive series of sonic soundings of the North Pacific Ocean. Between the years of 1928–33, the U.S.S. *Ramapo* crisscrossed the ocean about 28 times from the west coast of the United States to the Philippine Islands, taking depth readings at 5-mile intervals. A total of some 17,369 soundings were made, enough to provide a fairly accurate idea of the bottom contours in the area between 10° and 50° north latitude.

All hands aboard took part in this first mapping of the floor of the Pacific Ocean, which seems to substantiate all that Colonel Churchward had written about "The Lost Continent of Mu." Capt. Claude B. Mayo, U.S.N., in command of the U.S.S. *Ramapo* on these extensive ocean surveys, contributed a signed article entitled "The Portrayal of the Floor of the North Pacific Ocean" to the Hydrographic Review (vol. XII, No. 1), published at the Oceanographic Museum in the principality of Monaco, France, May 1935 (pp. 30–32), describing how a bas-relief map of the Pacific sea floor was made to scale: depth 1 inch equals 1,000 fathoms, horizontal 1 inch equals 50 miles. Captain Mayo told of great mountain ranges with peaks higher than Mount Everest taking form and canyons of such profound depths as to almost awe the imagination—"a new and gigantic world" he wrote, "was being brought to our eyes by the echoes of our sonic depth finder; a submerged continent of enormous extent with high mountains, great valleys, plateaus and plains, a submarine continent whose width is twice as great as that of North America and whose infinitely varied contour was even more striking than that of our own land above the sea."

Continuing in his report the late Captain Mayo further stated: "An inspection of the accompanying illustration will readily show the general aspect of the North Pacific floor. Its eastern half is a great plain covered by water of some 3,000 fathoms in depth and with few ridges or peaks. The central portion of this vast stretch is broken by the Hawaiian-Laysan ridge running northwestward all the way to Midway Island and indeed reaching the Kuriles in the extreme northwest. But it is in the western portion, from Marcus Island to the Philippines and Japan, that occurs so impressive and interesting a terrain. There is nothing so grand yet visible to the eyes of men that compare with these enormous heights and profound abysses."

Such is the evidence which, though still quite controversial, is beginning to fit together piece by piece and point up the fact that there more likely was a Land of Mu. What was it like? What sort of people lived there? How did they live? How advanced was their civilization? These and hundreds of similar questions, intriguing to the layman, are a source of continuing frustration to scientists sifting evidence to find positive answers. If a scientist was able to obtain the proper equipment which would make it possible for him to descend 3,000 or more fathoms to the Pacific floor he might well find the answer. Naturally he would have to make the descent in many different places and be able to light up a considerable area of the Stygian blackness in order to conduct a thorough search. If he did succeed in locating some evidence of civilization the questions would all be answered. Until that day comes, and it will come sometime in the future, only scientific guesswork based on the evidence in hand will answer the biggest question of all—was there ever a vast, lost continent known as the Land of Mu?

This article was beautifully illustrated in full colors by Rockwell Brank, based upon sketches by Col. James Churchward, and Capt. Claude B. Mayo's series of sonic soundings made aboard the U.S.S. *Ramapo*, 1928–33, and his descriptions of an official U.S. Navy bas-relief map that was exhibited at the San Diego World's Fair in 1937.

Address by Hon. T. Graydon Upton, Executive Vice President, Inter-American Development Bank, May 24, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address of the Honorable T. Graydon Upton, executive vice president, Inter-American Development Bank, before the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia, on May 24, 1962.

Mr. Upton spoke about the Alliance for Progress and the relationship of this important program to the American citizen of every community.

The address follows:

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AND THE CITIZENS OF PHILADELPHIA

Members of the World Affairs Council, distinguished citizens of Philadelphia, let me tell you what a distinct pleasure it is for me to return again to this city. Although I have now lived in Washington for almost 4 years, I still remember with pride the common efforts of many of us here to develop the Delaware River ports, and I still keenly miss Philadelphia.

I would like to speak to you today on a subject which is not only of vital importance to Latin America and to the United States, but to each citizen of Philadelphia here today. I speak of that bold program called the Alliance for Progress announced by President Kennedy on March 13, 1961, to bring about the economic and social transformation of Latin America. This vast 10-year effort is not just a concept enunciated in the White House and agreed to by the American Republics at the Conference of Punta del Este, Uruguay, last year. It is a program which calls for unwavering dedication and prolonged hard work not only on the part of the Latin American governments and the U.S. Government, but a profound participation by the peoples of the Americas. Its success will affect every person in this room. Its failure would be a catastrophe.

I would like to review briefly our relations with Latin America since World War II, in order to place the Alliance for Progress in proper perspective. Latin America emerged from World War II with substantial reserves of gold and dollars, because while it was able to sell raw materials during the war, since industrialized nations were rationing their productive output, it was unable to buy the goods it needed.

The immediate postwar era therefore was one of apparent well-being in Latin America. Western Europe was undertaking its reconstruction, and pent-up consumer needs, both in the United States and in Europe, created a favorable demand situation for such Latin American primary products as coffee, petroleum, cotton, copper, and tin. However, the exchange reserves which Latin America had built up were dissipated more rapidly than anticipated. In addition, these reserves brought less physical goods, because prices rose rapidly in the United States after the postwar decontrol. Latin Americans were thus not only hurt financially, but were seriously offended. They felt that during the war when they enjoyed a suppliers' market they had agreed in the common interest to subject themselves to the price control regime of the United States, and that the subsequent postwar price rise had cheated them. They also felt that they were the victims of pressure salesmen who encouraged them to buy goods which were not needed, were inappropriate, or were obsolete. Despite these adverse psychological and terms of trade factors, the immediate postwar years were ones of relatively rapid growth for Latin American economies, as they increased their imports of both consumer and capital goods.

This growth, however, was not accompanied by any basic structural improvement and the large majority of the people continued to live on the ragged fringes of the 20th century. The economy of Latin America continued to be managed by the fortunate few who controlled the best areas of fertile land, to which now was added the pockets of individual wealth of an incipient industrial revolution. Taxes were seldom well collected, and those that were paid were at such inadequate rates that the state could not carry out its function of providing economic infrastructure and supplying fundamental services. Thus the benefits of education, low-cost housing, potable water, and other social facilities did not filter down to the many least able to pay. In some measure, indeed, even this period of relative prosperity increased the rigidity and structural deformities of these economies, and increased social and political tensions.

Although the Korean war gave a temporary boost to Latin American purchasing power as the price of raw materials climbed toward new highs, in the second half of the decade of the fiftys, prices of primary products began a descent which is still continuing. On the other hand, prices of manufactured goods have steadily continued upward. These deteriorating terms of trade on the one hand, and on the other a strong demand for imports to meet expanding industrial economies, have caused frequent balance of payments and political crises and a sharp decrease in the rate of growth for most Latin American countries. In this connection, I should mention that the rapid increase of population averaging 2.5 percent for the area as a whole, but as high as 3½ percent in some countries, places a tremendous burden on the national governments and municipalities of these countries. It means that all types of social services, such as schools, roads, water, sewage facilities, and housing, must be provided rapidly at a time when not only industrial and agricultural expansion must be pressed, but when a decreasing proportion of the population is in its productive years. For example, 40 percent of the population of Latin America is less than 15 years of age. This in itself would be a serious burden, even if there were an absence of the structural deficiencies to which I have alluded, and even if these economies were more highly developed.

In the face of these growing adverse factors, and during the decade of the fifties, Latin American governments asked the United States for a change in lending policies which would permit the financing of social overhead projects such as schools and water systems; they asked for an inter-American financial institution in whose policies they would have a strong voice, they asked for techniques to stabilize their falling commodity prices, they asked for greater emphasis on public loans, and finally they asked, for the acceptance by the United States, of goals for Latin American development, and for acceptance of the necessity of planning. All of these requests were repeated in inter-American conferences of the fifties, and in the meetings of the Committee of Twenty-one established under the impact of Brazil's Operation Pan America—a spiritual predecessor of Alianza. These pleas had little impact on U.S. policy until the American people were awakened to the deep problems of Latin America by the riots which marked Mr. Nixon's trip to Latin America in 1958 and subsequently by the fall of Cuba into the hands of communism.

The first notable change in U.S. policy occurred in August of 1958, when Mr. Douglas Dillon, then Under Secretary of State, announced that the United States was prepared to consider favorably the longstanding Latin American request for establishment of an inter-American financial institution. The negotiations to establish the Inter-American Bank, in which I had the privilege of heading the U.S. delegation, began in January of 1959 and by December 30, 1959, the agreement establishing the new institution had been ratified by the necessary number of governments. In 1960 this new expression of U.S.-Latin American cooperation began operations, and the first of the policy objectives of Latin America was achieved.

The second major step in the transition of U.S. policy toward Latin America occurred in July 1960, when President Eisenhower issued his famous "Newport declaration," in which he declared that the United States was prepared to give financial assistance for social development programs if the Latin American countries would in turn undertake certain necessary institutional reforms. This declaration was crystallized in September in the negotiations for the Act of Bogotá, a historic document in which the signatory Latin American countries pledged to undertake institutional reforms in land structures, tax systems, housing, and education; and the United States formally promised definite financial assistance for the social progress of the area. This agreement was reconfirmed in the first months of President Kennedy's administration by a congressional appropriation of $500 million and the establishment of the special Inter-American Fund for Social Progress, to assist in financing projects for better land use, housing for low-income groups, water, sanitary and other community facilities and education. Of this sum, $394 million was turned over to the Inter-American Bank for administration on a multilateral basis. Thus was achieved the second of Latin America's policy objectives—funds to provide loans for social improvements.

On March 13, 1961, President Kennedy, keenly aware of the need for even bolder steps, issued his dramatic call for an "Alliance for Progress." At a White House reception for Latin American diplomats, the President proposed that the American Republics unite on a great 10-year plan to transform the 1960's into an historic decade of democratic progress for the hemisphere. Only the most determined efforts of the American nations themselves—he said—would make the program succeed. The Latin American nations, and they alone, could mobilize their own resources and modify their own social patterns so that all the people, and not just a privileged few, might share in the fruits of this undertaking. But if the Latin Americans did their part—the President said—the United States would help to provide resources of such scope and magnitude that the success of the plan would be assured, just as the United States had helped Western Europe to rebuild its economy after World War II.

This noble promise lifted hope in Latin America. After months of planning and preparation by specialists, in August 1961, at the Conference of Punta del Este, the details of the famous charter were negotiated. Latin America agreed to program its development to assure the most efficient use of resources, and a development goal rate of per capita economic growth in every country of Latin America of not less than 2.5 percent, per annum, was established. The Conference emphasized such social goals as a more equitable distribution of national income, encouragement of agrarian reform leading to the effective transformation of unjust systems of land tenure, the elimination of adult illiteracy by 1970, an increase in life expectancy at birth by a minimum of 5 years, and an increase in the construction of low-cost houses for low-income families. It also established an economic council of "nine wise men" to approve, and assist in preparing national development plans.

The United States for its part promised to assure a flow of $20 billion in outside capital to Latin America during the 10-year period. The United States also agreed to join Latin America in studying methods design to ease fluctuations in the prices of basic raw materials, if the producing countries undertook reasonable measures to reduce surpluses over the long term. Subsequently, I might mention the United States embarked on negotiations with the Latin Americans seeking the establishment of a fund of compensatory financing to assure a flow of additional resources to countries which suffer balance-of-payments difficulties as a result of the fall in prices of the basic commodities which they export. Thus, with the Charter of Punta del Este, the United States accepted the other principal policy objectives of Latin America, which had been sought so intensively for a decade or more.

It is now more than a year since President Kennedy made his dramatic appeal in the White House and it is evident that there is some disappointment with the Alliance for Progress, particularly by those who saw it originally as a panacea which would in a short period of time solve all of Latin America's problems. Let me make it clear that I do not share this disappointment. The new edifice of Alianza has not been constructed but the foundations are solidly in place. And to a group of citizens which have wrestled for more than a decade to transform Philadelphia into one of the Nation's great examples of successful community redevelopment I need hardly point out the struggles of the first years of such a vast undertaking, are inevitable.

The social requirements alone in this program are staggering. Latin America needs 1.2 million new homes each year to meet new family formations, and even this will not touch the accumulated housing deficit. The number of 5- to 14-year-old children without schooling is 22.5 million. Some 562,000 classrooms must be built if they are to gain a minimum elementary education. The rapid growth in population means that each year an additional 31,000 classrooms must be built, and the same arithmetic extends to many phases of human needs. As the cities mushroom, their water and sewerage systems become inadequate; new streets must be built, and social facilities of all types must be provided. And even more important, new agricultural land must be opened up, and new industry must be created to provide locally produced goods for exchange short nations, and jobs for the many coming to manhood.

Despite the staggering dimensions of the problem, the foundations of progress have been laid. A number of countries have initiated the land, tax, and administrative reforms which they pledged at Punta del Este. In others the public support needed to bring about such programs is at work. Three countries—Colombia, Bolivia, and Chile—have already presented national development plans to the "Committee of Nine Wise Men."

In half a dozen others the plans are well under way. Citizens of Philadelphia who have overcome so much inertia and opposition to redevelopment will understand how difficult it is to bring about changes overnight. You can appreciate what an uphill struggle it is to get legislative bodies to approve laws which will brings about significant changes in the relationships between different economic and social groups and which will curtail, in many instances, the privileges of the few in the interest of the whole. And what a psychological problem is involved in doing this in a way which will maintain the confidence of private capital, domestic and foreign. Even when the laws are approved, their implementation requires administrative skills and techniques which are in serious short supply in Latin America.

Programs must be studied for feasibility. These must be transformed into specific projects, requiring finance, blueprints, engineers, and a trained body of workers. This takes time and meanwhile the skeptics and an impatient people ask: Where are our houses, our schools, our water, and our jobs? There are admittedly very serious difficulties to be overcome, rooted in human shortcomings of many kinds in developing a program of this magnitude and complexity. But they will be overcome, with patience and with time. However, there is a more fundamental problem which I wish to bring before you today. The great leader of Puerto Rico, Luis Munoz Marin, said recently: "What troubles me, is the seeming lack of emotional commitment in Latin America towards this great and historical venture. The economic body is being gradually nourished, but the heart is not." And this is a failing for which government cannot provide a solution.

The fact is that the emotional and intellectual acceptance in Latin America of "Alianza" as true partnership has been circumscribed. Too many of our Latin friends look upon it in terms of a new Government-to-Government aid program, perhaps suspecting some of the features of long past U.S. policy, the old wounds of which are kept raw by Communist propaganda. Too few recognize the mutual responsibilities of "Alianza." One of the reasons for this is that many of our Latin American friends do not yet realize that Alianza is an expression of partnership by the people of the United States and with the people of the United States.

In my opinion, "Alianza" cannot truly succeed unless it awakens in Latin America a profound dedication of the spirit, in all classes, and among all interests, political, economic, and social. It cannot truly flower, unless it can deeply touch well springs of human effort, and sublimate local disagreement and social frustration in an intensive common effort for the common cause. And this in turn will be given a vital new impetus if the people of the United States, not through their Government, but as individuals, as civic leaders, as municipal officers, and as company executives, themselves recognize that "Alianza" action must be not only in the governmental sphere, but as a partnership of the spirit, and in individual and group action between the peoples of the Americas. "Alianza" needs the support, the warmth, and the human feeling which can only flow from one people to another, through a multitude of specific individual and group activities.

We have seen a beginning of this in such programs, for example, as the joint meeting of representatives of the United States and Mexican Congresses, in "Action in Venezuela" a private, imaginative, community development program, in "Operation Amigos," a project of the Miami Herald where young people from Latin America spend a period of time in Miami schools, community activities, and homes.

We have seen an awakening of corporate imagination and participation, in the Creole Petroleum Venezuelan industrial financing operation, in the Whirlpool Corp.'s establishment with a Colombian group of a training project in Bogotá for technical middle management, and more recently in the formation of Comap—the Commerce Committee for Alliance for Progress—a group of outstanding representatives of top U.S. industry, dedicated to lending their imagination, and hopefully some resources, to breaking some of the bottlenecks of Latin American development. And the work of our individual foundations, like Ford and Rockefeller, have long been in the van of such initiative. But this is only the beginning. Alianza must take new vitality from the peoples of the United States. It must awaken a response in individuals and in the civic organization of our country, which will call forth a response in the individuals of Latin America.

It is in the context of this deeply felt need, and in response to the President's challenge in his inaugural address, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country," that I make the following suggestion:

Let Philadelphia carry the spirit of the City of Brotherly Love to a new and broader concept of Alianza. Let the imagination, the ingenuity, and the practical commonsense typified by Benjamin Franklin, find a way of group participation in Alianza. I ask the World Affairs Council, and the people of Philadelphia, to find ways of significantly increasing individual action programs on the part of a number of municipal, civic, and business groups, each one modest, yet specific, but within a broad coordinated framework, so that the sum of these individual efforts will form the first broadly based municipal program in direct support of the Alliance for Progress. Programs, for example, like that of the American Field Service, or of Drexel Institute.

For example, Philadelphia has an outstanding housing association which mobilizes public support for housing in the city. It has a great redevelopment authority which has helped transform slum areas into model industrial commercial and housing development. It has a housing authority for effective public housing projects. It has a notable city planning commission, and a university preeminent in the field of city planning. Each one of these groups could lend a selected city in Latin America a measure of coordinated cooperation, in helping to train housing specialists, and solve housing problems and city development problems. The Inter-American Development Bank through its housing section would be prepared to cooperate closely with you in this endeavor. In an allied field, some of your savings and loan associations might lend technical and training assistance in helping establish some of the savings programs being actively carried forward in Latin America. Port specialists of Philadelphia could give invaluable assistance in the modern reorganization of a port of a Latin American city. Several of the leading Philadelphia foreign banks could invite volunteers at the same time, and for the same period, from their banking correspondents in a Latin American city, each benefiting from the presence of a fellow Latin American worker in another bank. Likewise, for example, through the Foreign Traders Association, and through the chamber of commerce, your leading industrial exporting companies working in Latin America could examine what project, or group of projects might be undertaken to make a practical contribution to the development of a true partnership with some Latin American industrial group—within the broad spirit of Alianza rather than solely within the narrower framework of commercial relationships.

One could develop this concept selectively in the field of the arts, of sport, of educational programs like that of St. Joseph's College. And finally the climax of such an intensive program could be demonstrated in the Festival of the Americas proposed by the Commercial Museum for early 1963. Imaginative ways could be found for dramatizing the various steps in these individual activities, and their achievements, so that the example given by Philadelphia could prove an inspiration for similar broad civic programs throughout many parts of the United States.

May I make clear that I am not recommending a onetime red-carpet treatment of Latin American officials, or a single official mission of distinguished citizens. I am recommending a practical, working program, of a number of limited, specific carefully selected activities, each one corresponding to the daily operation of an individual civic, educational, professional, municipal, business, labor, or allied group, coordinated to the extent necessary for practical efficiency, and to bring all of the projects within the recognition of Philadelphia's participation in Alianza.

This will involve giving time and effort to this vital undertaking, in a day when there are many pressing demands on all of you, but your greater participation in this effort will be rewarding. You will take municipal leadership in consolidating a dynamic democratic system in Latin America—and unless such a system is consolidated in Latin America, unless the Alliance for Progress fulfills its destiny, then democracy cannot be maintained indefinitely in the United States. This is a challenge to the people of Philadelphia, which I hope you will ponder deeply, and accept.

Thank you.

Arthur Burns Speaks on Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as is well known to all Members of this body, the Ways and Means Committee is now hearing testimony behind closed doors—over my objection, I might add—on the state of the economy with special interest in the area of possible tax rate changes. Although it is not possible for the members of this committee to reveal the testimony of the witnesses we have heard, a recent witness, Prof. Arthur Burns, of the Economics Department of Columbia University and president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, included with his testimony a speech he had made at DePauw University as part of that institution's series on political economics.

The importance of the question under discussion and the prominence of Dr. Burns in economic circles make this speech especially relevant at this time. Although included in his testimony, this speech is public and can well be read and digested by all who are interested in economic growth and national tax policy. The speech of Dr. Burns follows:

PLANNING FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE UNITED STATES

(Address by Arthur F. Burns, John Bates Clark professor of economics at Columbia University and president of the National Bureau of Economic Research)

(The Dr. Paul L. Morrison Fund in Political Economy was established in 1961 in honor of Dr. Morrison. It is designed to bring

to DePauw University political economists of international prominence to conduct seminars and to lecture to students and faculty. Dr. Burns is the first visiting professor to appear at DePauw under this program.)

I

In recent years, considerable dissatisfaction has been felt over the rate of growth of our Nation's economy. There are several reasons for this dissatisfaction and concern.

First, the human effects of automation and other aspects of technological progress are receiving wider attention. Clearly, if the United States is to avoid sizable unemployment, our economy must be able to absorb the workers displaced by technological advances as well as the million or more men and women who are added each year to the labor force.

Second, the rate of economic growth is nowadays connected in the minds of many citizens with a nation's prestige, if not also its international influence and military prowess. Thus, the failure of our economy to grow as rapidly as that of West Germany or Japan in the postwar period is frequently cited as a threat to our Nation's prestige, while the rapid economic growth of Russia is frequently viewed as a threat to our national security.

Third, many Americans are not only eager to improve their own standard of living and that of their neighbors, but also see a need to overcome what they regard as great deficiencies in our schools, roads, hospitals and other public programs. Clearly, a more rapid rate of economic growth would make it possible to satisfy to a fuller degree both private public needs.

The recent and keen concern about our Nation's rate of economic growth has led many thoughtful citizens to conclude that we cannot afford to practice "business as usual" in an age of rapidly advancing technology and international crisis. The view is therefore spreading that the powers of the Federal Government must be mobilized in the interest of raising the rate of growth of our economy, and that programs directed toward economic growth need to be organized around a governmental plan which, among other things, will set specific numerical targets for our economy.

If this type of prescription is followed, the pattern and mode of our economic life may be radically changed. Whether that is necessary or desirable has already become a subject of extensive public discussion. I shall try this evening to contribute to this discussion, first, by recalling the manner in which planning for economic growth has hitherto been conducted in the United States, second, by appraising the performance and prospects of our economy, third, by commenting on how the objective of more rapid economic growth might best be pursued in our times.

II

At first glance, it may appear that under peacetime conditions there has been no such thing as economic planning—or planning for economic growth—in the United States. Surely, the American people have traditionally been strong individualists. By and large, anyone in our midst has been free to choose his occupation, to work for himself or for an employer of his choice, to produce whatever he chose, to trade as he wished, and to spend or to save or to invest as he deemed proper.

We have conducted our economic activities without setting national targets for the output of specific products or for output as a whole. With rare exceptions, our Government has not resorted to controls over prices, wages, or profits. We have generally avoided the allocation of raw materials to business firms by governmental authority, or official certification of private investment projects, or the rationing of foreign exchange. In short, the very institutions and practices that are commonly associated in other countries with economic planning have been largely absent in the United States.

Yet, it is important to recognize that economic planning has been steadily practiced by the American people.

The most vital feature of our economy is that it has grown persistently and cumulatively for many decades—indeed, since colonial times. In a nation in which economic growth has become a firm tradition, the natural thing for individuals and business firms to do is to plan ahead, so as to be in a position to take advantage of new opportunities.

American business firms have therefore become accustomed to planning with some care their investments in plant, in machinery, and in equipment. The timespan of these investment plans varies a good deal. Some businessmen plan ahead for only the next year or two, while others make capital budgets for the next 5 years, 10 years, or even longer. Not only do businessmen plan their investment programs. They also plan their inventories, their advertising programs, their labor policies, their financing requirements.

More important still, businessmen have recently begun to plan on a vast scale the development of new products and to prepare for the future by conducting extensive research programs. Indeed, research and development work has become one of our major economic activities and one that is growing at a remarkable rate. In 1950, research and development expenditures in the United States amounted to about $3 billion. In 1955 they reached $6 billion. This year they will probably exceed $15 billion. Although a large part of this sum is financed by the Federal Government, the privately financed part has itself been enormous.

It goes without saying that research and development programs require careful planning. The progress of this activity has made American businessmen plan minded in numerous directions, and it has helped to make systematic planning a normal part of every major business.

Economic planning in our country has not been confined to the business sector. A second ingredient of planning for economic growth is the planning that goes on in our households.

American youngsters differ considerably, as they do everywhere. Some are ambitious, industrious, and alert, while other are not. But I think it is fair to say that our boys and girls typically begin planning their careers at an early age, drawing as they can on the advice of their families and teachers.

A typical American family is eager to make progress, to live better, and to provide for a better life in the future. Hence, it is characteristic of families to plan for a new home, or a new automobile, or a summer vacation, or a college education for the children, and so on. It is likewise characteristic of the head of a family to work hard, so that his family may live comfortably. Not only that, but he is often enterprising enough to search out or to create new opportunities.

Thus, in our individual homes, just as in individual businesses and farms, economic planning is being conducted incessantly. To be sure, much of this planning has been and is haphazard. To be sure, some of the planning has been hardly different from daydreaming. Yet, all of it has been directed to improving the economic position of the individual, that of his family, that of his business, or that of his community.

Planning for economic growth in the United States, unlike that of socialistic countries, has therefore been a mass activity—an activity pursued by millions of producing or consuming units, each looking to a better future and each striving more or less energetically to attain it.

Among the economic units engaged in planning for the future are to be found, of course, many thousands of public or quasi-public units—not only the Federal Government, on which I will comment later, but also State governments, local development corporations, churches, fraternal lodges, school districts, and municipal governments. Besides being concerned with the maintenance of law and order, which is prerequisite for any kind of economic development, many of our governmental units plan extensively for the educational and recreational needs of their communities, for maintaining good health, for better medical facilities, for improving or enlarging transportation systems, and doing whatever else seems desirable to make our communities a good place in which to live and work.

In short, planning has been a pervasive feature of economic life in our Nation. Planning has gone on steadily in many millions of economic units. Our planning for economic growth, therefore, has been a widely shared activity, not a special or exclusive perogative of the Central Government. The planning so conducted has served to mobilize the energies of people in all walks of life. And it has become traditional in our country to regard economic growth itself as being not merely a goal of an abstract entity called a nation, but as a goal of individual households, individual businesses, and individual communities.

III

When economic planning is decentralized, when it is conducted by many millions of independent economic units, it is natural to expect that the individual plans may at times, if not frequently, be in conflict with one another. This problem has been recognized throughout our Nation's history. Indeed, much of what is most distinctive about the American economy is the culmination of efforts to devise a workable scheme for reconciling and coordinating individual economic plans.

One part of our traditional scheme for reconciling individual economic plans is as old as free and competitive enterprise itself. When supply and demand in a competitive market are out of balance, something is bound to happen to prices, to inventories, or to both.

For example, if the demand for radios is smaller than the supply at the ruling price, then the price will come down or inventories will exceed the level desired by merchants. In either case, there will be pressure to lower the volume of production. Similarly, if the demand for services of a particular sort—let us say, the services of engineers—increases, the salaries paid to engineers will tend to go up. The rise in salaries will stimulate young men to seek a career in engineering rather than in medicine or law or teaching.

Open and competitive markets in American society have thus served as regulators of occupational choice and of production. In so doing, they have promoted a type of economic growth which is adjusted to the Nation's stock of resources and to the desires and preferences of people.

It is precisely because open and competitive markets perform the essential function of harmonizing and coordinating the economic plans of households, business firms, and governmental units that the American people have resorted to stringent legislative measures to preserve competition. Where monopoly is inevitable, as in the provision of electricity or telephone service, we have attempted to regulate it.

American experience over many years has demonstrated that the coordination of individual plans through open and competitive markets enables economic life and economic development to proceed, on the whole, in satisfactory fashion. It is undeniable, however, that competition sometimes produces results that are harsh, or that appear inequitable or otherwise undesirable. To deal with such matters, the Government has not infrequently resorted to protective devices—for example, inspection of foods and drugs, price supports, interest rate ceilings, minimum wages, and import quotas.

Furthermore, although competition is a good cure for overproduction in a specific market, experience has taught us that competition is a very inadequate cure when a shortage of demand develops in many markets simultaneously. When that happens, business activity as a whole will slump, production will drop, the flow of incomes will be checked, and unemployment will spread. In short, the Nation will experience a business recession.

On the other hand, when demand becomes excessive not in just one or a few markets but in many markets simultaneously, the general level of prices will rise and this may bring hardship to recipients of fixed incomes and salaried workers.

Recession and inflation were a familiar feature of the American scene during the 19th century and during the early decades of this century. These periodic disturbances of economic life gave rise to urgent demands for reform, the upshot of which has been the assumption by the Federal Government of a responsibility to use its great powers to moderate the business cycle and to foster a high and expanding volume of overall production and employment.

In recent years, therefore, the Federal Government has played a much more active roll in economic affairs than in the past. But the Government has done this primarily by stimulating at certain times, and by restraining at other times, the general level of economic activity. Apart from agricultural pursuits, our Government has rarely attempted to regulate the volume of production of individual firms or of individual industries.

When private business activity falls off, it is generally expected nowadays that the Federal Government will move fairly promptly to ease credit conditions, or to lower taxes, or to raise its own expenditures. On the other hand, when business activity becomes so exuberant that it may mainly serve to bid up prices, it is expected that the Government will adopt monetary or fiscal measures to restrain the expansion of overall demand.

In these ways, then, the American people have sought to preserve the spontaneity and enterprise of individual economic planning, and yet assure that the plans of individual economic units are sufficiently coordinated to result in a reasonably steady use of the Nation's resources and in a reasonably stable price level.

The essential features of economic planning, as it has developed in the United States, can therefore be summed up in three broad propositions. First, our planning for economic growth has been a widespread activity in which many millions of people actively participate. Second, the plans of individual economic units have been coordinated by the maintenance of competition and by a flexible use of the monetary and fiscal powers of the Federal Government. Third, despite an increasing array of protective devices that circumscribe individual planning, our economy has continued to be largely characterized by free and competitive enterprise.

IV

The success that we have had through our kind of economic planning, while far from perfect, has been substantial in recent times, just as it has been substantial over the long stretch of history.

We have preserved economic and political freedom in a revolutionary age, when many other nations have lost or destroyed their freedom. Our economy has continued to grow—although it has grown less rapidly than many of us would like. We have made some progress in checking the inflation which has marred our prosperity in the postwar period. The fruits of enterprise have been widely distributed among the people, so that poverty—as understood a generation ago—has been nearly eliminated in our country. And we have had striking success in moderating the business cycle and in reducing the impact of recessions on the lives of individuals.

To be sure, the United States has experienced several recessions since the end of World War II, but they have been less severe on the average than earlier economic contractions. Not only have they been short, not only have they involved relatively small declines in production and employment, but the close link that once existed between cyclical declines in production and changes of personal income has been broken.

Partly as a result of the introduction of unemployment insurance and the development of public and private pension plans, partly as a result of the growth of service industries and of white-collar jobs, partly as a result of stable dividend policies on the part of corporations, total personal income has remained remarkably stable during the postwar period in the face of cyclical drops in production. What is more, the size of the income-receiving population has continued to grow during recessions as well as during the expansions of economic activity throughout this period.

All in all, therefore, while we have had no shortage of economic problems, the kind of economic planning on which our Nation has relied has worked tolerably well. Even now, the American economy—despite excessive unemployment and numerous other shortcomings—is the marvel of the rest of the world.

To be sure, our Nation's economic growth has recently been less rapid than that of some other nations—notably, Russia, West Germany, France, and Japan. We must be careful, however, in making international comparisons.

In the first place, each of these foreign countries suffered devastation during the war. Under such circumstances, the mere rebuilding of a factory or a railway connection can often lead to spectacular increases of production. This source of growth, which was extremely important in the years immediately following the war, has lately waned in significance.

On the other hand, the stage of economic development reached by the United States continues to differ from that of other nations. The American people are abundantly supplied with material goods—not only with food and clothing, but also with washing machines, refrigerators, television sets, automobiles, and countless other expensive goods. To an increasing degree, therefore, we spend our incomes on services rather than commodities—on such things as health, education, and travel.

It is far more difficult to improve the productivity of physicians, teachers, artists, or hairdressers than the productivity of those engaged in manufacturing steel or textiles or automobiles. As other nations continue to develop their economies, services are likely to become a larger part of their endeavor. Their rate of economic growth will tend to become lower for this reason, as well as because the opportunities for adopting American technologies will already have been largely exhausted. The discrepancy between our Nation's rate of economic growth and that of other industrial countries is therefore likely to diminish in the natural course of events.

We may, however, both help to assure and hasten the improvement of our Nation's position on the international scale of growth rates by recognizing the importance of strengthening economic incentives to enterprise and investment, as other industrial countries have done in recent times. Even Communist Russia has seen fit to reward rather handsomely its managers, scientists, teachers, and the more skilled workers in order to elicit their industry and enterprise.

V

As we look to the future, it seems clear that the impulses to economic growth and improvement remains strong in our Nation. In the first place, Americans are generally willing to work hard to obtain the income they need to live as they feel they should. This willingness to work is reflected in the continuing increase of the proportion of women in the labor force. It is reflected in the large and increasing number of men who hold down more than one job. It is reflected in the slackening of the long-term decline of the average workweek in manufacturing despite the increased power of trade unions.

This willingness to work, the evidence of which is all around us, stems from a desire of the American people for a higher standard of living. We can reasonably count on this factor to continue driving our economy toward steadily higher levels of activity.

Another reason for optimism about the economic future is the tremendous effort being devoted to research and development—an activity on which I have already commented. This activity results in a constant flow of new products, new materials, and new technical processes. To exploit these opportunities, huge investments in plant and equipment will be necessary in the years ahead.

Still another reason for optimism about the economic future is the rapid growth of population in the United States. A growing population in an affluent nation is an important psychological factor in business planning. Knowing that population will continue to grow rapidly, businessmen can look forward to larger markets and they are therefore likely to prepare for them.

With such fundamental forces driving our economy forward, it would seem that the continuation of our Nation's economic growth and improvement is assured. A cloud over the future is cast, however, by a perceptible weakening of faith on the part of a substantial number of Americans in the capacity of free and competitive enterprise to extend our economic blessings. Surely, the belief is growing that heavy reliance on the planning of individual economic units is poorly suited to the needs of a swiftly changing world.

One school of though, which has gained considerable influence, holds that an increase in the rate of economic growth of the United States is urgently needed, that this need can be met by enlarging the role of Government in economic activities, and that larger governmental expenditure is an essential device for speeding economic growth.

According to this school of thought, the Federal Government should set a high numerical target for the Nation's output and then proceed, with due regard to its other economic policies, to spend whatever may be needed to assure the desired level of output.

According to this school of thought, the Federal Government should increase outlays not only for defense, but also on foreign economic aid, on social security, on housing programs, on medical care, on agricultural programs, on education, on research, on highways, on retraining or relocating workers, on subsidies for ailing industries, on subsidies for industries feeling the pinch of foreign competition, on depressed areas, on local transit—indeed, on an ever-increasing list of programs that imaginative men, dreaming of a better society, keep suggesting, and contriving.

This school of thought is predisposed to value the benefits of public spending more highly than the benefits of private spending. This school of thought finds it natural to suppose that Federal officials are peculiarly capable of determining what the interests of the American people require. This school therefore keeps urging an expansion of executive power over activities that have traditionally been the province of private citizens.

If the teachings of this school of thought prevail, the governmental sector of our economic life is bound to expand while the private sector will shrink. In the process, unbalanced governmental budgets may remain troublesome even if taxes rise. Inflationary pressures are not likely to fade away in such an environment. Nor is the balance-of-payments deficit likely to be cured easily or quickly.

When the Government is reluctant to deal with inflationary pressures and the balance-of-payments problem by practicing monetary and fiscal restraints, it may drift into a policy of imposing direct controls over prices, wages, and profits. Such controls may start with a basic commodity like steel, but they are not likely to end there.

The spread of governmental regulations of economic life would severely limit the economic freedom that Americans have enjoyed. To be sure, if the scope of private business decisions is curtailed, businessmen will make fewer mistakes. That does not mean, however, that Government officials will make better decisions than would the businessmen immediately concerned. Nor does it mean that economic mistakes, when once made, will be corrected as promptly by Government officials as they would be by businessmen subject to competitive market pressures.

An unavoidable effect of a proliferation of governmental controls over economic life would be a redirection of the energy of business executives. More and more of their finest hours would be devoted to cajoling Government officials or to contesting or circumventing governmental edicts, instead of to developing new markets or to experimenting with improved products or new processes—activities which alone serve to build a nation's economic strength. Efficiency, therefore, would suffer, and the higher rate of economic growth—which was so urgently being sought through governmental initiative and spending—might well remain an elusive objective.

VI

In emphasizing this danger, I do not mean to minimize the importance of a higher rate of economic growth or the role that the Government can play in fostering economic growth. My point is only that governmental spending cannot be the sole or even a large part of the answer to the problem of achieving a higher rate of growth in our Nation's economy.

If governmental economic policy is to be successful, a simple but basic principle must be respected—namely, that a nation's prosperity depends on the energy and skill with which people apply themselves to production. A corollary of this principle is that governmental actions to spur economic growth are likely to be most effective when they increase confidence in the economic future, thereby stimulating people to use their brains, their energy, their money, and their credit in building today for a better tomorrow.

Of the many governmental actions that are currently needed to foster a higher rate of economic growth, perhaps the most important is a reform of our tax system. When tax rates on personal income become nearly confiscatory, as is the case for upper income brackets, the injury to economic incentives of individuals in the middle and upper brackets is serious. When corporations need to pay over half of their profits in taxes, there is a heavy drain on the resources available for new investments. When tax rules governing depreciation fail to take account of the revolution in technology or of inflation, business firms may be required to pay taxes on income they never earned and they may therefore lack the funds needed to maintain their capital intact.

Unlike other industrial countries, which in recent times have kept redesigning their tax laws in the interest of stimulating enterprise, innovation, and investment, our country has continued to function with a tax system that largely grew up under wartime conditions. Surely, the time has come for a basic reform in the structure of Federal taxation.

It is also highly important that the Government at all levels should interest itself to a greater degree in fostering efficiency. Monopoly power, whether of business or labor, needs to be suppressed. Restrictive work practices, which abound in railroading, construction work, and other branches of industry, need to be strongly discouraged. Local building codes need to be modernized and urban traffic congestion relieved. Research in the physical, biological, and social sciences needs to be promoted. Expenditures on education need to be redirected so that the opportunities of poor but able youngsters may be enhanced. And governmental roadblocks to efficiency, of which the farm program is only the most notorious example, need to be reduced or removed.

It would also be constructive if smaller firms, which lack the resources to undertake research and development programs of their own, were aided in adapting to the rapidly changing technology of industry and finance. With some stimulation by the Federal Government, our colleges of business administration should be able to render much the same kind of assistance to small businesses that our agricultural colleges have over many years rendered to farmers. A similar function might be served by local productivity councils, which would bring together businessmen, bankers, local officials, and trade union leaders to explore ways of reducing waste and improving efficiency.

In planning for the future, it is also well to recognize that the growth of our economy will almost certainly not proceed at a uniform pace. Recessions are likely to occur from time to time, and we should therefore seek ways of stiffening the resistance of our economy to these setbacks. It would be helpful if temporary extensions of unemployment insurance, such as the Congress tardily improvised in 1958 and again in 1961, were no longer needed in the future. When the next recession strikes, as in time it almost certainly will, our country should already be equipped with an unemployment insurance system that covers practically all wage earners, that automatically provides for extended benefits during periods of abnormally large unemployment, and that guards against existing abuses.

Once we achieve such a system of unemployment insurance, it will become possible to develop policies for stimulating economic activity in a calmer atmosphere than has ruled in past recessions. This should give us some protection against inflationary adventures that in the end may undermine economic freedom.

These agenda of public policies for promoting economic growth need to be both expanded and elaborated. But perhaps I have said enough to suggest that although larger governmental spending in some directions can be highly constructive, so also may the curtailment of some governmental activities that are currently being practiced. Larger total spending on the part of the Government is not the only way, nor is it often the best way, of raising a nation's rate of economic growth. If we accept uncritically a rapid expansion of governmental budgets, we may easily end up by having a closely regulated economy, but it is less clear that we will also have a higher rate of economic growth. Let us not be hasty, therefore, in accepting alluring promises of a higher growth rate at the price of policies that may seriously change the character of our economic organization.

Much has of late been said and written about the economic miracles of West Germany and Japan—the two nations whose rate of economic growth has led the rest of the world in the postwar period. As I have previously observed, international comparisons can be misleading. Yet, if I understand correctly what has happened in Germany and Japan, one major factor in their outstanding success has been a deliberate and energetic policy of fostering a market economy in which individuals and business firms can conduct their economic planning in an atmosphere of confidence. This has also been the major source of our own great economic achievements in the past. We cannot afford to lose sight of this fact as we struggle with the new and baffling problems of our generation.

Seventy-five Historians Rate Effectiveness of American Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a constant factor in the growth and prosperity of this Nation has been the high degree of effectiveness displayed by the men elected to the Presidency of the United States. Students of history have expressed amazement in the undeniable fact that America has usually produced a Chief Executive capable and fitted to accept the challenges of the times, and to guide our citizens in the building of a better country.

An interesting and provocative article by Arthur M. Schlesinger in the July 28 New York Times magazine discusses this subject and publishes the findings of a poll conducted among 75 experts of American history, including two in English universities. Mr. Schlesinger points out that results showed a considerable agreement as to the "great and near-great", but some difference of opinion was evident in selecting those Presidents whose performance in office was "average."

The total picture, however, was seen as an enviable record of dedication and success in the public service, as Mr. Schlesinger concludes that:

> Taking the entire span from Washington to the exit of Eisenhower, the historical consultants find that great men occupied the chair during 40 of the 172 years and, if their near-great associates be added, the grand total approaches 80 years, or nearly half the lifetime of the Republic. Can any other nation display a better record?

I ask unanimous consent that Arthur M. Schlesinger's article entitled "Our Presidents: A Rating by 75 Historians" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PRESIDENTS: A RATING BY 75 HISTORIANS—A POLL OF EXPERTS CONCERNING OUR CHIEF EXECUTIVES SHOWS AT LEAST 5 WHO MAY BE CONSIDERED GREAT AND, OVERALL, A NOTEWORTHY LEVEL OF COMPETENCE

(By Arthur M. Schlesinger)

How good have America's Presidents been? Which ones have left an enduring mark? Who were the failures? Where do the others rank? Seventy-five students of American history, including two in English universities, have undertaken to answer these questions.

Had they been appraising the total careers of the men, the results in some cases might have been quite different. Madison, John Quincy Adams, Grant, and Eisenhower, for instance, were great Americans, though not, according to the panel, great Presidents.

Their title to fame rests on contributions made before and after holding the office.

The present inquiry, however, has to do with a single point—achievement in the Executive chair. Omitted from consideration—besides, of course, Mr. Kennedy—are two Presidents who were too briefly at the helm to permit a fair evaluation: William Henry Harrison, who died within a month of his inauguration, and James A. Garfield, who served little more than half a year.

Each participant in the poll applied his measuring rod in accordance with the relative importance he attached to the complex factors that helped make or break the particular administration. Did the President head the Nation in sunny or stormy times? Did he exhibit a creative approach to the problems of statecraft? Was he the master or servant of events? Did he use the prestige and potentialities of the position to advance the public welfare? Did he effectively staff his key Government posts? Did he properly safeguard the country's interest in relation to the rest of the world? How significantly did he affect the future destinies of the Nation?

Admittedly, the judgment of the historians is not necessarily the judgment of history, but it is the best we can have without waiting for the sifting process of time. The members of the panel agreed with little dissent on the great and near-great and, at the opposite extreme, on those who made the poorest records. The principal differences involved the comparative ranking of the Presidents regarded as average and of those below average but not failures. Even in these cases, however, the preponderance of opinion was conclusive.

Lincoln, Washington, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Wilson, and Jefferson receive the accolade of greatness in the order given. The reasons for their preeminence will be examined later; but since the inclusion of Roosevelt may surprise persons still smarting from memories of New Deal times, it should be noted now that his place reaffirms the view of 55 historians, most of them overlapping on the present panel, whose findings were published in 1948. The longer perspective adds weight to the previous judgment.

After the top group come the half-dozen figures who, while eclipsing the majority of White House residents, yet fall of the foremost rating. Beginning with Jackson and Theodore Roosevelt, the near-great Presidents continue with Polk, Truman, John Adams, and Cleveland.

Old Hickory marked the advent of the common man to national power and, in particular, distinguished himself by defeating South Carolina's attempt at nullification and by destroying the monopolistic second United States Bank. The 1948 poll, indeed, placed him among the great Presidents, but the present one, by a narrow margin, lowers him one degree. Theodore Roosevelt, responding to similar impulses, taught the electorate the danger to the public weal of consolidated business, and against entrenched opposition he instituted a program of Federal regulation as well as of the conservation of natural resources.

Polk, for his part, extended the national borders until they embraced what is now the great Southwest and all the country lying between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Ocean. Added to Jefferson's acquisition of France's Louisiana territory, these accessions from Mexico and England gave the United States its continental breadth. Though Polk's conduct toward Mexico violated international ethics, it is noteworthy that his critics, neither then nor later, have ever proposed that the conquests be returned.

Truman, the only one in the near-great class still with us, discharged impressively the awesome obligations devolving on the United States as the leader of the free world in the cold war with Soviet imperialism. The Truman doctrine for the protection of Greece and Turkey, the Marshall Plan for the restoration of Western Europe, the Berlin airlift, the Point Four program for backward countries, NATO (our first peacetime military alliance), and the intervention in Korea in support of the United Nations—all these constituted landmarks in an assumption of global responsibilities undreamed of only a few years before.

Of the last two in the near-great group, the case for John Adams rests primarily on his successful resistance to his own party's demand for changing a limited conflict with France into an all-out war, while the inclusion of Cleveland recognizes his stubborn championship of tariff reform and of honesty and efficiency in the civil service.

Then follow the Presidents—more than a third of the whole number—who fall in the average or mediocre class. By and large these 12 believed in negative government, in self-subordination to the legislative power. They were content to let well enough alone or, when not were unwilling to fight for their programs or inept at doing so. In descending scale they are Madison, John Quincy Adams, Hayes, McKinley, Taft, Van Buren, Monroe, Hoover, Benjamin Harrison, Arthur, Eisenhower and Johnson.

Johnson was the principal exception to a passive role, but his prolonged contest with Congress over Southern reconstruction brought him the ignominy of impeachment and a narrow escape from dismissal from office. Eisenhower, the most recent and, consequently, the hardest of the Presidents to evaluate, received a few votes in the near-great category but many more for beneath the average and failure. A two-thirds majority, however, placed him toward the bottom of the average incumbents.

Of the executives of still less stature, six of the eight qualify as below average; Taylor, Tyler, Fillmore, Coolidge, Pierce, and Buchanan in that order. By ill chance, Pierce and Buchanan headed the Government in the years of mounting crisis which precipitated the Civil War. Had more statesmanlike hands directed affairs, that tragic failure of the democratic process might have been avoided. A sizable number of the historians, indeed, rated the two as failures.

The verdict of total unfitness, however, was, by the overwhelming majority, reserved alone for Grant and Harding. Both were postwar Presidents who, by their moral obtuseness, promoted a low tone in official life, conducting administrations scarred with shame and corruption.

Under Grant the wrongdoing reached as high as his private secretary, the Postmaster General, and the Secretaries of War and the Treasury. In Harding's case, three members of the Cabinet were, for like reasons, forced out, one of them going to prison along with several other important executive officials. Harding, who could not plead Grant's political inexperience, worked intimately with the notorious Ohio gang which had accompanied him to Washington. His belated qualms at betraying the public interest probably helped bring on his death after two and a half years in the White House.

A comparison of the findings of the 75 historians in 1962 with those of the 55 in 1948 shows no significant change except for the reduction of Jackson one notch to the rank of near great. Otherwise the choices in the five major classes hold good, though the earlier survey, of course, necessarily omitted Truman and Eisenhower. Within each of the intermediate categories—near great, average, and short of average—occurs, however, some rearrangement of the order, notably the lowering somewhat of the positions of Cleveland, Monroe, and Coolidge, and the upgrading of Polk, Madison, and McKinley.

What qualities and achievements elevated five Presidents over all their fellows? Was there a pattern of greatness which distinguished these men who otherwise varied so widely in education, personality, and political style and who, moreover, faced problems special to their eras? The answer lies in the nature, direction, and permanent effect of their accomplishments. A quick review will reveal the common elements.

Each held the stage at a critical moment in American history and by timely action attained timeless results. Washington converted the paper Constitution into a practical and enduring instrument of government. Jefferson expanded the original area of the United States to include the huge region stretching westward from the Mississippi to the Rockies. Lincoln saved the Union from internal destruction. Wilson tightened the restraints on big business and finance and carried the Nation successfully through World War I. Franklin Roosevelt preserved the country in the face of its worst depression and marshaled its resources for victory in World War II. Lincoln excepted, all effected profound domestic changes peaceably within the democratic framework—revolutions by popular consent.

By the same token, each took the side of liberalism and the general welfare against the status quo. Washington, to be sure, today seems a staid conservative to persons forgetful of his historical context. In truth, however, this director of a people's war of emancipation from colonialism devoted all his prestige and ability as their civilian head to justifying the daring new "republican model of government," the fate of which, he told his countrymen, was "deeply," yes, "finally, staked on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people."

Jefferson, standing on Washington's shoulders, widened the concept of popular rule by word and example, and in acquiring the vast trans-Mississippi domain, he sought, among other things, to check the growing power of the eastern business interests with an expanding agrarian West. Lincoln, given no choice in the matter, settled on the battlefield the question of "whether, in a free government, the minority have the right to break up the government whenever they choose," and while doing so he advanced the cause of human rights by outlawing the anachronism of slavery.

And in our own century the New Freedom of Wilson and the New Deal of Roosevelt have, in turn, enlarged momentously the Government's responsibility for the social and economic well-being of the people.

These towering figures, moreover, acted masterfully and farsightedly in foreign affairs. All cared profoundly about keeping the country out of war, though over the years circumstances beyond American control necessitated differences as to the means. When the Republic was young and craved time to build up its strength, Washington instituted, and Jefferson perfected, the policy of isolationism or neutralism toward the chronic power struggles embroiling Europe; and Lincoln, in the dark days of the Civil War, averted, through consummate diplomacy, the calamity of British intervention on behalf of the South.

But with America's coming fully of age the situation changed. As Washington had foretold in his "Farewell Address," the United States now could take "command of its own fortunes"; and the shrinkage of global distances plus the modern weaponry of destruction obliged a departure from the past. The goal of peace remained unaltered, but the method devised by Wilson and Roosevelt to achieve it was through an international structure for collective security. Under this sign, Wilson pioneered the League of Nations; and Roosevelt, succeeding where Wilson had not in winning senatorial approval, helped reshape that body into the more potent United Nations.

The members of this group were not only constructive statesmen but realistic politicians. Washington apart, none of them waited for the office to seek the man; they pursued it with all their might and main. And upon winning it, they functioned as chiefs of their parties as well as Chiefs of State. Washington, it is true, as the first to occupy the position, endeavored to shun political ties; he even appointed the contending party leaders, Jefferson and Hamilton to his Cabinet; but, taught by experience, he presently abandoned his nonpartisanship as "a sort of political suicide." His successors followed this course from the outset.

The arts of the politician were, of course, indispensable to gain the needed congressional support for their policies. With unconvinced Members they knew when to reason and to browbeat, to bargain, and stand firm, to concede what was relatively unimportant in order to obtain what was essential. If occasion demanded, they used such means as bestowing or withholding Federal patronage, employing or threatening to employ the veto and, when all else failed, they appealed over the heads of the lawmakers to the people.

Every one of these men left the executive branch stronger and more influential than he found it. As a matter of course they magnified the powers expressly granted them by the Constitution and assumed others not expressly denied by it. They acted on the conviction that when the framers of the document provided for a chief magistrate chosen periodically by and responsible to all the people they had intended that he should always be equal to the widening needs of society.

Inevitably, these Presidents encountered trouble with the Supreme Court, for its members, enjoying lifetime tenure of office and, moreover, restrained by the tribunal's past decisions, tended to speak for times gone by. Only Washington, the one President to name the entire body, escaped the dilemma.

Jefferson, alarmed lest the judiciary he had inherited from the political opposition would strike down "all the works of republicanism," got Congress to abolish a series of lower judgeships which the outgoing administration had prepared for its adherents, and he induced the House to impeach a grossly partisan member of the Supreme Court. Had the attempt at ouster succeeded, Chief Justice Marshall almost certainly would have been the next quarry.

Over and over again Lincoln, under plea of military necessity, ignored or defied judicial decrees. On one occasion he even disregarded a writ of habeas corpus of Chief Justice Taney himself. Wilson, though managing to avoid open strife, nonetheless viewed the Court's conservative bent as the Nation's "most obvious and immediate danger." And Franklin Roosevelt, when thwarted by the high bench in expanding his New Deal program, sought to correct its "horse and buggy" mentality by the addition of younger and more progressive Justices. Although Congress did not consent, the tribunal, in alarm, hastily changed its attitude. In all these affairs, moreover, the verdict of time has upheld the Presidents' underlying purposes, if not always their methods.

Being strong executives, the five also offended vested economic interests and longstanding popular prejudices. Furthermore, their sins of commission and omission, though small in the backward view of history, looked enormous to critical contemporaries. Each, in turn, met with charges of subverting the Constitution, of lusting to be king or dictator, and of knuckling under on occasion to some foreign power.

The "arrows of malevolence" so wounded Washington that he exclaimed to a friend that he "had never repented but once having slipped the moment of resigning his office, and that was every moment since." Jefferson was pelted with such epithets as "Mad Tom," "contemptible hypocrite,' "a man without religion" and a "ravening wolf." Lincoln suffered abuse, even from northerners, as "the baboon in the White House," "a usurper" and "a perjured traitor." He said it was in his heart to pity Satan if "to be head of Hell is as hard as what I have to undergo." Wilson and Roosevelt, as many today will still remember, came off no better, both being reviled for wanton personal ambition and seeking to rule or ruin. In the case of each of the greats, the newspaper press added fuel to the flames when, indeed, it did not start them.

Yet, notwithstanding all the sound and fury, these Presidents were more deeply loved than they were hated. The rank and file of Americans reelected every one of them to a second term and Roosevelt to a third and fourth.

Another factor marking the group was that, but for the selfmade Lincoln, they came from an upper level of society (and, indeed, even Lincoln, before reaching the White House, had surmounted his humble beginnings to become a leader of the Illinois bar). This willingness of the voter to accept patrician leadership sheds an interesting light on the flexibility of U.S. democracy. Washington, Jefferson, and Roosevelt, alike in being well-to-do, landed proprietors, believed, as a matter of course, in the importance of preserving or recovering for the mass of people the kind of values and human advantages traditional to a rural way of life; and Wilson growing up in a highly cultured but not affluent atmosphere, arrived at pretty much the same outlook on the basis of extensive reading.

But, superior though these personages were, only two, Washington and Wilson, excelled as administrators. The rest either lacked the ability or else believed the ends of public policy more important than the machinery for achieving them. On balance, moreover, their inattention served to unfreeze official routine and inject vitality and a readiness to innovate into the Government ranks. Franklin Roosevelt in fact went so far as to declare, "The Presidency is not merely an administrative office. That is the least of it." If he overstated the matter, all the others would have heartily endorsed his further view: "It is preeminently a place of moral leadership."

Moral leadership meant a commitment to maintain and transmit to future generations the liberal and humane ideals of the past. It involved the capacity to fit the national purpose to the constantly changing requirements of a dynamic people. In brief, the foremost Presidents possessed a profound sense of history, a rooted dedication to time-sanctioned principles which each, in his own day and way, succeeded in reinvigorating and extending. Essential as it was to win approval at the polls, they looked as well to the regard of posterity.

James Bryce, assessing the United States' Chief Magistrates down to 1900 in his book, "The American Commonwealth," entitled a famous chapter, "Why Great Men Are Not Chosen Presidents"; but he erred even for those years. Taking the entire span from Washington to the exit of Eisenhower, the historical consultants find that great men occupied the chair during 40 of the 172 years and, if their near-great associates be added, the grand total approaches 80 years, or nearly half the lifetime of the Republic. Can any other nation display a better record?

Moreover, even the do-nothing stretches in the White House did not lack value, since, as a rule, they provided breathing spells for the country to digest the achievements of the forceful Executives.

All in all, the historical picture offers the present-day defenders of democracy against totalitarianism reassuring evidence that Jefferson's—and America's—reliance on the people as "the safest depository of power" is the cure for mankind's ills.

THE 75 PARTICIPANTS IN THE POLL

Lewis E. Atherton, University of Missouri.

James P. Baxter, III, former president of Williams College.

Ray A. Billington, Northwestern University.

Wilfred E. Binkley, Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio.

Theodore C. Blegen, University of Minn.

John M. Blum, Yale University.

Denis W. Brogan, Peterhouse, Cambridge University, England.

Paul H. Buck, Harvard University.

Solon J. Buck, former National Archivist, Washington, D.C.

James M. Burns, Williams College.

Francis W. Coker, Yale University.

Henry S. Commager, Amherst College.

James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University.

Marcus Cunliffe, University of Manchester, Manchester, England.

Richard N. Current, University of Wis.

Merle Curti, University of Wisconsin.

Virginius Dabney, editor, the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

Chester M. Destler, Connecticut College, New London.

David Donald, Princeton University.

Dwight L. Dumond, University of Mich.

Clement Eaton, University of Kentucky.

Harold O. Faulkner, Smith College.

Gilbert C. Fite, University of Oklahoma.

Felix Frankfurter, U.S. Supreme Court.

John Hope Franklin, Brooklyn College.

Frank Freidel, Harvard University.

Ralph H. Gabriel, American University, Washington, D.C.

Paul W. Gates, Cornell University.

Norman A. Graebner, University of Illinois.

Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina.

Oscar Handlin, Harvard University.

James B. Hedges, Brown University.

Pendleton Herring, president, Social Science Research Council.

John D. Hicks, University of California at Berkeley.

John Higham, University of Michigan.

Richard Hofstadter, Columbia University.

Arthur N. Holcombe, Harvard University.

Sidney Hyman, political analyst, Washington, D.C.

Gerald W. Johnson, journalist and historian, Baltimore.

Walter Johnson, University of Chicago.

Arthur S. Link, Princeton University.

Dumas Malone, University of Virginia.

Asa E. Martin, Pennsylvania State University.

Reginald C. McGrane, University of Cincinnati.

Frederick Merk, Harvard University.

Elting E. Morison, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Samuel E. Morison, Harvard University.

George E. Mowry, University of California at Los Angeles.

Curtis Nettels, Cornell University.

Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania.

Russell B. Nye, Michigan State College.

John W. Oliver, University of Pittsburgh.

Bradford Perkins, University of Michigan.

Dexter Perkins, Cornell University.

Stow Persons, University of Iowa.

Earl Pomeroy, University of Oregon.

David M. Potter, Stanford University.

Edgar E. Robinson, Stanford University.

Lindsay Rogers, Columbia University.

Eugene H. Roseboom, Ohio State University.

Clinton Rossiter, Cornell University.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Harvard University.

Charles G. Sellers, Jr., University of California at Berkeley.

Fred A. Shannon, University of Illinois.

James W. Silver, University of Mississippi.

Henry Nash Smith, University of California at Berkeley.

Kenneth M. Stampp, University of California at Berkeley.

Irving Stone, biographer and historian.

Glyndon G. Van Deusen, University of Rochester.

Richard C. Wade, University of Chicago.

Walter P. Webb, University of Texas.

Thomas J. Wertenbaker, Princeton University.

T. Harry Williams, Louisiana State University.

Harvey Wish, Western Reserve University.

C. Vann Woodward, Yale University.

Appendix

Mrs. J. Mitch Johnson "Mrs. Democrat of San Saba County" Received 50-Year Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 3, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mrs. J. Mitch Johnson, of San Saba, San Saba County, Tex., generally referred to as "Mrs. Democrat of San Saba County," a Gold Star Mother and winner of many awards and honors, is known to people throughout the central Texas area and in the State capital city of Austin.

Mrs. Johnson has received a 50-year membership pin in the San Saba Chapter of the Eastern Star. She has won many other honors in her life and has organized parent-teachers' associations in schools all over San Saba County, and was the first person in San Saba County, Tex., to ever receive a life membership in the PTA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the San Angelo Standard Times of June 15, 1962, under the title, "Mrs. Johnson Awarded Pin at San Saba," and an article from the Brownwood Bulletin of June 18, 1962, under the title, "50-Year Award Goes to Mrs. J. M. Johnson."

Mrs. Johnson's life of political, religious, and civic leadership has endeared her to all who know her and has ennobled all of the activities which she has touched. We honor ourselves when we honor her.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times, June 15, 1962]

MRS. JOHNSON AWARDED PIN AT SAN SABA

SAN SABA (SC).—In a ceremony in her home recently Mrs. J. Mitch Johnson was awarded a 50-year membership pin in the San Saba Chapter of the Order of Eastern Star.

The presentation was made by Mrs. Cecil Brown, worthy matron of the chapter.

Mrs. Johnson has served twice as worthy matron of the chapter and also has held district offices.

A Gold Star mother, and a lifelong resident of the county, she is the former Miss Lillie Alice Hamrick, daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Joe Hamrick, early pioneers who helped organize the county. In 1901, she married J. Mitch Johnson, a native of Mississippi. Her lawyer husband, a former mayor of San Saba and county tax assessor, died in 1946.

The couple's family has included three daughters and two sons. The daughters are Mrs. Inez Garrett, of San Saba, Mrs. Carlos Ashley of Llano and Mrs. Neff Manor of San Antonio. Mrs. Ashley and Mrs. Manor are twins. One son, Edward Johnson, is an attorney of Brownwood and Dallas.

Dr. John Mitchell Johnson, Jr., of Longview, lost his life in World War II. Mrs. Garrett and Edward Johnson are graduates of Baylor Unversity and Dr. Johnson graduated from Tulane University, New Orleans.

Mrs. Johnson is often referred to as "Mrs. Democrat of San Saba County." She was cochairman of the women's division of the county Democratic party, a member of the First Methodist Church, and was given a life membership in the Women's Society of Christian Service. She helped organize the parent-teachers' associations in schools over the county, and was the first person in the county to receive a life membership in the PTA.

She is a charter member of the San Saba Study Club, and past president of the San Saba Garden Club.

Living with Mrs. Johnson are her daughter, Mrs. Garrett and teenage Jonibeth Garrett, one of her 10 grandchildren.

[From the Brownwood (Tex.) Bulletin, June 18, 1962]

FIFTY-YEAR AWARD GOES TO MRS. J. M. JOHNSON

SAN SABA (BBC).—Mrs. J. Mitch Johnson has been awarded a 50-year membership pin in the San Saba Chapter of the Order of the Eastern Star.

Mrs. Johnson has served twice as worthy matron of the chapter and has also held district offices.

This Gold Star mother, a lifelong resident of the county, is the former Miss Lillie Alice Hamrick, daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Joe Hamrick, early pioneers who helped organize the county.

After attending San Saba school, she married J. Mitch Johnson December 22, 1901, a native of Mississippi. Her lawyer husband, a former mayor of San Saba and county tax assessor-collector, died in 1946.

The couple's family has included three daughters and two sons. The daughters are Mrs. Inez Garrett of San Saba, Mrs. Carlos Ashley of Llano and Mrs. Neff Manor of San Antonio. Mrs. Ashley and Mrs. Manor are twins. One son, J. Edward Johnson, is an attorney in Brownwood and Dallas. Another son, Dr. John Mitchell Johnson, Jr., died during World War II.

Mrs. Johnson is often referred to as "Mrs. Democrat of San Saba County." She was cochairman of the women's division of the county Democratic Party.

A member of the First Methodist Church, she has taught Sunday school classes in almost every department and was given a life membership in the Woman's Society of Christian Service. She helped organize the parent-teachers' association in schools over the county and was the first person in the county to receive a life membership in the PTA.

She is a charter member of the San Saba Study Club and past president of the San Saba Garden Club.

Living in the home with Mrs. Johnson are her daughter, Mrs. Garrett and daughter, Jonibeth, one of 10 grandchildren.

Let's Give the Boys Something We Never Had

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article concerning Our Lady of Czestochowa Junior Baseball League of Jersey City. It is my hope that the accomplishments of this league will provide a model which can be followed by other groups who wish to contribute to the sound growth of our Nation's children by providing adequate recreational facilities.

The article follows:

LET'S GIVE THE BOYS SOMETHING WE NEVER HAD

Located in the heart of historic old first ward of Jersey City, within the shadow of the lady in the harbor, Miss Liberty, and but a country mile from Ellis Island, stands the Our Lady of Czestochowa Junior Baseball League Field, on Grand and Henderson Streets.

The field is the property of the parish of Our Lady of Czestochowa. The Reverend Father Martin Piasecki, pastor of Our Lady of Czestochowa, turned the vacant lot over to a group of private citizens whose ancestors passed through Ellis Island from a then glorious and free Poland.

These men, who continue to reside and do business in a neighborhood that is a history of America's Revolution—Essex, Morris, Warren, Wayne, Henderson, Montgomery, Green, York, Sussex, Mercer, etc., Streets—donated their own money and sacrificed their time to convert an empty lot into a regulation junior league baseball field.

Six hundred feet of outer cyclone fence, 180 feet wooden inner, outfield regulation fence, two cinder-block dugouts, two sets of grandstand, spectator seats, 300 yards of topsoil, a 15-foot backdrop screen, grass-seeded and white-chalk-lined infield complete the physical field.

The Our Lady of Czestochowa league was founded in 1960. Its motto: "Let's give the boys something we never had." Four teams of boys between the ages of 8 and 12, are fully equipped with uniforms, baseball equipment, bubble gum, scoreboard, good "umps" and bad "umps," comprise the league.

Sponsors of the teams are four downtown businessmen: Edward Bromirski, funeral director; Eugene Brauczewski, plumber contractor; Ben Pienkowski, pharmacist, and Mitch Stepuch, godfather of the league, Anchor Inn keeper.

Adult advisory council members of the league are: Henry Goscienski, Stanley Lewandowski, Paul Kowalczyk, Joe Goscienski, Ziggy Zdrowski, Jack Konkolewski, and Rev. Father Edward Gubernat, moderator.

Adult coaches and managers are: Ben Kowalczyk, Bill Journitz, Ziggy Kowalski, Chet Tomaszewski, Joe Liszewski, John Gornicz, Butch Szelwach, Hank Goscienski, Sam Gnyra, Wally Switav, Richie Kowalczyk, and Hank Legowski.

During the past few weeks much has been written about Poland and other captive nations. These men by their silent words and loud actions have set an example in the living proof of the value of freedom and liberty and a sincere and prayerful desire that their children and their neighbors' children will live the lives of decent juveniles with the hope that the shout of clean sports and good fun will someday enter the hearts of the children of the captive nations throughout the world, and may these captive boys someday have what our boys have.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the U.S. conference of Governors, earlier this year, adopted a resolution relating to the role of the National Guard in our defense and national life.

In my home State of Wisconsin—as throughout the Nation—the National Guard plays a significant role both in war and in peacetime.

Reflecting the consensus of the Governors' views, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution published in the National Guardsman printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY VOICE VOTE, WITHOUT DISSENT, BY THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF GOVERNORS, AT HERSHEY, PA., JULY 3, 1962

Whereas international communism by aggressive military action and subversion continues efforts to gain control over free world areas and thus to threaten the security of the United States; and

Whereas the unrelenting pressures of the Soviet Union in Berlin and the current military offensives of Communist forces in southeast Asia forecast the shape and intensity of aggressions we must expect in the years ahead; and

Whereas in addition to the capability for waging conventional war and other forms of harassment, the Soviet Union possesses a large stockpile of nuclear weapons and delivery system capable of placing such weapons on targets in the continental United States; and

Whereas because of the war potential of Communist nations, the United States must maintain defense forces of such strength and diversity as to deter or contain aggression by conventional forces and to deter nuclear attack, and, should deterence fail, have the ability and the strength to recover and retaliate; and

Whereas to fulfill increasing demands for forces in troubled areas overseas, to have adequate strategic reserves in the United States, to provide for a rapid general mobilization, and to be prepared to achieve recovery from nuclear attack, it is necessary that we have a large, flexible defense force, both Active and Reserve; and

Whereas little more than half of our conventional forces are located in the United States and much of this could be lost in a nuclear attack; and

Whereas to have a depth in defense necessary to sustain military operations and to assure a capability to recover from nuclear attack, the United States must have a large and ready reserve force widely dispersed; and

Whereas the National Guard has consistently furnished the Department of Army and the Department of Air Force with the types of organizations requested and has maintained these organizations at high levels of readiness, as evidenced by the speed with which the State forces responded in the Berlin crisis and the manner in which they carried out assigned missions; and

Whereas the determination of the Army National Guard to maintain and increase the professional competence of its organizations and individual members is evidenced by acceptance of active defense missions and by organizing special forces units and operating State officer candidate schools; and

Whereas the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia are prepared to furnish the Department of Defense the type of units requested at desired levels of readiness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 1962 Governor's Conference that—

1. The Army National Guard be continued at an average strength of 400,000;
2. The existing units of the Army National Guard be retained, including its 27 combat divisions, and that new type units required by the Active Army to assure a properly balanced and modern force be achieved by conversion of existing units to combat and combat support types required and be comparable in size to units converted;
3. The strength of nonpriority divisions and nondivisional units of the ARNG be manned at levels sufficient to permit effective training and thus assure the maintenance of all divisions and nondivisional units at reasonably high levels of mobilization readiness, in general 60 percent;
4. The Secretary of Defense be urged to direct a restudy of the proposed reorganization of the Army National Guard and that such a restudy be undertaken with a view to effecting changes in the Army National Guard structure at the same time as the conversion to the road concept is implemented, and, further, that the requirement in every State for an adequate, organized, trained and equipped recovery force be given due consideration; be it further

Resolved, That the Governors support the principle of greater readiness in the Nation's Reserve Forces, but oppose firmly and plan the implementation of which would drastically reduce the size and effectiveness of the National Guard in many States and overall reduce the capability of the Army National Guard to fulfill its historic role as the first line reserve; and be it further

Resolved, That no action be taken in any State with respect to proposals made to the individual States until the advisory committee on the National Guard has had further opportunity to study the details of the proposals and to confer again with the Secretary of Defense.

A Letter to Secretary Rusk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussian nation, known to learned historians as White Ruthenia, is one of the captive nations held by force within the present-day Russian Communist empire. While the Byelorussian nation is identified as one of the members of the United Nations, relatively little is known on the American scene, in a popular sense, about the history, the customs, the traditions, and the aspirations of the people of this ancient land. They are known as the people between the marshes because their nation was inaccessible to the hordes of Genghis Khan when those forces swept the Eurasian lands and reached deep into the heart of Western civilization. The marshes of Byelorussia served as a natural barrier against the rapidly moving, horse borne forces of the golden horde which made Genghis Khan the spectre of fear in his generation. The people of Byelorussia are very proud of the fact that they have resisted the influences of the princes of Muscovy, the tzars and the commissars of Moscow just as they resisted the conquering waves of the golden hordes.

The people of Byelorussia fight on today for the realization of their ideals of freedom and self-government against the new menace of Moscow, which takes the form of imperial Russian communism. History tells us that the people of Byelorussia seized the opportunity to proclaim their national independence and won complete separation from Russian tyranny with the collapse of the Russian tzarist empire in 1917. That was the golden age of national independence so far as the nations now held captive within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are concerned. It was golden because the refreshing air of freedom, the stimulating spirit of self-government, the compelling force of liberty prevailed everywhere throughout the broken empire of the princes of Muscovy, except among the Muscovites who alone were untouched by this powerful current in the affairs of man. But Byelorussia's national independence was short lived. It became the first victim of imperial Russian communism as the Red commissars who replaced the oppressive czars launched a campaign of aggression to reconstruct the broken empire. This interruption in the national aspirations of the Byelorussian people is a temporary one because the spirit of liberty, of self-government, and of national independence serves as a unifying force among all Byelorussians worthy of the name.

To assist the people of Byelorussia in their struggle against the imperialism of Moscow, the Byelorussian Liberation Front, with headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio, serves a very useful, constructive, and determined purpose. The members of this organization seek nothing more than understanding for the aspirations of their people and support for their objective of national independence.

On July 21, 1962, the Byelorussian Liberation Front sent a communication to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, presenting their views on the worldwide struggle between the forces of freedom and the evil forces of imperial Russian communism. Their views are very impressive. They include a warning that a change of control within the Russian empire from Communist to non-Communist hands will not remove the threat to freedom which weighs so heavily upon the world of our time. The Russian czars long maintained that nations such as Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and the other captive nations within the Soviet Union did not exist as a historical fact. The commissars of Moscow have been compelled by the driving force of nationalism—the power factor of national independence—to not only admit the existence of these nations, but to plead for their admission into the United Nations. It is a tragedy beyond description that current policy of our State Department refuses to recognize the political existence of these non-Russian nations and, worse, supports the reactionary propaganda of the former Russian czars by maintaining that such nations are nothing but traditional parts of the Russian state.

The conclusion of the Byelorussian Liberation Front, with which I concur, is that a Russian non-Communist empire, if permitted to exist will be as much of a threat to the world as was czarist Russia at one time and as Red Russia is today.

Under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the letter of July 21 to Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State:

BYELORUSSIAN LIBERATION FRONT,
Cleveland, Ohio, July 21, 1962.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State
Washington, D.C.

SIR: On the occasion of the observance of the Captive Nations Week, which has been enacted by the Congress of the United States last 3 years and approved by the President in the issuance of a special proclamation, the national headquarters of the Byelorussian Liberation Front participating in the nationwide ceremonies along with other submerged nations, tenders hereby to the Government of the United States its sincere appreciation and thanks for the moral support thus extended to these enslaved peoples in their continued struggle to liberate themselves from the Russian Communist imperialism.

In this connection, we desire to reemphasize the following recognized facts:

The Russian communism today menaces the free nations of Europe, Asia and other parts of the world. Sooner or later they will be faced with the same fate which met the captive nations unless international communism is destroyed at its source—in Moscow.

In view of the threat represented by Russian Communist imperialism, a threat menacing the freedom and indeed the very existence of the free world, we declare that—

The Communist peace offensive has been launched in order to paralyze the free world and to disarm it, thus to achieve world domination without bloodshed as boasted by Khrushchev;

Communist offers of trade and cultural exchange are merely bait to lure the democracies and to break up the security systems of the free nations;

In the present Berlin crisis provoked by Khrushchev, America must make no concessions for the making of the slightest concession to the Kremlin in the solution of the German problem will be used by the Communists to make further provocative demands;

Every effort must be made to further the liquidation of the Communist regime in Cuba by giving the necessary help to the Cuban people for carrying on the struggle to free their country from Communist slavery, for a further extension of the Communist system on the American continent would mean the spreading of the cancer cell in a healthy organism;

The Soviet campaign for the recognition of Red China, and the satellites for seating them in the United Nations is a dangerous trap for the free world;

America and the other free states must pay great attention to the present unendurably hard living conditions among the Chinese people living under the Communist regime and must give the necessary help to the Government of Nationalist China to carry on the struggle for the liberation of the entire Chinese people.

The free world is obliged to help the oppressed peoples in Europe and Asia in their struggle against the Communist conspiracy. By their struggle against communism these oppressed peoples have prevented Russian communism from consolidating for further conquests;

The threat to the peace and security of the free world will disappear only after the source and root of the Communist conspiracy—the Russian Soviet Empire—is divided into its parts, separating the non-Russian peoples from their Russian oppressors and helping them build their own national states;

To check dictator Khrushchev who is openly avowing his aggressive intention by methods of force, terror and deceit of imposing the Communist system on our children and of raising in triumph his bloody and slavish hammer and sickle banner over the free world—to check this Communist tyrant, America and the other nations of the free world must give moral and material support to all those nations who for years have been carrying on the struggle for liberation from Khrushchev's banner and his slave system;

The preservation of the U.S.S.R. intact after the fall of communism without the dissolution of the Russian Empire into its component parts, will neither terminate the Russian Imperialistic threat to the world nor satisfy the just aspirations of the non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. for a free life of their own. A Russian non-Communist empire if permitted to exist will be as much of a threat to the world as was tsarist Russia at one time and as Red Russia is today;

Freedom is indivisible. The world cannot forever remain half free and half slave.

May God guide the free nations in arriving at their decision and may He grant wisdom in having it properly implemented.

Respectfully yours,
Capt. JOHN SHIKCHIK,
Chairman of the Byelorussian Liberation Front.
ARKADZI SACEWICZ,
Chairman, American-Byelorussian Cultural Relief Association.
Eng. LEONID HARTANOWICH,
Chairman, Byelorussian Orthodox Church Committee.
KONSTANT MATYLICKI,
Representative American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Block of Nations.

The New Un-Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 3, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on March 26, 1962, Miss Harriet Miller, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Montana, made a significant address to the Conference of School Administrators of Montana. Her address, which is titled "The New Un-Americanism," has just been published and covers subject matters and issues that merit wider circulation than was given the original message. I commend Miss Miller's speech to all friends of education. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW UN-AMERICANISM
(By Harriet Miller)

Today I want to talk with you about something that is so fundamental that we seldom find ourselves discussing it—the protection and preservation of American education.

When we speak of American education, we usually take for granted two important premises—again, so fundamental that to point them out may seem unnecessary. These premises are first, that American education, by its very essence, is education for American life and citizenship; and second, that education for individual freedom demands freedom of thought and inquiry to the end that the educated individual is competent to act responsibly and intelligently from free choice.

These premises we take for granted and, until fairly recently, there seemed to be no reason for doing otherwise. But recently a new threat to American education has appeared on the scene—a threat that endangers not only education but our way of life since it is no exaggeration to predicate the survival of our free society on the survival of American education. Today schools everywhere—Montana schools included—are threatened seriously enough to give us pause.

Without naming names, I think it is enough to say that there are forces at work today whose business is fear and suspicion. These forces masquerade in a wide array of disguises, some apparently quite respectable, and their work does not suffer from the disguise as they go about planting the seeds of distrust among Americans. By inference and innuendo, by oversimplification to the point of falsehood, by shameless appeals to emotion and ignorance and prejudice, these forces are working to destroy the fabric of America by turning us against each other. Their method: create deadly suspicion. Their goal: divide and conquer. This has become the new un-Americanism.

Once, you know, we Americans believed that we could recognize such forces. Typically, we believed, their spokesmen came among us in something resembling beatnik attire, wearing shaggy beards, suffering from lack of a bath, and waving pamphlets bearing red covers with the hammer and sickle prominently displayed. But times have changed, and today the forces which would destroy us are much more sophisticated; they see to it that their representatives look and act and sound very much like the rest of us. And, unfortunately, these forces sometimes are aided by well-meaning people who have no intention of being anything but patriotic. But how much more effective these forces are when the voice among us spreading fear and suspicion is the voice of a neighbor, perhaps a local businessman, or a well-known rancher, a community leader, a hometown newspaper or radio station, serving, usually unwittingly, the cause of those who would divide us as Americans.

This characteristic of the new un-Americanism is perhaps its most dangerous aspect—the phenomenon we are witnessing today where well-meaning citizens, who are honestly devoted to our way of life, are being persuaded by clever appeals to their very patriotism to serve the forces which would destroy us.

For the schools, the problem is real, for the fact is well known to everyone, friend and foe alike, that there is nothing more important to the preservation of our way of life than our educational system. The schools, then, become a special target, in ways not always easy to recognize. Let's look at some of the ways.

One is the subtle turning of natural interest and concern into distrust and suspicion. The forces behind the new un-Americanism are aware of the sincere interest which many a citizen takes in the schools. It is also well known that nearly everybody has some fault to find, some bone to pick, about the way the schools today do, or do not do, something or other. Now this is natural, and to be expected, but here the point of departure comes, because from this point, unfortunately, it seems to be not very difficult to persuade some well-meaning citizens that whatever it is they don't like about the schools today is indicative of nothing less than deliberate subversion.

Perhaps Citizen Jones disapproves of the way his first-grade son is being taught to read. Suppose Citizen Brown thinks the questionnaire which the guidance director sends home is too personal. Suppose Citizen Smith objects to a book assigned as outside reading in a high school English course. Suppose Citizen Green disagrees politically with the civics teacher. Surely in America there is room for the opinions of all of these citizens, and surely proper attention is due the honest questions which citizens and parents normally raise. But it is at this point that the new un-Americanism attempts to seize upon the citizen's natural, normal interest, and by emotion, not by logic, seeks to develop a conviction that there are dark and dangerous reasons behind whatever it is the school is doing which displeases the citizen. Thus, we hear of everything from investigations of school library books, to condemnation of guidance as brainwashing, to the charge that Johnnie is deliberately not being taught to read so that in his future ignorance he will be a pushover for communism. These are sypmtomatic of the fear ond distrust which, by devious emotional appeals, the forces of the new un-Americanism have succeeded in implanting in some susceptible minds.

Let us not confuse this kind of activity with the constructive efforts of thinking citizens to improve education. Questioning and criticism certainly are the right and the responsibility of the thinking citizen. The difference, which menaces the schools, is the misuse of the citizen's normal questioning, turning it from a desire for the facts to a subtle accusation that there must be something subversive behind the scene, with an inferred condemnation of those directly associated with the schools; and, as a result, an implication that, no matter what the schools are doing, their motivation is suspect.

Perhaps the most obvious instance of this dangerous development is the question that we in education are encountering today with increasing frequency—"Why are the schools not teaching Americanism?" The phrasing of this question, it seems to me, is the most alarming aspect of the current problem.

The question itself is not alarming, because, for any citizen honestly concerned about Americanism in the schools, there are ready answers—very good, very positive, very enlightening answers.

It is rather the way in which the forces of the new un-Americanism have succeeded in having the question phrased that is the reason for concern: "Why are you not teaching Americanism in the school?"

You see the distrust there—the implied acceptance of an idea that the schools today are devoid of Americanism; that the schools now do nothing to develop an appreciation of our American heritage; that they now do not instruct pupils in American history and government; that they now do not work to foster respect for American principles and devotion to our American way of life.

Surely citizens have the right to ask for reassurance about what the schools are doing—but of the queries I have heard, I cannot recall a single one which asked, as a person would ask for other information, "What are the schools doing to teach Americanism?" or even "Are the schools teaching Americanism?" No. The question is always phrased negatively—"Why can't we have Americanism taught in the schools?"—showing the conviction that the schools purposely are not teaching Americanism, that there are people—impliedly educators—who deliberately are keeping it out.

This strange conviction, I believe, did not just happen to develop. There is no doubt in my mind that it has been cultivated and carefully nurtured by those who want our people to suspect and distrust each other, which means also suspecting and distrusting the schools. If there were not a planned effort in this direction, the current wave of popular concern about Americanism in the schools would find expression, at least occasionally, in something other than the negative, which inevitably suggests that those who raise the question in this negative way are using phrases deliberately implanted in their minds.

For us in education, I think it is important to recognize what is going on, because I believe for many of us it is hard to take seriously the questioning of Americanism in the schools.

After all, we may say, American education is, by its very being, education for American life and citizenship, is it not? Are not our schools the essence of Americanism? If the schools are not doing any of these things which are necessary to develop good American citizens, then we had better close the schools tomorrow, for anything else they are doing is totally meaningless.

Yes, we in education may say this, and for us it may well be sufficient, for it is on this premise that we have based our work and hence our lives. But I do not believe that any of us here has a deep-rooted doubt about the truly American orientation of our schools; I do not believe that any of us here is deeply suspicious of our schools; I do not believe that we here are lacking in trust in American education; I do not believe that we are fearful of some dark shadow lurking in the schools clutching at young minds, luring—even forcing—innocent pupils to turn their loyalties away from our country and our way of life.

But make no mistake. Merely because these suspicions and doubts are not ours—merely because the shadows are not real to us—does not mean that, for some people, they do not exist. And because some people are thus distrustful and afraid, we, too, have cause to be alarmed—not because of what they fear, but rather of the fact that they have become fearful, and suspicious, and lacking in confidence, victimized by the new un-Americanism.

To the extent, then, that such people are in a position to encourage a general loss of confidence in American education, the schools, and our way of life, are jeopardized.

Now it may be submitted that these current expressions of a lack of confidence in the motivation of education are just normally developing reactions which might be reasonably expected at this point in our history. Could this be the explanation? The facts, I think, convince us otherwise.

Historically, the schools have performed a magnificent task. From the beginnings of free education in America, accomplishments have far outweighed shortcomings. Consider what our Nation's history might have been without our educational system, and it will be unequivocally clear that the schools have made this country strong and great. From a struggling young Nation striving to weld together the many peoples who came to our shores, to the vital America we know today, the history of national growth has been the history of success of the American dream of free education for all.

With this proud history, is it reasonable to expect dark doubt today about the motivation of our schools? Is it reasonable to expect suspicion about what is really guiding American education? Or can these reactions be explained only as a deliberate effort to strike at the very roots of our way of life?

I know of no one who claims that education today is perfect. I know of no one who claims that, in all America, there is not a single teacher of un-American persuasion. I know of no one who claims that the schools could not do a better job than they are doing, whether it be in science or physical education or American history or whatever. Faults have always been with us; they are not new. Traditionally, however, Americans are accustomed to working constructively to correct faults by seeking the facts, proposing possible solutions, experimenting objectively, and adopting the changes needed for improvement. Until recently, Americans have not been accustomed to emotionally charged searchings for the "reason behind" the faults, accompanied by the fearful inference that only treachery could be the explanation. This, then, is the situation in which schools today find themselves.

What can we do about it? What must we do?

First, I believe, we in education must recognize that, because of our profession, it is to be our lot to be on the firing line perhaps more than any other single group. We must recognize that the problem is not going to go away, and although we may expect it to diminish from time to time before approaching new crests, we must convince ourselves that there is nothing to be gained by hiding our heads in the sand. We cannot ignore the challenge; we must face it head on.

We in education, of course, are not alone. There are other targets of particular interest to the forces of the new un-Americanism, such as the clergy, the employees and officials of the various levels of government, those in the communications media—the press, radio and television—and, occasionally, those in various learned professions. All of these, along wtih the schools and colleges, are subject to more than the usual proportion of unsubstantiated charges of being infiltrated with communism or of having "sold out" to the Communists. But locally, on the home front, the schools and the educators make the handiest targets.

Some of you already have experienced what I am talking about; chances are that within the next few months more of you will become personally and painfully aware of the problem. And this is precisely the reason why I am discussing this with you today at this conference. It's a lot easier to keep your perspective the first time somebody calls you a Communist if, instead of taking it personally, you realize that it is a part of an overall program, and that you as a person just happen to be one of those in the line of fire. It also helps, I think, to know that you are far from being alone.

What you do in those circumstances, of course, is up to you. The important thing is to keep your dedication to the schools, keep your determination to work for the principles of American education as you know them, and to trust in the good intentions and good sense of the majority of the people. You, as an educator, must not wilt because, if you do, you leave your school defenseless, and that, of course, is exactly the intended result.

Now, in addition to being prepared personally for innuendos and inferences, and even outright accusations, there are other things that we as educators can do to combat the new un-Americanism.

First of all, of course, we must be able to recognize it. In the current age of labels, recognition involves something more than identification by name. In fact, names and labels have become about as unreliable a guide as we can imagine. Liberal, conservative, radical, extremist, left, right, middle-of-the-road—what do these mean? Because these terms have been used so loosely, and because they have been misused deliberately to induce fear and suspicion, it seems to me better to avoid relying on them at all.

When the schools are criticized other than constructively, let us not label the critic, but rather let us recognize the true source of the criticism, remembering always that most of our critics are well-meaning citizens and that a certain amount of criticism actually is based on misinformation and misunderstanding. Surely it will do our schools no good to react to criticism by hanging one of the popular labels on the critic, and such action may obscure the real source of the problem.

True Americanism, after all, has its basis in individual freedom. Its antithesis is totalitarianism. America is founded on the principles of liberty with responsibility, and justice for all. Totalitarianism tolerates no diversity; it recognizes no rights; it guarantees no justice; it relies on enforced conformity. It is the objective of dictatorship, and not of American education, to produce generations of youth guaranteed to think alike. Free education, American education, derives its strength from freedom of thought and inquiry; our free America derives its strength from the diversity of our people. To recognize the new un-Americanism, we do not need labels; all we need is a clear understanding of these basic differences between our way of life and totalitarianism.

Next to recognizing the characteristics of the new un-Americanism, we should be prepared to enlighten those who are honestly misguided. Remember, this deliberate program of spreading fear about what our schools are doing has been designed to raise doubts in many minds, and as a result there are today more than a few citizens who would benefit by a bit of solid reassurance. Why not give it to them? Why not prepare a brief review of what the schools have been doing all along, quietly, routinely, to foster appreciation and true understanding of America? Many of the things are so obvious that it may seem unnecessary to list them, but let's list some of them anyway: the salute to the flag; the patriotic songs and music; the drawings of George Washington's cherry tree and Abe Lincoln's log cabin; the Gettysburg Address; the observances of national holidays; the courses in history and civics and American Government—even the little exercises in written expression of American principles and patriotism. The list can go on and on.

In the past several years, as many of you know, I have visited hundreds of Montana schools, large and small, city and rural, and I have seen an impressive number of the everyday activities that come under the heading of teaching Americanism, although no one had intended such a specific classification. One typical example which I recall dates back 2 or 3 years. It happened to be in Livingston, and it happened to be a fifth-grade classroom. When I walked in, unannounced, I noticed a display of well-written statements on American citizenship. These were done as an assignment in English. I mentioned them to Superintendent Haines, and later he sent them to me.

Just for a moment, I'd like you to hear some of these fifth grade statements—not because they are unusual, but because they are so typical:

This one is called, "What Does My American Citizenship Mean To Me?" by Kamla. She says:

"I means to me to be loyal, to help others, to be thrifty, to do our best, to love God, to help build a better nation and to do our share."

This one, by Diane, says:

"I am glad I am an American because I am free. I can go to the church I want. I can be what I want when I grow up. I am glad that when I grow up I can vote on the things I think are best for my country. I can go to a free school. I can say anything I want about my Government. My family and I are not forced into doing anything we do not want to do."

This one, by Mike, says:

"I am glad that I do not live in a foreign country for I would have to belong to a military group instead of Boy Scouts. Every boy in America has the chance to become President; maybe someday I may be that boy."

And Kerry said:

"Americans have responsibilities to do what is right—responsibilities to help his neighbor and his neighbor should help him."

And one last statement, by Ellen:

"As I see the flag in school or anywhere, it gives me all the heart to say the pledge with everything I got. I love my free country and I am going to help keep it free. This is what my American citizenship means to me."

It seems to me that this sort of thing should help to reassure some of the honestly apprehensive, especially in view of the fact that it hadn't occurred to the school administration to publicize this activity because it is such a commonplace part of the school program. After all, we don't send up rockets or put ads in the newspaper whenever we teach arithmetic; somehow we just expect people to know that's what we're doing, since that's one of the things that schools are for. But today, to combat the new un-Americanism, a review of all the commonly accepted aspects of Americanism in the regular school program might be a very useful thing.

Next, don't overlook the support of the people who know what you're up against. If possible, before it becomes a problem in your community, enlist the help of citizens and groups whose substance and integrity are unquestioned. The very existence of a substantial group of informed citizens whose purpose it is to protect the schools from unwise pressures can serve to deter those who otherwise might conclude it would be easy to pressure the local administration.

Above all, we must keep an open mind about constructive criticism. One of the greatest pitfalls resulting from the situation existing today is the tendency to react by condemning all criticism as stemming from the sources of the new un-Americanism. This is a natural reaction, and it is a trap we must studiously avoid. After all, we know the schools are not perfect. We know there is room for improvement. We must remain open to constructive suggestions and be willing to make changes that are soundly reasoned and objectively necessary, whether these changes involve improvement in the teaching of American history and government, or English, or mathematics, or the elementary reading program.

Certainly now, as always, is a good time to place renewed emphasis on American ideals—our American heritage—our American way of life, as long as the motives behind the action are good, and there is no underlying attempt to use the schools to promote a doctrinnaire viewpoint.

The important point, I think, is that any renewed emphasis on Americanism be recognized as just exactly that—renewed—and not be turned into an apparent victory for those who profit by promoting the notion that the schools are devoid of Americanism because pupils do not carry around a book with a red, white, and blue cover bearing the title, "My Americanism Course." Such superficial devices are scarcely necessary for renewing the emphasis on those basic aspects of Americanism which all along have been an intrinsic part of the school program.

These have been some suggestions for meeting the problems created for the schools by the new un-Americanism. It is tragic that we should have to devote so much precious time and energy to this task, when the needs of our schools are as great as they are today. Still, this is one battle we cannot lose, for only as long as the schools remain free can our American way of life continue. Protection of the kind of education that we as Americans cherish is every citizen's responsibility, but to us as educators fall the special tasks of fighting and winning the skirmishes to keep the schools from becoming institutions of indoctrination, rather than of education, and of helping people regain and retain confidence in the schools.

It will do us no good to put the first man on the moon if we fail in preserving the tradition of American education for the American way of life.

Charles H. Nehf Writes of Waterfowl and Wetlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Charles H. Nehf, the widely known outdoors editor of the Allentown (Pa.) Call-Chronicle, recently wrote an interesting report on the status of our national waterfowl resources which I commend to the attention of all Members.

DUCKS DEGRADED TO "PORK BARREL" STATUS

(By Charles H. Nehf)

The innocent wild duck, by a strange set of circumstances, is now on the verge of joining the long list of legislative characters in the Federal "pork barrel" gallery. It's indeed pathetic, but recent congressional action (maneuvering) on a program to implement waterfowl restoration on a national scale puts more value on "what local areas can get out of the duck stamp money" than "the great benefits—economic and natural—which a waterfowl refuge contributes to the immediate land around such sanctuary."

It all started in a very innocent way. In order to get a brief idea of what has transpired let us review a four-act play:

ACT I, DRAINAGE FOR MORE CROPLANDS

As America pushed its great agricultural frontier into the upper Plains States it finally reached the pothole section of northern Nebraska and Iowa, western Wisconsin, and the States of North and South Dakota. This section produces about 65 to 70 percent of all the ducks in the United States. From here they fan out, in fall and winter migrations, down the Mississippi, Central and Atlantic flyways. The greater portion of all wild ducks flying through Pennsylvania are produced in the pothole section of the country.

World War II brought great demands upon American agriculture. We not only fed our own people well, but also supplied the greater bulk of foodstuffs to the Allies. Naturally more land was needed to grow these crops so drainage of the potholes, begun in the early 30's, was pushed more than ever.

In the challenge to meet a world food crisis, we continued to drain the natural water reservoirs of the plains. Wetlands shrunk and our national supply of waterfowl came tumbling down.

ACT II, DRAINAGE CONTINUED, IN SPITE OF OVERPRODUCTION

Following World War II as our world food market declined, we continued to hang onto our stupid program of paying subsidies to drain more and more land to burst more and more storage bins of surplus grain.

Every Federal taxpayer; whether interested in water conservation, farming, or wildlife, is a part of this vicious shakedown. On the one hand we all pay for the drainage of wetlands to provide more croplands. Then when the surplus grains come along we get taken for the second pocket wringer in paying for storage.

Believe me, it isn't funny any more.

ACT III—DRAINAGE AND DROUGHT REDUCES WATER TABLES

The vast pothole sections of the prairie country are nature's water reservoirs. What precipitations fall on the flatland are then retained, later released or held to maintain the valuable water tables for the immediate areas.

In order to get some idea as to the harmful effect of Federal subsidy on drainage, Field Sports submits to its readers the recent testimony made by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations—

"As a result of the subsidized farm drainage in the prairie pothole area of Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota, almost half of the area's 1,350,000 acres of wetlands have been drained in the past 10 years.

"During the first 6-months period, Department of Agriculture subsidies for draining wetlands were given in 77 percent of the 553 cases where the Interior Department has recommended that financial assistance be denied * * * Thus the disregard of wildlife conservation appears to be getting worse," REUSS concluded.

In addition to the vicious tenacles of drainage tile which are being placed throughout the great plains, continued droughts over the past several years has added more havoc with water tables.

ACT IV—CHALLENGE PARTIALLY MET

Conservationists across the country, realizing the situation, pushed for the passage of a bill which would initiate a crash program for the purchase of wetlands. A core of sympathetic Congressmen provided the leadership and a very practical bill was passed during the last session of Congress.

Basically, as now visioned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, they are setting their sights for the acquisition of 3.7 million acres of additional wetlands. As pointed out by Frank P. Briggs, Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, the accelerated program should purchase 2.9 acres of this land by 1970. Total cost of this needed conservation program is set at $140 million.

From 1971 to the year 2007 it is anticipated a very small program, only 750,000 acres are contemplated for purchase in that 36-year period. All of these lands must be purchased by duck stamp funds.

Congress has given the Fish and Wildlife Service permission to borrow $105 million for use over the next 7 years; at the end of the 7-year period repayments of the borrowed funds must be made from the sale of the duck stamps.

The master plan outlines the purchase of 270,000 acres for refuges in the Atlantic flyway; 400,000 acres for refuges and 189,000 acres for production in the Mississippi flyway; 260,000 acres for refuges and 1,561,000 acres for production in the central flyway; and 270,000 acres for refugees in the Pacific flyway.

LOGROLLING BEGINS

Now that the program has been announced and the sportsmen will be paying the traffic, the professional politicians have now started their logrolling contests. The staves for the pork barrels are being planed, let's hope the binding rings are weak.

Under present law, counties in which a refuge is domiciled get 25 percent of net preserve revenues from grazing, oil and gas leases issued by the United States, from concessions, etc., on that particular refuge.

In spite of the fact that a waterfowl refuge in any given area is a great economic asset since it attracts tourists, sportsmen, bird watchers, and greatly hikes the private land values immediately adjacent to the refuge we now have Congressman who would: (a) Increase to 75 percent revenues returned to counties (S. 2138); (b) up the return to 100 percent (S. 2678); (c) direct appropriations to pay counties 1 percent of current value of refuge lands therein (S. 2270); and (d) direct payment in the amount of three-fourths of 1 percent of the apraised value of the land.

Waterfowl refuges, as pointed out 2 weeks ago in Field Sports, are on the same status as an industry. Once they are established and developed they provide terrific economic advantages to any given area. The land on which such a refuge is located is taken from the local tax roll, so the sacrifice in this small area is no different than the inducements given to industry by some communities. The overall benefits, if the judgments are fair, greatly exceed the minor loss of local real estate tax revenues when marginal lands are turned into a refuge.

RAY OF HOPE

In this great contest of manipulation, there appears one great ray of hope. Congressman LESTER R. JOHNSON, of Wisconsin, authored H.R. 8520, which would limit further Federal stimulation of the destruction of wetlands essential to the national waterfowl restoration program in North and South Dakota and Minnesota.

The first hurdle was cleared as this measure passed the House last September. Unfortunately it is now in deadlock in the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Several compromises have been advanced, but all hinged on phases of the big farm bill which was knocked down the other week.

Passage of H.R. 8250 in the Senate is now essential if the water conservation and waterfowl preservation program is to move forward. Pennsylvania is only a small part of the total program, yet each of us must be aware of what is happening on the national conservation scene.

American Red Cross—Home Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in our American life, there are many "unsung" individuals who serve unstintingly the needs of humanity.

The Red Cross, for example, has created one of the great, great stories of human service in history. Nationally and internationally, this work is performed by a nucleus career staff and about 2 million volunteers.

Recently, the Red Cross published a handbook on its home service for servicemen, veterans, their dependents, and others.

Reflecting upon how this great organization continues to serve humanity—in service and out of service—I ask unanimous consent to have the bulletin printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOB OF THE RED CROSS

The American Red Cross is a nationwide voluntary organization through which all people may serve in the American tradition of neighbor helping neighbor.

Organized under the Congress and directed by a volunteer board of governors broadly representative of the people and the Government, the Red Cross performs its work through 2 million volunteers and a small career staff serving across the Nation and overseas where U.S. Armed Forces members are stationed. It is an organization deriving its support from over 44 million adult and junior members. The local unit is the chapter.

Under Federal laws and regulations, the Red Cross sets up disaster preparedness plans and, when disaster occurs, puts them into operation to provide emergency relief for disaster victims and long-term assistance in restoring them to normal living, assists members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families, fulfills America's obligations under certain international treaties and, along with other Red Cross societies, conducts an international relief programs.

To carry out these charter responsibilities and to perform other health, safety, and welfare functions in the community and the Nation, the Red Cross has 10 service programs. Chapters fulfill Red Cross obligations by providing disaster services, services to the Armed Forces, and, by natural extension, services to veterans. Local needs and resources determine the extent to which other programs are conducted. This is your Red Cross.

THE HOME SERVICE PROGRAM STATEMENT INCLUDING EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Under Federal statute and regulations of the Armed Forces, the American Red Cross furnishes volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of the Armed Forces, and acts in matters of voluntary relief and as a medium of communication between the people of the United States and their Armed Forces.

Home service is the program through which the American Red Cross carries out in communities this responsibility to servicemen and veterans and their dependents and to the dependents of deceased servicemen and veterans.

I. Home service program for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents

The American Red Cross national organization and chapters have a primary responsibility to provide home service as a well-rounded program of family service to members of the Armed Forces and their families, which includes the following specific functions:

1. Counseling in personal and family problems. This service is an integral part of all other functions of home service.

2. Reporting and communications service, including (a) assistance to servicemen and their dependents by providing reports and social histories needed by the military authorities; (f) guidance concerning direct communications between servicemen and their dependents; (c) information transmitted or requested through Red Cross channels when direct communication will not meet the need.

3. Assistance in applying for Government benefits, including supplying information concerning Government regulations and legislation.

4. Referral service, through which applicants to the Red Cross may be informed of and assisted in the utilization of other available resources.

5. Financial assistance, on the basis of need, will be provided—

(a) By the use of chapter funds for basic maintenance needed by wives and children of members of the Armed Forces during the period pending first receipt of family allotment, and during periods when such payments as may be due are delayed or interrupted.

"Basic maintenance" includes such regularly needed essentials as food, shelter, fuel, clothing, household utilities, and necessities, and incidental medical supplies and services.

"The period pending the first receipt of family allotment" refers to the period between the submission of the first application for such benefit and either the receipt of the benefit following favorable action or notice of disallowance of the application by the military departments.

"Periods when such payments as may be due are delayed or interrupted" refers to delays or interruptions incidental to the processing of applications for allotments by the military departments, and does not apply to situations that result from failure of the applicant to submit such required information as change of address.

(b) By the use of chapter funds or by referral to other local resources for basic maintenance needed by other dependents of members of the Armed Forces during such periods.

(c) The use of chapter funds or by referral to other resources for emergency needs of wives and children of members of the Armed Forces, which arise at any time during the period of military service.

"Emergency needs" covers needs such as medical and hospital care, transportation, burial, and others essential to health and welfare, that are urgent and require immediate attention as distinguished from those that are desirable but do not require immediate attention.

(d) After responsibility has been assumed for a program of assistance for dependents of members of the Armed Forces, as defined above, and for disabled veterans and their dependents, and the dependents of deceased servicemen and veterans, as defined in the next section, each chapter, within its own resources and with due regard for all other resources and for local needs, may develop a program of financial assistance on the basis of need for members of the Armed Forces and any of their dependents, under circumstances other than those defined above.

II. Home service program for veterans and their dependents

The American Red Cross provides to former members of the Armed Forces and their dependents specific services as set forth in this program statement. These services are given through the combined efforts of chapters and the national organization to assure a nationwide service that is unified and effective.

1. Assistance will be given by chapters to veterans and their dependents in the preparation and development of applications for Federal and State benefits and in supplying information concerning benefits available.

This service will be given on the basis of the applicant's request and need for assistance, and will be terminated when reasonable efforts have been made to establish eligibility for the benefits sought. Activity may be renewed upon the applicant's request in a given case when a change affecting eligibility has occurred, such as the enactment of new legislation or an increase in a veteran's disability.

2. To enable chapters to carry out the program of assistance with applications for Government benefits, the national organization has either a resident or an itinerant field director covering each Veterans' Administration office to review claims folders and inform chapter home service workers that evidence is a matter of record and what evidence is needed; guide home service workers in the preparation and development of individual claims cases, and on behalf of chapters; represent veterans and, when necessary, appear in person on their behalf at personal hearings when it seems that the veteran cannot well represent himself; and assemble and prepare for presentation the evidence necessary to support an appeal from an adverse decision of a regional, district, or central office rating board.

3. Chapters will cooperate with the Veterans' Administration on behalf of veterans and their dependents by providing reports such as those regarding the families of hospitalized veterans needed in relation to the rehabilitation of the patient, social histories needed in diagnosis and treatment, and reports of home conditions required in deciding questions of leave from hospitals.

4. All service given to veterans and their dependents by home service in chapters involves counseling in personal and family problems, which may include referral to other resources.

When the problem arises from military service, counseling may be given for a limited period of time even though no other service is being given, but sustained or repeated counseling will not be undertaken when other resources exist.

The service of referral, through which veterans and their dependents may be informed of and assisted in utilizing other available resources, will be given at any time and whether or not the problem is related to military service.

5. Chapters are responsible for seeing that the needs of disabled veterans and their dependents for financial assistance, as defined in this item, are met either by referral to other resources or by the use of chapter funds.

In this way basic maintenance and emergency needs will be met during the period between the submission of the first application to the Federal Government for service-connected disability or service-connected death benefits and either the receipt of the first payment following a favorable decision or notice of the disallowance of that application.

Veterans awaiting the first decision under the retirement provisions of the Career Compensation Act will be given the same consideration.

6. After carefully considering the availability of other resources and after having fulfilled their responsibility for service and assistance to members of the Armed Forces and their families, and to disabled veterans and their families as defined above, chapters may give financial assistance to other veterans and their dependents on a limited and temporary basis.

III. Emergency relief to civilians

Emergency relief to civilians (other than disaster relief and relief to members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families) should be undertaken by American Red Cross chapters only in conformity with the following principles:

Priority of those needs of members of the Armed Forces and veterans and their dependents that the American Red Cross has undertaken to meet and of disaster preparedness and disaster relief shall be observed.

Duplication of existing activities in the community shall be avoided.

The chapter shall be competent to finance the service and to conduct it with credit to the American Red Cross.

There shall be observance of the standards of work prescribed by the national organization.

Chapters should transfer responsibility for such emergency relief services to other agencies whenever it becomes apparent that the interests of the beneficiaries and of the community, and the future of the activity, will be best served by such action. When such transfers involve a temporary continuing expenditure of Red Cross chapter funds, the chapter shall participate directly in the administration of the activity as long as such expenditure is continued.

Red Cross emergency relief to civilians may include financial assistance, the providing of medical care, food, clothing, and shelter, and such related services not otherwise available.

IV. Foreign location inquiry service

The American Red Cross, through home service, will process inquiries from persons in the United States about the location of persons in other countries with whom contact has been lost because of dislocations of peoples caused by changing world conditions.

Red Cross societies throughout the world engage in a similar service with which the American Red Cross cooperates when persons sought are thought to be in the United States.

National High School Orchestra To Perform at White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1962

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, with considerable pride, I rise to advise my colleagues about a cultural invasion of Washington scheduled for next Monday, August 6, which has been launched from Interlochen, Mich., in the congressional district I represent.

At the invitation of the First Lady, Mrs. Kennedy, Dr. Joseph E. Maddy is bringing the National High School Symphony Orchestra and a ballet corps from the world-famous National Music Camp to perform a concert from the White House lawn.

Many Americans are already aware of the fact that the National Music Camp, at Interlochen, founded and developed by Dr. Maddy, is a unique educational institution. Michigan's great Senator, Arthur Vandenberg once described it as "the greatest center of youth culture in the world."

The group that will perform Monday morning at 10:30 is not just an ordinary orchestra. This is a complete symphony orchestra of 102 high school students from 24 States and 2 foreign countries. They represent but a small fraction of the cultural explosion of some 2,000 high school students from all over the United States and the world who flock to Interlochen, in northern Michigan, each summer to study music and fine arts at this great music camp.

Anyone who has assumed that the Midwest is a vast cultural wasteland has not been to Interlochen. The National Music Camp, at Interlochen, is strictly an American institution, built by Midwest-American ingenuity and ideals yet, its strong influence is being felt all over the world.

Dr. Joseph E. Maddy started the National Music Camp 35 years ago—in 1928. He began with a borrowed shoestring of $15,000 and only 115 students. With little more than a dream—and his shoestring—he has built the camp into the world's largest music school, a $5 million institution which spreads over acres and occupies 400 buildings—to accommodate more than 2,000 students each summer.

More recently, Dr. Maddy has added at Interlochen a year-round boarding school to provide appropriate training for talented young musicians, artists, actors, and dancers, right along with a college preparatory high school course. The Interlochen Arts Academy, as it is called, will open its doors on September 10, and it promises to become one of the Nation's foremost centers for leadership training in the arts.

Dr. Maddy began his musical career as a violin player in Wellington, Kans., at the age of 5. When he was 9, he played the piccolo in the Wellington Boys' Band. From there he went on to the Wichita College of Music, the Minneapolis Symphony Orthestra, and then into music education.

Dr. Maddy organized the first high school symphony orchestra in Richmond, Ind., in 1924. He started the symphony orchestra movement in our public schools. Dr. Maddy organized the first national high school symphony orchestra—composed of youngsters from all over the United States—in 1926, and another in 1927. Finally, in 1928, he located his camp at Interlochen as a summer home for his national high school orchestras. In time, the National Music Camp became affiliated with the University of Michigan, and Dr. Maddy served as professor of music at the university.

Dr. Joseph E. Maddy has probably done more to stimulate the cultural training of the youth of our country than any other one man. He is largely responsible for the instrumental class teaching methods in use today which have developed thousands and thousands of young musicians. In fact, no other man is more directly responsible for the fact that 1,400 symphony orchestras are now organized in this country—more than in any other nation in the world.

Dr. Maddy refers to his young musicians as world missionaries of peace, and he is right. Former Interlochen campers now hold first-chair places not only in the major symphony orchestras of our own country but in other countries as well. The conductor of the Munich Youth Symphony was a former student at Interlochen, and the conductor of the Vienna Youth Symphony attended the camp. Interlochen's musical organizations are heard each week over nearly 100 network stations in this country as well as on Voice of America worldwide network.

Someday soon Dr. Maddy hopes to be able to take his national high school symphony orchestra on a tour of countries behind the Iron Curtain. Such an orchestra of talented youngsters, speaking the universal language of music, would serve as an impressive force for peace and understanding.

Van Cliburn, who has been acclaimed by music critics as the world's greatest concert pianist, has paid the National Music Camp the tribute of returning for two successive seasons to play a benefit concert, turning over all proceeds to the camp for scholarships. He has referred to Interlochen as the country's Cape Canaveral for Musicians.

I am proud to have this cultural center located in my congressional district. On behalf of the camp, and Dr. Maddy, I am pleased to extend to my colleagues in the Congress an invitation to come soon to Interlochen and visit this great institution.

Tax Reduction and the Need for Reduction of Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1962

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two statements I have made concerning tax reduction, and the need for reduction of Federal expenditures in this fiscal year; and to postpone proposals for new spending programs.

The first statement was made on July 1, in the course of the television and radio program "Let's Look at Congress," of Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, my distinguished Republican colleague from New York.

The second statement was made on July 9. This statement amplifies the necessity of reducing current appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and postponing administration requests for new spending programs.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVIEW OF HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, REPUBLICAN, U.S. SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY BY SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, REPUBLICAN, NEW YORK, ON TELEVISION AND RADIO PROGRAM "LET'S LOOK AT CONGRESS," SUNDAY, JULY 1, 1962

Senator KEATING. This is Senator KEN KEATING welcoming you to another "Let's Look at Congress" program. My guest today is a distinguished colleague who in 1960 was voted by a poll of newsmen the ablest Republican in the Senate. He is former Ambassador to India and my dear friend, the Honorable JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky. JOHN, it's nice to have you here to talk to the people of New York.

Senator COOPER. KEN, I'm glad to be with you.

Senator KEATING. You have a lot of friends in New York?

Senator COOPER. Well, I like New York. I have friends there—yes.

Senator KEATING. What do you think will be the biggest campaign issue this fall?

Senator COOPER. I think the biggest campaign issue—the one that will have more influence than any other—is the state of the economy. People out of work are going to continue to wonder how long they are going to be out of work. Businessmen are going to wonder about their business. Consumers and everyone will wonder about continued high prices but generally, whether our economy is going to pick up or whether it's going to stagnate. If it stagnates, it must go down, I think.

Senator KEATING. How do you feel about a tax cut at ths time?

Senator COOPER. KEN, this is what I believe. We know there is great uncertainty in the country today. A part of that uncertainty grows out of the uncertainty of the administration about its fiscal policy. It's evident from the record that we will have had three deficits—in 1961 about $4 billion (of course, part of that might be attributed to the Eisenhower administration), a deficit in 1962 of, I think, $7 billion, and now it's agreed we'll have a deficit in 1963, unless something is done, of $4 to $5 billion.

It seems to me deficit financing has failed as a measure to spur the economy. If we must have a deficit, it is preferable to have it come about as the result of a tax cut, because a tax cut will stimulate the economy. I believe that the Congress should enact a tax cut this year. If the administration doesn't propose it, I think at least the Republican Party ought to agree on one and urge it in the Finance Committee and in the Ways and Means Committee and if they're not successful, at least off and on the floor. I remember in 1954, and you do too because you were in the Congress, that there had been deficits for 2 or 3 years. There was a deficit in 1954 anticipated of about $4 billion and yet President Eisenhower had the courage to propose a tax bill. It was a tax cut of about $7½ billion annually. I assume today that it would be $10 or $12 billion. I think that we forgot that we've had a continuing tax savings for the people since 1954 of $8 to $12 billion a year. Now what happened after the tax cut? The next year there was a slight deficit, but in the following year there was a considerable surplus. You had the largest investment then, after that tax cut, there had been since World War II, and even before World War II. I believe that if we enact a tax cut this year, that it would have that same stimulating effect.

Senator KEATING. What kind of a tax cut did you have in mind?

Senator COOPER. I would just say that it would have to be something on the order of the one we enacted in 1954. Not the same, because you had other problems then—excess profits and other matters. But I would say, to reduce the corporate tax maximum from 52 to 47 percent, and then have corresponding decreases in the tax rates of all classifications—both the corporations and to individuals. I would point out that if this should be done—assuming that there was a reduction of about $8 or $9 billion—that about $2½ to $3 billion of this would go to the corporations. The remainder would go to the individual income taxpayer. I think it would give a tremendous spur to the economy. Also, I think that it would have an effect upon confidence abroad and would tend to halt the outflow of gold. But, KEN, I think it ought to be accompanied by reductions in spending, too.

Senator KEATING. How would you go about that?

Senator COOPER. Well, that's been one of the problems up here, as you know. Some of us in the Congress—and I'm one of them—favor what are called liberal programs.

I would call them human programs. But they are based upon our ability to pay for them. I would say that, this year, to make a tax cut creditable—to give confidence to the people and abroad—that the administration should itself cut back all our programs, except defense, by a reasonable amount. If they will not do it, then I believe that the Republicans in the Congress should offer amendments to every appropriation bill, other than defense. A reasonable cutback, of say just 5 or 6 percent, wouldn't disturb any agency and it would show that you really meant business. Now a lot of people say, "well that's unscientific." But all members can't agree on every bill. Everybody could agree upon a reasonable cutback, because they know it would not hurt any agencies. So I think that is the second thing that should be done.

Senator Keating. You travel around the country a great deal. What general reactions do you find to the President and his policies?

Senator Cooper. Well, at the beginning, and for a long time, the President has enjoyed a great deal of personal popularity. I think he does now. But, I just have to say what all of us know, and what we are talking about now—that there is this basic uncertainty about the state of the economy. I think it grows from this conflict of whether we are going to depend upon deficit spending to spur the economy; or whether we will have a tax cut and some sacrifice in spending.

Now, I'd like to make one other point. I do agree with the administration on one proposal and I don't know that I have much support from my colleagues on the Republican side. But I do support the proposal for withholding of interest and dividends, because we are losing about a billion dollars a year of unpaid taxes on dividends and interest that have been payable under law since 1913. Really, I think this is where businessmen could contribute something. I think instead of opposing this they should support it, because if they believe in fiscal integrity, I do not see how they can oppose an effort to collect a billion dollars of unpaid taxes. Now that, too, would help create confidence, would help reduce these spending proposals and expenditures; and I think it would help accomplish what I have been talking about—that is a tax cut, plus reduction of spending, to spur the economy.

Senator Keating. Recently, you criticized what you termed the "administration's obsessive drive for power"—that is the phrase you used. Is President Kennedy acting any differently in that regard from Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower?

Senator Cooper. Someone has said that when one has power there is a natural tendency, to believe that your policies are right and to seek the means to achieve your ends. But I must say that President Eisenhower was very conscious of the separation of powers between the Congress and the Executive. I think he observed that very carefully. And President Roosevelt, on at least one of the most famous historical occasions, attempted to secure his aims by packing the Supreme Court. There was a tremendous outburst of resentment against it. President Truman attempted to seize the steel industry. There was an outburst against it and, of course, the Supreme Court denied him that power.

This administration has asked, again and again, for the Congress to transfer to the Executive the power to write the specifics of legislation. Now what does that mean? In the first place, we may not do the best job always, but I see no reason to believe that some people over in the administration are not subject to public criticism and debate, or can do any better job. I certainly wouldn't think so. But the basic proposition involved in this is that there is a means given under the Constitution to examine, to debate, to accept, to reject, to modify any proposal, and it seems to me if we give that up, then we have denied a very basic essential of our form of government. I am rather surprised—and it's not very good to be critical of newspapers—but some newspapers seem to believe that just because the President submits a program, there's some duty on the part of the Congress to accept it without debate or criticism. Debate and criticism—they are in my view the distinguishing factor—one of them—between a free country and a totalitarian system.

Senator Keating. That's a very eloquent statement, John.

Senator Cooper. Well, I feel this and I've always felt it.

Senator Keating. To change the subject now for a moment, you were our U.S. Ambassador to India and you have, this last week, been critical of Mr. Nehru's proposed purchase of Mig airplanes from Russia. In your judgment, has India's unfriendly Defense Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon, any chance of becoming successor to Mr. Nehru?

Senator Cooper. Yes. Of course, I cannot try to talk about what might happen in another country but I must say that in my experience in India, I recognized that Mr. Menon was a very forceful man, that he is a very determined man and a very able man. I thought from the very beginning that he had the possibility of becoming Prime Minister of India. Now whether that is going to occur or not I don't know, but I would certainly say that it's not beyond the realm of possibility.

Senator Keating. Do you see any decline in American support for the United Nations?

Senator Cooper. Well there's been a great debate raised on it this year, as you know. I don't think there's a decline. What I think is happening is this. Under the administration of President Eisenhower, there was a certain quietness on the part of a great many people in this country who didn't feel too kindly about the United Nations. I think because of President Eisenhower's influence and support, there wasn't much talk about it. But I believe in the last year, with certain reverses and also with dangers becoming quite apparent—in Berlin, Laos and other places—that many people have sought to find a reason for these reverses in the United Nations. I do not agree with that viewpoint, Ken.

Senator Keating. Do you support the administration's position on Cuba and Laos?

Senator Cooper. Cuba is, to me, a matter which has passed. At the time I felt that the administration should have made a choice. One choice would have been not to support the invasion; but if it did support the invasion, then I think it was bound to support it fully. But it did not do either. So that was a failure. But it's past now, and frankly I do not see anything we can do now except to let Castro stew in his own juice. I wish we had not paid as much attention to him—give him as much importance. He is not that important. He's having great troubles and it's possible that he'll fail.

Senator Keating. Let me ask you a political question to close the program. How do you assess Republican prospects for next November?

Senator Cooper. I believe the Republicans will win the House and I think that we can gain seats in the Senate. I cannot tell you how many, but I believe that is correct.

Senator Keating. You are a very cultivated gentleman and still they tell us you wear red suspenders when you campaign all over Kentucky. Do you have a split personality?

Senator Cooper. Well, I suppose all of us have a split personality, in different senses. Thank you for you compliment about being cultivated, but I come from a small town and from a country community. They still call me John and Judge. They are fine people. I don't wear suspenders, though. I do the same at home as I do here. But I always remember one fellow: After looking me over, after I had been up there, he just told me flatly. He said, "John, you don't impress me at all."

Senator Keating. Thank you very much Senator John Cooper, of Kentucky.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, OF KENTUCKY

I have urged that the administration recommend and the Congress enact a tax cut during this session of Congress. I am not a member of the Senate Finance Committee, but all of us in the Congress know of the uncertainty which prevails in the country about the economy, and the debate over administration policy which contributes to this uncertainty.

I renew my argument for the enactment of a tax cut during this session of the Congress for the following reasons:

1. A tax cut is needed to give the country assurance concerning the administration's fiscal policy. For this uncertainty is undoubtedly contributing to the stagnation which prevails today. Evidently, there are those in the administration who want large budget deficits—even in this time when economic factors are generally sound—claiming that they are necessary to counteract the downturn in the business cycle. I am sure that others in the administration hold the view that a tax cut, accompanied by positive efforts to reduce spending and to apply priorities among administration requests for spending, is the best means of stimulating the economy. I am sure that the great majority of the people of this country support the latter view, and that they are frightened by the former. They believe, and I agree, that deficit spending cannot get our economy moving again.

2. A tax cut will have the effect of reducing or curing the deficits which continue to plague the Federal Government. For, spurring business activity, it would increase revenues. In 1954 a deficit of about $4 billion was anticipated. Yet, President Eisenhower proposed a tax bill, which released to taxpayers an estimated $7½ billion in the first year. In the following year there was a slight deficit, but the next year the Government achieved a considerable surplus. As a consequence of the tax cut, the country experienced the largest nivestment that had taken place since World War II. Taking into account the advances in gross national product and individual income since 1954, it is probable that $75 to $100 billion have been released since 1954 to corporations and individuals.

3. A tax reduction which will enable business to modernize, and which will enlarge consumer demand—if accompanied by restraints in spending—will remove the uncertainty about administration policy, and provide the confidence needed to move the economy, which is basically sound.

But I emphasize again the conditions for a tax cut which I believe are necessary to make it effective:

1. A tax cut should be accompanied by reductions in all current appropriations for fiscal year 1963, except defense spending, on the order of 5 to 6 percent. Such reduction would amount to $1 to $2 billion. Many will contend that across-the-board reductions are unscientific, but we in the Congress know that any agency of the Government, other than the Defense Department, can get along with a 5- to 6-percent reduction.

2. The administration should postpone requests that entail additional spending, unless critically essential. As an example the request for a billion-dollar raise in the pay of Federal employees could certainly be postponed for a year—until we know that it can be afforded.

3. The Congress should act upon provisions of the tax bill now before the Senate Finance Committee, which would revise justly a part of the tax structure, and provide additional revenue. I refer to revisions of taxes on mutual fire and casualty insurance companies, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, and co-ops.

4. I support also the revision which is designed to secure the payment (through the means of withholding 20 percent of dividends and interest) of $1 billion annually lost to the Treasury. Taxes are now withheld on wages and salaries, and means are provided in the tax bill to reduce the burdens on persons with low income. These provisions are particularly helpful to persons over 65 years of age. Business should support this proposal. I do not see how one can oppose logically a proposal to collect a billion dollars in taxes annually lost on dividends and interest, which either through inadvertance or purpose are not paid, although they have been taxable since 1913.

With international conditions of danger being what they are, there is now, and will continue to be a need for large Federal revenues. It would be irresponsible to propose a tax cut which would drastically and permanently reduce needed revenues, and which enlarge yearly deficits. But if the administration proposes a tax cut, and at the same time makes a conscientious attempt to reduce nonessential Federal expenditures, the effect will be to greatly improve economic conditions, and help correct the Government's fiscal position both nationally and internationally.

If the administration will not take the initiative, I hope very much that the Republican minority will work together for a program of tax reduction and reduction of spending.

Senator Harry Byrd Totals the Costs of Paternalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD, I herewith insert an editorial from the Jeffersonian Democrat of Brookville, Pa.:

SENATOR HARRY BYRD TOTALS THE COSTS OF PATERNALISM

Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia, a good Democrat, in the first of what he promises to be a continuing series of reports on Federal finances, has reported that the Government is in hock to the tune of almost $1¼ trillion. Trillion, repeat, not billion. And a trillion is $1,000 billion, not that that fact will enable you to comprehend the concept much better.

This fantastic mortgage on the country, the Senator says, is the price of "paternalism, intervention, and control which have been allowed to develop in this country." These conditions, it is true enough, have been "allowed" to develop by the taxpayers, but taxpayers, except as they push their own interests through pressure group greed, don't create the conditions. The politicians do that, and they are forever at it.

There is hardly a piece of legislation now before Congress which isn't calculated to buy political favor by giving something to somebody. The new farm bill, medical aid under social security, aid to education, job retraining, public works, matching funds to the States—you name it, and it is always something that the politicians profess to be extending out of their own generosity.

But, of course, all these things cost. They eat up all of the available taxes, and the Government is always reaching out to grab a little more. And so, with budgets now running at the rate of $93 billion, there is never enough, and year after year we are exposed to further deficits, which contribute that much more to the lien Senator BYRD already finds upon existing property and upon the future hopes of the people to get out from beneath this monstrous burden.

It is not any coincidence that the Kennedy administration, having already raised the "temporary" statutory limit on the national debt to $300 billion, is now seeking a further increase to $308 billion. For, of course, this fictitious limit must always be pushed farther ahead in the race with Federal spending.

This external urge of government to erase even an artificial restraint upon spending by periodically extending the debt limit is a deliberate fraud upon the citizens. It is like lining up the taxpayer at a track meet and informing him that he is to run a 100-yard dash. Then, as he approaches the supposed finish line, he finds the tape retreating before him, so that his race is never run. After he has run a quarter of a mile, a half mile, a mile, he finds that he is condemned to a marathon.

As Mr. BYRD states, even this fiction of a debt limit is a deceit, for a figure of $300 billion, or $308 billion, does not hint even remotely at the truth. The truth is that the actual and contingent liabilities of the Washington Government, the legal and moral commitments which the Government is pledged to redeem, are of such astounding magnitude that they exceed by four times the assessed value of all real and tangible property in the country.

If every citizen surrendered every penny he made in a year to Washington in order to redeem the existing and developing debt, he could not achieve that end in less than 3 years.

We have heard a prediction that the inevitable course of government will be to tax the entire earnings of the people away from them, so that they never actually handle a cent of their own money. And after that, so the prophecy runs, the Government will give them coupons to be exchanged for food, lodging, clothing, and such other minimal needs. The system would be a refinement even on the communism practiced in Russia and the mainland China.

Is this just fantasy? Contemplating that trillion-and-a-quarter billion-dollar mortgage, it would be hardihood to say that it is.—The Chicago Tribune.

Uncle Sam Abuses Copyright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Uncle Sam Abuses Copyright," published in the Wausau, Wis., Record-Herald of July 11, 1962, relating to the copyrighting of Government publications.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE SAM ABUSES COPYRIGHT

Government can assume new powers in many ways, some of them comparatively minor and seemingly insignificant, but yet with harmful implications for the future. Such a case is the copyrighting of the new White House guidebook, which is called the "Official Guide to the White House."

The book was written by the White House curator, copies are to be sold by employees of the National Park Service and income will go for refurbishing the White House. The copyright owner is the White House Historical Association.

Because it is copyrighted, the material about the White House is restricted and cannot be used or reproduced without permission of the copyrighter.

Editor and Publisher magazine asks two good questions about the case: "If it (the historical society) is an official body of the Government or of the White House then the law expressly prohibits such copyright. If it is a private organization, then what right does the Government have to grant a restrictive copyright on material that belongs to the people at large?"

It is traditional in free America that government institutions belong to the people, because this is a government of, by and for the people. Facts about official Washington, including the White House, therefore belong to all the people and Uncle Sam has no right, we would think, to assign exclusive use of facts about the White House to anyone.

Go Home, Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 1, I reported to the House on the Albany, Ga., situation. My report was based on a trip I made at the request of the Congress of Racial Equality and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article about that tense and turbulent town by Murray Kempton, one of the country's ablest reporters. The article which appeared in the New York Post on August 1 provides a keen insight into the Albany, Ga., situation:

GO HOME, FREEDOM

(By Murray Kempton)

ALBANY, GA.—This puzzled city, after 3 days of decorous attention to adult matters like courts and motions and countermotions, is once again at the unpredictable mercy of teenagers.

There are still more than 200 Albany Negroes scattered in jails from here to Americans for prayers, pilgrimages, and other disturbances of the peace and the number grew yesterday. The most conspicuous is Martin Luther King, but the most consequential may be the children.

Albany let 10 teenagers out last night on their simple promise to picket no longer. But 15 more went to jail for congregating on the steps of the city library, to the disappointment of a community that opened a new colored library just 3 weeks ago. Six adults were arrested praying in front of city hall this afternoon, and a little before 9 last night, Alice Porter led 17 other persons in prayer before the Albany police force, all of them bowed on their knees on the sidewalks with the police looking down upon them with expressions mixing embarrassment and wonder. "All right, now," said the officer in charge, "you've had your prayer. Now will you move on?" They stood singing that they would overcome and, having finished one chorus, marched off to be booked. One of them said he was 12.

The other night, Police Chief Laurie Pritchett was arresting a group in prayer. One of the demonstrators was no more than 3 feet tall. "How old are you, son?" said the chief, peeking over the booking window. "Nine," said the boy. "What's your name?" said the chief. "Freedom, Freedom," said the boy. Chief Pritchett put his hand on this criminal's head. "Go home, Freedom," he said. The rule by now is that you throw back Albany movement soldiers when they're younger than 12.

In sum, the jails of southwest Georgia had gotten rid of 10 of these unexpected and unwanted tenants and picked up 39 more. One of these released was Willie C. Lovett, who is 16, and had been in the Americus jail for 7 days. His mother had asked him to come out. "I promised the chief I wouldn't picket, so I'll just march for a week," he said. He spoke from what was plainly a sense of honor, and he will keep his promise. But he will be back before long in any case, because by day, he spends his time escorting country Negroes into voters' registrar offices to try and qualify them for the rolls.

He has been in jail seven times.

"I think jail's easier," he reported. "In jail they just try to scarce you. In communities, they beat you up."

He was on his way back to Mount Zion Church, where the cooks and maids of the Albany movement were singing that "All God's children got a race to run" and waiting to hear a message from the Reverend Martin Luther King, Sr., who follows his son to spare little churches like this one, less than 2 years after the political scientists credited him with carrying two States for President Kennedy.

Other kids came up in the light outside the church and asked Willie Lovett and his three friends when they had gotten out. They stood talking in the yard of one of the houses and its mistress came to the door and smiled at these children and said, "Welcome home, gentlemen."

Roosevelt Matthews, who is 13, is still in jail in Americus.

His mother, Annie Pearl Matthews, is a maid. Roosevelt went in 2 weeks ago for picketing city hall after the arrest of Martin Luther King. The police sent word the other day that Roosevelt wanted to get out, and she went to talk to him and was about to give her word for his bond when she was struck with mistrust. "How do I know he wants to get out?" she asked. "If he did, one of the boys there would have brougfht me a message when he came out. I don't think it's fair to bond him out if he don't want to come. He's strong; as long as he gets a little something to eat and a little water, he'll be allright."

Annie Pearl Matthews spent a week in jail as a demonstrator last December.

"The people I worked for never mentioned it until yesterday. She paid me my $15 a week right along while I was in jail. She mentioned it the first time yesterday. She said she didn't understand why we listened to that Martin Luther King. I said, 'Miss Allison, you don't know how mean some of these white people are. You all are nice; you pay me $15 a week. But I got neighbors who work from 7 to 7 and get only $12 a week.' "

In the post office, Judge J. Roland Elliott listened sympathetically most of the day while the city of Albany and the State of Georgia tried to enjoin Annie Pearl Matthews and her son, Roosevelt, from continued mischief. It is not a case with much future; the Court of Appeals seems likely to throw out any order Judge Elliott writes. The South spends most of its time these days getting decisions in its favor from new Kennedy judges which are promptly reversed by old Eisenhower ones.

The court was full of Negroes who had the pleasure of watching Donald Holloway, an Atlanta Negro lawyer, brashly cross-examining their police chief. It was not a unmixed pleasure; they have a certain affection for Laurie Pritchett. He is a large man, proud, as he deserves to be, of his city's record in maintaining order. He was especially gratified yesterday at being able to tell the court that he had kept what he called the "Kluckers" in hand. He spoke, perhaps from policy, perhaps from a certain respect of the difficulties of dealing with "the Reverend Martin Luther King and these other Nee-gro leaders" who kept telling him that the city laws affronted their consciences. "Go back," he had kept saying to the demonstrators, "to your, uh, way of life."

King, as a defendant in the suit, was out of jail to sit in the courtroom, in short-sleeved shirt, his eyes patient, a mysterious mixture of indifference and endurance on his face. To counsel for Albany, he represented the incalculable force of the humble which has laid their city under siege. They made him sound like an awful presence indeed. His real strength, however, may be simply that he is led by children.

Patron Saint of the Birds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1962

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Norfolk Ledger-Star entitled "The Patron Saint of the Birds," provides an excellent illustration of an assertion made on yesterday by Bishop Pike. He said that our Supreme Court in misconstruing the meaning of the first amendment in the New York prayer case, had made a ruling which, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, would destroy what he described as our historic middle way of life, namely a government in which there could be official recognition of the fact that there is a God and that our Government is based upon the teachings of the Bible without having laws that either promoted or hindered a religious sect or prevented the free exercise of religion. Students of the Constitution well know that the first amendment was designed to outlaw tax support for any organized church and that the words "establishment of religion" refer to a religious sect or organization commonly called a church.

A citizen of Norfolk has objected to a life-like statue of St. Francis of Assisi being maintained in the Norfolk Botanical Gardens. It was placed there because St. Francis of Assisi is known as the Patron Saint of the Birds. But he was such a well-known figure of the early Catholic church that he is regarded by some as a religious symbol. A Mr. Sawyer, of Norfolk, regards the statue as a religious symbol and claims it has been outlawed by the decision of the Supreme Court in the New York prayer case, because if a 22-word nonsectarian prayer for voluntary use constitutes the establishment of a religious sect or organization so would a statue of a prominent leader of a religious organization even though he died more than 300 years before the first settlement was made at Jamestown.

The editor of the Norfolk Ledger-Star replies:

> Religious symbols represent part of man's highest accomplishments in the arts. * * * Clearly, it would seem to us that this whole tempest in the tree grove is a question not of religion but of art.

But, the contention of Mr. Sawyer cannot be so lightly dismissed. Pending before the Supreme Court for decision at its October term is a case where atheists of Dade County, Fla., claim that religious art, hymns and the celebration of the religious holidays of Christmas and Easter are all illegal in public schools. In a clear and pungent decision, the Supreme Court of Florida definitely turned that claim down. But the U.S. Supreme Court had doubts about the correctness of the decision of the Florida court and agreed to hear the case at its October term. Therefore, until the Supreme Court hands down its ruling on the Florida case, the distinguished editor of the Norfolk Ledger-Star cannot be too sure that the issue raised by Mr. Sawyer concerning the statue of St. Francis of Assisi is just a "tempest in the tree grove."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Norfolk Ledger-Star editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATRON SAINT OF THE BIRDS

The controversy over the 6-foot statue of St. Francis of Assisi—is it a religious symbol? Is it sectarian propaganda? Is it constitutional? Is it art? Seems to us to be just the sort of subject reasonable people can well spend a few moments thinking about.

Maybe we all ought to be grateful to Mr. Sawyer for bringing it up. For the Constitution does forbid the Congress to make no law respecting an establishment of religion, though we doubt that the early Americans had in mind banning the gift of a statue to the city government for use in the Norfolk Botanical Gardens.

First of all, if it was placed there as sectarian propaganda to lure Jews from their religion and to make Protestant forget Martin Luther and John Knox and turn to catholicism, we'd say it ought to go. But that could hardly have been the purpose. For there are five members on the botanical garden committee, which has the final word on such matters as garden statues, and two of them are Jews and three of them are Protestants.

Is the statue of St. Francis of Assisi a religious symbol? It is. But it is also something else. For many religious symbols belong not to one sect or to one religion but to all mankind. Museums supported by public funds across the country are full of religious art. Religious symbols represent part of man's highest accomplishments in the arts; music poetry, painting, sculpture. Da Vinci's "Last Supper" is a religious symbol and so is Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel ceiling. Are they any the less great as art because of their religious symbolism? Or are they the greater because of it?

Clearly, it would seem to us that this whole tempest in the tree grove is a question not of religion but of art. The statue honors a man who lived more than 700 years ago and when he died he probably had no idea his church would call him a saint. He was known as Francis, a man from Assisi, who lived in the fields and doubtless was judged something of a crackpot by some of his contemporaries; after all he once preached a sermon to the birds.

It would be interesting to see this case go, as Mr. Sawyer says he intends, to the courts for determination. We know that the courts have long ago upheld the proposition of separation of church and state. We have little doubt that they will have commonsense enough to recognize the separation between religion and art.

Problems of Potato Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1962

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, potatoes are an integral part of Colorado's economy. In 1960 my State ranked seventh in the Nation so far as production of potatoes is concerned. During that year Colorado farmers harvested a crop amounting to 11,922,000 hundredweight, from 11,800 acres. An informative publication, the Colorado Potato Grower is published monthly by the Colorado Potato Growers Exchange and covers the broad range of matters concerning this vital industry. I note that the Colorado Potato Growers Exchange of Denver goes into its 40th year early next month, having been organized in 1923. The exchange was originally established to provide orderly marketing of Colorado potatoes, and over the years it has handled anywhere from 20 to 40 percent of the total Colorado crop. L. B. Waters, president of the exchange has written a thoughtful article in the July issue of the Colorado Potato Grower, dealing with several subjects of immediate and national concern. Mr. Waters gives his views with respect to our problem in agriculture generally, as well as the alternatives which potato growers face with respect to a national marketing order for their crop. Mr. Waters' views should be given consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What About Our Farming, Government, and Potatoes?

(By L. B. Waters)

This was written on July 4, Independence Day, and it makes one wonder sometimes if we really have the independence our forefathers fought so valiantly for. Our destinies are being planned by young and inexperienced people, often from the universities, who are trying to put over idealistic ideas that are not practical. Thank goodness, Congress tends to be more down to earth.

FARMING AND GOVERNMENT

Farming is still the biggest business in the United States, but it is operated by some 8 million people with probably 8 million different ideas of how it should be done. We are a minority group and have lost a lot of our political power. The livestock and dairy industries comprise approximately half of our agricultural income, and last week Congress came within inches of giving dictatorial powers to the Secretary of Agriculture over this segment of our industry. If the farm bill had passed with the so-called supply management section of feed grain intact it would have given the Secretary this power.

The Department of Agriculture is such a sprawling giant with so many subdivisions, branches, and committees that it can't possibly be coordinated and supervised. They have such a multiplicity of rules and regulations and overlapping committees that it makes such a case as the Billy Sol Estes fiasco possible. It also makes our metropolitan Congressman very critical and suspicious of any and all farm legislation.

The Government is supposedly spending billions on farm relief and the city taxpayers are up in arms about it and we can't blame them. There is nothing, however, said in these reports about the amount of income tax paid by the farmers on these Federal payments, it can't amount to less than 25 percent and is probably considerably more. There is seldom any mention of the amount received from the resale of farm commodities and never any mention of the real estate tax paid on farmer-owned granaries storing Government grain.

What really costs the taxpayer is the salaries of the army of employees necessary to administrate the huge Government programs. As I see it, all farm programs do is create a lot of jobs and buy a lot of votes. If the Government is really interested in saving money, they should do away with all farm subsidies and farm supports and exempt the farmer from income tax to the extent of one-half of the present cost of the farm program. This would benefit all farmers far more than any subsidies they now get, and it would leave them far more independent.

NATIONAL MARKETING ORDER

There is an inelastic demand throughout the United States for potatoes. It amounts to nearly 105 pounds per person and we consistently produce more than this demand justifies. Price has little bearing on consumption but it has a terrific bearing on the amount the grower received. One percent change in production is accompanied by a 4- or 5-percent change in price to the grower.

We have three possible courses of action to try to correct the situation. We can ask for Government support to remove the surplus. This we do not want, as it is never satisfactory, it casts a stain on the potato industry and since Billy Sol Estes, we probably could not get it anyway. Secondly, we can continue as we are, let dog eat dog, and try to remain in business at present prices. With our increasing costs and larger outlay for equipment, this is becoming more and more difficult to do. Or thirdly, we, the potato growers of the United States, can initiate a national marketing order designed to remove the surplus through grade regulations, volume control, or both. This order would be grower initiated, grower financed, and grower controlled. It would have to be enforced by the Department of Agriculture We are somewhat reluctant to let them have even that much authority, but they are the only body in position to, or with the legal authority to enforce it.

Our area marketing orders are only partially effective. They can upgrade the quality and increase the demand for potatoes from a certain area or they can go too far and lose markets to competing areas. Transportation is becoming so efficient and so competitive that practically all markets are vulnerable to all areas. Maine is probably the only State in the union with sufficient market isolation to benefit materially from a State or area marketing order. We do not know yet what the final draft of the order will be or if it will ever come to a referendum. We do not know if it will pass or if we can approve of it when we see it.

Here are some things we do know: We know that if we are to continue to grow potatoes something must be done to control the relatively small margin of surplus that means the difference between profit and loss. We know that we do not want Government subsidies or Government controls dictated by Washington bureaucrats. We know that a Federal marketing order will contain inequities and faults, especially on the first draft, but it can be amended or at the end of 3 years, it can be voted out entirely.

There has never been a perfect set of rules passed since the Ten Commandments.

Nat Howard Examines the Permanent Purge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, two very significant articles related to teaching the truth about Russian communism in our secondary public school system were written by Mr. Nat Howard, the able and widely known newspaperman, and which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. Howard makes the point that in teaching our high school students the facts of life about Russian communism, special attention should be paid to the Russian technique of the routine mass purge. Those mass purges are an essential part of imperial communism and no one is able to escape this system of terror when the Moscow regime feels opposition to their total power is being generated anywhere within their empire.

Mr. Howard concludes his very thoughtful and timely article on the note that the permanent purge is the significant Red donation to history. By leave previously obtained, I insert these two articles in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 7, 1962]

U.S.S.R. Introduced Routine Mass Purge

(By N. R. Howard)

Now that teaching about Russian communism is being accepted in our secondary public education, it is, in my estimate, of importance that this factual instruction reveal in fullest detail the most novel and terrible historic invention of the Kremlin regimes, the regularized mass purge. The best history and interpretation of the purge is by Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski of Columbia, ("The Permanent Purge," Harvard University Press, 1956), one of the valuable products of the Harvard Russian Research Center.

Purges (meaning mass arrests, executions and imprisonment) are not new to history; the terror of the French revolution ran more than a year to maniacal proportions, and Hitler twice purged his ruling party and people. But not until the Soviet regimes had the wave of mass terrorism and punishment been taken out of the psychology of the impulsive and the desperate and fitted into a routinely-used catharsis.

For all students of Russian communism, this will distinguish purpose and performance as nothing in Red economics, enslavement, world posture, or militarism will do; which is why I think it of significance to be examined in lasting detail.

To employ understatement ominously, this is what the Kremlin chiefly has given to the world's annals.

Lenin was the author. Confronted with outside war and inner reluctance as early as 1921, he induced the central Communist committee to organize a weeding out of "class enemies" and "unreliable elements," built the CHEKA, the first secret police, to be the committee's weapon, and 2 years later (after how many liquidations no one will ever know) advised a periodic weeding out to insure the success of the first 5 year plan.

But it took Stalin to see the real effectiveness, first to himself and then to his party, of the repeated and—greatest novelty of the national terrorism—the advertised purge.

It did not take a purge to rid Stalin's government of Trotzky, Zinoviev, and Bukharin, Stalin's three principal domestic opponents. Possibly Stalin thought their banishment and imprisonment would dispel their danger to his regime. It is probable he then found their following greater than he had calculated—and the regularized purge began.

These were announced in advance in the controlled press, though there is much evidence that particular individual targets already had been grabbed (and even shot) by the NKVD, Stalin's expansion of the secret police.

First formal command in 1933—this was after the second Lenin-advised screening of party members in 1929—was that every Communist cell and state party organization should call in all membership cards, get a full biography from every member, and invite public criticism of every Communist.

Russian newspaper "box scores" indicate this indicted and deducted 10 to 12 percent of the nearly 2 million party membership. Of these, tens of thousands were executed, other tens of thousands imprisoned, others reprimanded and cast from the party, others warned but not molested.

What sharply stimulated and cemented the purges was the assassination in 1934 of Kirov, one of the four-man top purge commission. Stalin used the event to highlight his and Lenin's admonition as to purge necessity. The 1934 purge was broadened beyond the party membership, under the aggressive network operated by Yezhov, NKVD chief, who appealed for public accusations.

Stalin then added to classes of public enemies the managers of agricultural and industrial program failures; the Ukrainian, Byelo, Georgian, and other "narrowly nationalistic" state party operations, "Old Bolsheviks" (including the Trotzky-Bukharin following); and all communicationists with the capitalistic world.

Following this broad targeting, terrified men and women began accusing each other. Men accused their brothers and sisters; deputy managers accused their top bosses in order to get their jobs; the frightened babbled indiscriminately before they might be put on the spot. Local, state, and national purges caught up so many the prosecuting committees and police were swamped under the hundreds of thousands of cases.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 9, 1962]

Study of Purge Basic to Course on Soviets

(By N. R. Howard)

In appealing for the close examination of the Soviet Russian periodic mass purges, in our public school teachings of what communism is, I am bearing down on the originality in world history of purges in cycle as devised by the Moscow governments. Nothing else seems so characteristic or so full of possibilities for real understanding of the Soviet purposes.

No other absolutism ever produced a regularity of population flushing by liquidation and imprisonment—almost as regular as, say, the sessions of Congress in our country.

Stalin's greatly broadened purge of 1934, the fourth since the Red revolution of 1918, may have involved as many as a million accused, and might indicate how uneasy the dictator felt at that hour. The overwhelming number of individual accusations produced by Yezhov's secret police surely convinced the boss that the Russian people could be terrified.

So he glorified, by throwing open to the world with full publicity, the 1936–37 trials of 33 top "criminals" from his half dozen classifications of public enemies. All but one were executed after "confessions" which are psychological monuments to an adventurer's last wild fling at being a hero.

Radek saved his life by testimony incriminating top army people. Stalin had wished desperately to purge the army. Scores of officers including generals went to the firing squads.

What was not publicized until long after was that similar trials by the hundreds went on in separate U.S.S.R. states. These liquidated the largest proportion of operators who had not fulfilled agricultural and industrial goals, and provincial Communist Party secretaries accused of building up their personal powers.

Incidentally, a plump Communist named Nikita Khrushchev moved into the Ukraine party secretaryship thus forcibly vacated. He had been skillful in not saying too much or too little.

Ravages in party membership were considerable by 1938 and natural popular reaction from the terror more than visible; so Stalin turned on his NKVD, removed Yezhov and named Beria, freed wholesale lots of untried accused, and tightened up the rules for individual accusations. He demanded that party cells now go after new, less-bullied members. In 1939, he even supported a congress resolution against further nationwide purges—it was very helpful to a quiet purging of the NKVD Stalin deemed necessary.

Needless to say, there were no purges during World War II when, during the Nazi occupation of western Russia, Communist authority disappeared from the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and east Poland. But in 1946 there was nothing in the records to prevent Stalin from regional purges, and the Ukraine and Byelo cadres were weeded by secret police and individual accusations in the accepted technique—and widely reported.

During the next 4 years came broad purges of the industrial, communications, and agricultural areas (carefully kept from resembling a nationwide movement). Beria was almost wholly in charge of the purges by 1950, armed with a new law making criticism of Stalin treason with the death penalty.

Stalin died in the throes of his only apparently uncalculated attempted at a purge, aimed at Moscow physicians, families, and friends. The struggle to succed him was between Beria and a Malenkov-Bulganin-Khrushchev opposition. It cost Beria his life.

Under a new secret police administration, Malenkov extended the regional purges to Georgia, Azerbaidzhan, and other states, and shot seven principal rivals in high office in Moscow.

Malenkov, however, restricted his purge punishments largely to exile and prison; and Khrushchev, taking over in 1956 and repudiating the blood baths of the Stalin government, has followed this example in what minor purges his government has applied. But he has several times, in speeches, indicated understanding that he rules a nation which has been hardened into some form of unity by the purge system.

To repeat, this is the significant Red donation to history.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Law and Order in Albany and the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., is noted for its eloquent editorial comments. On August 2, 1962, the Greenville News has lived up to this reputation in printing an outstanding editorial which points up a great difference between the preservation of law and order in Albany, Ga., and Washington, D.C., and makes the point that perhaps the administration should give more of its attention toward preserving law and order in Washington, D.C., before it attempts to support by public words or deeds the irresponsible agitation antics of Dr. Martin Luther King and his hypocritical Albany movement.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW AND ORDER IN ALBANY AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Seen in the wrong light and taken in the wrong spirit, this editorial could be considered inflammatory. It is written close to the edge of anger and even closer to the edge of sadness.

But it has to be written because it deals with frightening facts pertaining to law enforcement in two cities.

One is the once peaceful city of Albany, Ga., where hundreds and even thousands of Negro demonstrators are almost daily threatening peace and good order in the name of rights and freedom. They have attracted national attention and sympathy, Cabinet officers, northern Governors, and thousands of do-gooders encourage them.

They have defied a Federal court injunction to continue their marches. Their mob assemblies have been applauded while the TV cameras rolled to record their antics.

The administration has either overlooked the danger or intimated that it may intervene in their behalf.

The other city is Washington, D.C., the Capital of the United States and one of the most heavily policed areas of its size in the world.

But it has become unsafe for a white woman to venture out of doors within a stone's throw of the Capitol building (or even on the Capitol steps) even in broad daylight and even with an escort.

Physical assaults and the ultimate in heinous crimes—rape—are becoming more and more commonplace, along with muggings and purse snatching. And the combined forces of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police and the Capitol guards haven't been able to stop it.

Most of the assailants and violators of the lesser laws on crime against the person are Negroes. But the suspects or persons arrested and charged are seldom if ever identified by race except by newsmen representing southern newspapers.

It seems to be bad taste or a violation of some sort of civil right to call a Negro criminal a Negro in print in Washington or in the big northern cities.

The situation has been getting worse for years as the percentage of Negroes among the population has risen. Members of Congress have protested before. They are crying out now in anger and in fear for the safety of their staff members, their families and visitors. They have attracted little attention.

Not all of the perpetrators of these crimes are Negroes, of course. But Washington has become the largest of the Nation's cities where Negroes outnumber whites, and Negroes account for a percentage of the criminal offenses higher even than their proportionate number among the total population.

Capitol Hill has replaced New York's Central Park as the most dangerous place in any metropolis for anyone to move about at night without an armed guard.

The administration seems to be looking the other way—toward Albany perhaps.

Let's go back a little further into the facts and merits of the problems in the two cities.

First Albany: The city has been turned into a racial battleground by Negro citizens who have been aroused by professional race-baiters from other States. Chief among them is Martin Luther King, the darling of the liberal integrationists and a pet of the administration.

It started with the familiar sit-ins and freedom-ride activities. It has developed into something much bigger and more sinister. Mobs of Negroes gather in rallies, sing hymns, pray, listen to promised-land speeches by leaders who know just how to work them up.

They march through the streets, they congregate in public places. They call their methods Christian and nonviolent and speak of peaceful aims. They say, or are told by their leaders, that the object is to win their rights and their freedom.

But the threat of violence looms over every such gathering. There have been reports of jeering at police officers and the throwing of brickbats.

The rights and freedom these people talk about boils down to one thing only: It is not the right to equal treatment by the law (if the demonstrators were white, they would be treated the same way) nor to own property; it is not freedom of movement to go where they will nor to meet in peaceful assembly to petition for the redress of wrongs; their primary and sole purpose is to try to force an end to segregation, to be integrated with whites in any and every place of their own choosing.

But are they proving themselves prepared for racially mixed society?

The remarkable thing is that serious injury and wholesale riots have been prevented. That it has is due to local law enforcement and not to Federal policy or action; quite the contrary.

Now Washington: Rampant Negro hoodlums have created a reign of terror around the Capitol so intense that the Congressional Secretaries Club has called for drastic action. These women work on Capitol Hill and many of them live nearby. Women caught in the vicinity have been the victims of rape, murderous assault, and violent robbery.

The recent meeting of the secretaries was called after a white woman, a congressional secretary, was attacked in a church adjacent to the Capitol grounds while kneeling in prayer and stabbed nine times. The initial reports said only that the assailant was a man. Southern newsmen have learned and reported that he was a Negro. He has not been caught.

Soon after this incident, a visiting Ohio housewife was beaten by two Negro girls in an unprovoked daylight assault on the Capitol steps. When the woman's husband tried to run down the two girls, a Negro boy tripped him up. By the time a few of the scores of policemen who patrol the place arrived, the three were gone. They have not been caught.

In the last 3 weeks or so, they have been five or more rapes committed within a few blocks of the Capitol; each victim described the attacker as a Negro. A Negro man has been arrested and charged.

The situation became so bad that police officers issued a broadside urging secretaries who had to go home after dark to call for a police escort to their homes.

The thugs then started making attacks in daylight.

In a speech before the House last week, Representative MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, said that Washington has become "the jungle of the civilized world." He noted that Attorney General Bobby Kennedy had been quoted as saying that such incidents would continue unless "wider opportunities are offered to permit young people to live differently than they do now."

This RIVERS took to mean a demand for passage of administration legislation on juvenile delinquency and others of its proposals. However, said RIVERS, the Attorney General "moans about the criminal and not the victim" and "has said nothing about better police protection and sterner punishment."

Despite all the provocation, violence thus far has been prevented in Albany. State, county, and city officials have seen to that.

Hoodlums seem to roam and attack at will in Washington. The Federal Government is responsible for governing the District of Columbia and enforcing the law.

Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to insert in the RECORD a letter from a reader to the Rapid City, S. Dak., Journal which I am sure many Members of Congress will find very interesting. This policy of providing everything free to all people is spelling the death knell to many industries, including those industries engaged in providing recreational facilities for people wanting to see nature at its best and tour through the great open spaces of America.

The letter is as follows:

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

May I take this means of sharing with you and your readers a bit of history in the making? Several recent articles published in your newspaper may have escaped their notice, yet the articles are of vital importance and demand the immediate attention of every citizen who is interested in holding the line against the Federal Government's inroads into private enterprise.

The U.S. Forest Service has asked that 473 acres of national forest land in the Black Hills be withdrawn from operation of the general mining laws, so that this land may be used by the Forest Service for expansion of their campgrounds and the construction of new ones. This proposal was announced recently by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, 1245 North 29th Street, in Billings, Mont.

Privately owned and operated campgrounds in and near the Black Hills already compete with the Forest Service's 41 campgrounds and 26 picnic sites. Now it is proposed to build another 473 acres of federally operated campgrounds. As a matter of fact, the Forest Service has already started on their construction program, having allowed $56,544 for the building of five comfort stations, camptender's residence, and office, etc., at the Wind Cave National Park and another $136,400 contract for the construction of roads and parking, fence, and utilities systems in the new Elk Mountain Campground at Wind Cave National Park.

This is a glaring example of how the Federal Government eliminates private enterprise and certainly the program should be renounced and abandoned. When the demand for more camping facilities justifies the need for more development of campgrounds, then we intend to meet the demand; just as other privately owned campground operators intend to expand and enlarge as the need arises.

It seems inconsistent with commonsense that we must pay taxes to assist the Federal Government in their efforts to run us out of business. Frankly, we don't mind competition but it is intolerable that we are placed in a position where we are forced to patronize our competition.

We ask that citizens who believe in the system of private enterprise help us and other campground operators by writing to their Congressmen so that the noise we are making will be heard in Washington and will not become the death rattle in the throats of privately owned campground operators.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT NOELLER.
FISH 'N' FRY, DEADWOOD.

Foreign Visitors and Our Democratic Posture: Address by Commissioner Bernard Katzen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is sometimes difficult in meeting with foreign visitors in the United States to place in proper perspective the civil rights problems facing our Nation. Our country has been nourished by a tradition of freedom and equality under the law. Americans are justly proud of our heritage of liberty and justice and consider the maintenance of these principles a solemn obligation. At the same time, we cannot hide the ugly scars of intolerance and discrimination which exist or deny the examples of oppression and lawlessness which appear in our newspapers daily.

Recently, Commissioner Bernard Katzen, the vice chairman of the New York State Commission for Human Rights, delivered an address dealing with this subject at a conference of commissions against discrimination in Seattle, Wash. His address, entitled "Foreign Visitors and Our Democratic Posture" contains some excellent guidelines for discussions of civil rights problems with foreign visitors. Commissioner Katzen points out that the struggle between communism and freedom provides an added exigency for realizing, in actual practice, the principles reflected in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. At the same time he emphasizes that the "concept of equality of opportunity was woven into the very structure of our Nation long before there was a Soviet Russia."

Mr. President, I know that Commissioner Katzen's eloquent and incisive remarks will be of interest to many Members and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN VISITORS AND OUR DEMOCRATIC POSTURE: AN ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER BERNARD KATZEN, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE NEW YORK STATE COMMISSION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, TO BE DELIVERED TO THE CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION, JULY 1962, SEATTLE, WASH.

The introduction to the report of President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals aptly describes the sense of my address this evening: "The way to observe freedom is to live it. Our enduring aim is to build a nation and help build a world in which every human being shall be free to develop his capacities to the fullest. We must rededicate ourselves to this principle and thereby strengthen its appeal to a world in political, social, economic, and technological revolution."

May I, at the outset, set forth what I believe to be some fundamental premises for my remarks this evening.

It is an acknowledged fact that the rapidly shrinking globe is having a tremendous impact upon the economic, political, and scientific segments of the world society.

It is equally acknowledged that it also makes the favorable resolution of conflicts because of race, color, creed, or national origin the imperative of our age.

It is well known that Caucasians make up only one-third of the world population today. It is not so well known that the three major faiths in this country (Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant), together account for only about 900 million people throughout the world, which is less than one-third of the world population. Moslems, Hindus, Confucians, Buddhists, Taoists, Shintos, Zoroastrians, and primitive religionists together number about 1,500 million, or approximately half the world's population. Another half-billion people throughout the world belong to other small religious sects or to none.

It is against this background that those of us who work in the field of human relations and human rights see, in new perspective, the inescapable fact that human rights have no boundaries—that human dignity is indivisible. No state, indeed no nation, can be an island unto itself. We all share in the global responsibility for peace and freedom.

We have been accustomed to viewing our respective jurisdictions as rigidly circumscribed by state and local boundaries. In global terms, this fragmentation of our functions and our energies is no longer possible. True, our enforcement jurisdiction is still limited, but the effect of what we do is limitless. Any concept that we can do a job without regard to the surge of events throughout the world would be as unrealistic as King Canute's command to the tides to stay away from his feet. Whether we like it or not, our feet are wet already. The time has come to ride the wave of the future with all the vision and the courage we can call forth.

But, as we advance toward equality of opportunity, we encounter resistance of those who cling to outmoded privilege. This resistance frequently finds expression in acts of discrimination—which in their impact, cannot be localized. Through modern communication media the story is piped into the stream of world consciousness, within a matter of hours, with no lurid detail missing.

Our role of leadership toward freedom and democracy is weakened and our failures not only exposed but blown up out of all proportion to our actual total situation. It is this image abroad that lends profound significance to our task at home.

When I express concern over our posture before the world, I do not mean that we should eliminate the ugly facts of discrimination in this country merely so as to win the East-West clash. Instead, I am saying the cold war provides an added exigency to the need for realizing, in actual practice, those principles which were fundamental to our country at its inception. America came into being because of the yearning for freedom by oppressed people. The concept of equality of opportunity was woven into the very structure of our Nation long before there was a Soviet Russia. However, today, looking at ourselves in the mirror of world opinion, we see the lag in the implementation of our principles in a new light. We have too long been apathetic, albeit with a twinge of guilt. Today, we are being put to the test. It does not matter whether our self-appraisal is agonizing as long as it is honest. This is the time for facing up to ourselves, for learning what we believe by the actual living out of our beliefs. Only in this way can we prove ourselves worthy of our role of leadership of the free world.

In this context, our task is twofold: First to step up our progress toward the realization of our goals at home; and second to correct the unbalanced and completely negative image of America which has, in part, been created by outside forces, both hostile and uninformed.

Throughout this conference, sensitive awareness of the first part of our task has been apparent. I have perceived a ready acceptance of the supreme importance of what each of us has been doing within our State and local boundaries to protect human rights, and, moreover, a determination to carry forth this great work more effectively and more rapidly than ever. Our drive for true equality within our respective areas of jurisdiction must take on a new tempo and a new impetus in relation to the global dimensions of our common task.

However, even while we are facing old problems with a new vigor at home, we can and must correct the distortions and one-sidedness of our image abroad. We would be the first to deny that discrimination based on race, creed, color and national origin has been eliminated from American life. However, we must make sure that both sides of the picture are presented fairly, when we are tested in the crucible of world opinion. The surprise and gratification of foreign visitors as they learn about our work and the breakthroughs that have been made are eloquent testimony to the need for presenting to the world a balanced picture of our race relations—a picture which puts the whole matter of race relations in perspective. I can say to you from personal experience that an honest presentation of race relations in America is appreciated by foreign visitors, whose preconceived ideas unfortunately, are sometimes reinforced by experiences they have here.

This brings me to the link we, in State commissions, have with our posture before the world.

There is a steady stream of short-and-long-term foreign visitors to this country: diplomats, government officials, educators, businessmen, labor leaders, civic leaders, and students. The students who come here are often mature and experienced graduate students who come to America to sharpen their skills and add to their knowledge so that they can make a greater contribution to their own countries when they return. They are the leaders of the future in a very real sense.

These are the people to whom their countrymen will listen when they return and tell about what they have actually seen, heard, and felt in America. Their experiences in this country mean more than a thousand words piped in by radio or by ambassadors of good will. These may, indeed, be the people who will be called upon to make crucial decisions about East-West relations and they are all concerned with the problem of race relations, those from the Asian and African countries intensely so.

The extent of our challenge and responsibility is indicated by the results of six surveys conducted by the Institute of International Education during the academic year 1960–61. It was found that of approximately 70,000 foreign citizens reported in the United States that year, approximately 50,000 (76 percent) were students. There were also approximately 10,000 interns and residents affiliated with U.S. hospitals; approximately 4,000 scholars, lecturers, or advanced researchers appointed to U.S. facilities; and approximately 3,000 trainees with U.S. business and industrial firms.

It was found that these foreign citizens in the United States during 1960–61 came from every major geographic and political area in the world, but the largest number (35 percent of the total) came from the Far East. The greatest increase in the numbers of students in the United States was reported for Africa—an increase of from 2,314 in 1959–60 to 3,241 in 1960–61, representing an increase of 40 percent in 1 year. Since a constructive approach to the emerging countries of Africa and Asia is essential to a free and democratic world of the future, these figures have special significance for our Commissions.

Significant also is the way in which foreign students fanned out all over the country. According to the Institute of International Education, institutions of higher learning in 49 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam reported foreign students on their campuses during the academic year 1960–61. Thirteen States and the District of Columbia reported more than 1,000 foreign students during that year, of which 10 are represented in our Conference of Commissions Against Discrimination: California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin. The States of California and New York each had nearly 7,000 foreign students during that same academic year.

However, the dimensions of our job are not limited by the areas in which foreign students studied. The image of America is a total impression.

When two Sengalese dignitaries were allegedly refused admission to a nightclub, as was the case recently in the North, or when a delegate from India was humiliated in a railroad terminal, as happened in the South, the effect cannot be contained within any geographical boundaries. These things happened in the United States of America; that is their only meaning to the world. When a Nigerian diplomat was refused table service at a restaurant located on U.S. Route 40, just as in the case of the Indian delegates, the implications are even more serious because of the indirect connection with a public service.

The extent of the indignities suffered by foreign visitors to this country was vividly presented in one of the surveys conducted by the Institute of International Education. When more than 1,000 African students were polled, it was discovered that three out of every four of these African students in the United States reported suffering some discrimination since their arrival here. We, in the New York State commission, located as we are close to the United Nations, have been alerted to this challenge in a very special way. We have seen it as an integral part of our work to contact these foreign visitors and to devote the time of our top echelon to discussions with them. Governor Rockefeller has set up a special bureau in the executive department known as the New York State International Official Visitors Office to cooperate with our commission in this respect and to coordinate this effort throughout all the departments, divisions, and bureaus of the State government.

I have had the privilege of serving as chairman of the foreign visitors and foreign students program within our commisson. This has been a most illuminating experience. The extent to which our talks with foreign visitors from literally dozens of countries has had a real impact upon their image of America is, of course, impossible to say. We have not yet devised and I doubt that we can ever devise a valid and reliable instrument for precise measurement of the impact of our work in this field.

I can, however, give you my firm impression that some new insights resulted. We cannot expect a reorganization of attitudes in depth in one interview. However, we were heartened by the numerous expressions of surprise and interest and by the frequent repetition of the phrase: "I had never seen your country in this light before."

Time does not permit a detailed description of our program for foreign visitors, but I believe that its salient objectives are relevant here.

First, we try to put the development of race relations in this country in historical perspective, pointing out the tragic influence of slavery, as well as the benign influence of our Founding Fathers who viewed this country as a haven for the oppressed. We do not deny that the flourishing of slavery within such a framework is one of the supreme ironies of history, and the cause of deeply rooted conflict within the fabric of our society.

Second, we try to bring to the awareness of our visitors the fact that bigotry is not indigenous to America alone—that it has plagued mankind through the ages, in many forms and in many lands.

Third, we point out the clashes at Jackson, Montgomery, Little Rock, New Orleans, and the resultant concentration of moral, legal, and even police power, to preserve peace, order and to eliminate abuses, in themselves demonstrate dedication to basic human values.

Fourth, without denying the obvious and inescapable disgrace of discriminatory acts in this country, we point out what is being done by our commission, a score of other State commissions and numerous local commissions, and the progress that has been achieved to date. Almost invariably, the breakthroughs we describe are greeted with surprise and gratification by our visitors.

Fifth, we acknowledge and appreciate contributions of all cultures to world progress. We ask our visitors about conditions in their own countries and give them some new light upon conditions in our own. We try to look at world problems in a spirit of teamwork, in a common search for answers, instead of giving answers.

Sixth, we attempt to leave no question unanswered, no matter how hostile it may be in content and in the manner of its presentation.

Seventh, we are as completely honest and frank as it is possible for mere human beings to be under conditions of sharp challenge.

Eighth, we try to create an unhurried atmosphere and we devote great care to preparing for these visits, both of which factors express more vividly than gracious words, the importance we attach to this opportunity for an interchange of ideas and information with our new neighbors.

There are two comments I would like to make in connection with the above points:

First, our approach is not cast in an apologetic mold. Central to our posture in these conferences is a firmness of conviction that our Nation leads in the fight for true equality among men and the recognition of the primacy of the individual.

Second, no inference should be drawn that we consider the format we employ as the most effective or comprehensive. The fact is that when we explored the methods and techniques used by various groups concerned with the problem of race relations and the foreign visitor, it became as clear as it was distressing to discover that there was a vacuum in certain areas, no standardized methodology in others and a definite lack of coordination in dealing with the many ramifications of this subject among the many governmental and lay groups, agencies and committees in this field. Techniques should be improved, their utilization extended and effected.

Perhaps a few actual experiences will show the need for different techniques and orientation in this area. Recently, I had the privilege of addressing a group of 300 university students who, under private auspices and with Government blessing, were headed for 14 African countries. Their program called for a 2 months' visit. Their objective was to establish a rapport as Americans with local communities via assistance in various construction projects, such as building of roads, libraries, schools, recreational centers, etc. I talked to one of the students who was going to the Ivory Coast and asked this question, "If you are asked, 'How do you explain discrimination in the United States?', what would you say?" Her answer was, "I would have to tell the truth. Our country is suffering from a disease."

During the question-and-answer period, I was asked these two questions:

1. "Mr. Commissioner, how do you explain the persecution of Communists in the State of New York?"

2. Another question, "As long as you're talking about government of the people, by the people and for the people, why shouldn't the people of each State have the right to decide what to do about discrimination in their own States?"

I suggest that the training and approach of these students, as they may present American ideals abroad, leaves something to be desired.

I recently visited Washington to discuss with informed persons the possibility of standardizing techniques. I turned to a professor, who is a lecturer to foreign visitors on race relations of democracy in our country. His reply was astounding. "I tell my class that democracy will come to the United States because the pressure of outside world forces will compel us to become democratic."

I spoke to a director of a volunteer hospital committee, which is engaged in finding homes for foreign students during their stay in this country. I asked that the hostess of a foreign student would answer if questioned about race relations. "I cannot tell you," she replied. She had never considered the problem. She felt that the fact that the student was taken into her home was sufficient to establish understanding and goodwill. While I believe that the hospitality program may be of tremendous assistance in making friends of foreign visitors, I am confident it still leaves unanswered in the mind of the visitor questions oftentimes not expressed.

Some months ago, a group of youth leaders from several of the African nations visited with our commission. I spoke to them for fundamental truths inherent in our Nation's democratic purpose and traced historically our emergence from colonialism with its inheritance of slavery. I spoke of the Declaration of Independence with its enduring philosophy: "All men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." I got to Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, then to the Gettysburg Address with its memorable quotation, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth," and I also quoted from Lincoln, "Freedom is indivisible; when it is denied to some, it is diminished for all." In the question-and-answer period that followed, one of the young men quite serenely but pointedly inquired: "Mr. Commissioner, wasn't it also Abraham Lincoln who said, 'You can fool some of the people some of the time, some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time.'" There was no mistaking his point. He was asking in effect, "How do you square your vaunted leadership in democracy with discrimination?"

The most frequent attack on the United States with which we have been confronted in these discussions is the accusation that we say one thing about democracy and do another. When I speak of democracy as a hope—a goal—a fundamental truth—rather than as a total actuality in any country or at any time, the rejoinder usually is, "But why should this be so? Isn't the United States supposed to be the leader and set an example in democratic practice?"

Let me say to you at this point that some of these questions are not easy to answer. The word "why" reverberates in my mind and in my heart as I search not for just the right answer but for the real answer. It was only 100 years ago that by the stroke of a pen, Lincoln changed the status of American Negroes from that of chattels into men. However, the stroke of a pen does not immediately remove an image that has become imbedded in the consciousness of both white men and black men, inescapably warping the outlook of both. An image both reflects and reinforces the reality situation. Gradually, as people in some parts of the country began to work, play, and live together in equality, a new image of the Negro emerged in the minds of both white and black men. It took a century for the black man to throw off the shackles of slavery. More slowly, but inevitably the imprisoned moral and spiritual values of his white brother who maintained the system of slavery are being liberated. This does not excuse the slow rate of speed so apparent in reaching our goals. It partially explains it.

Another frequently voiced complaint against America is that even in the North, where progress has been made, laws against discrimination appear to be necessary. Our visitors ask whether this means that Northerners, too, are bigoted. The answer to this comes more readily to mind. There are laws against murder and stealing, too, but this does not mean that we are a country of murderers and thieves. It means only that public policy through laws reflects the community mores and that any who infringe upon our precepts are punished.

You can readily see that the task before us is not an easy one, nor is it one that can be accomplished within the confines of one State.

I therefore urge that this gathering give consideration to the development of specific guidelines for a program of communicating the work of our commissions to foreign visitors. Undoubtedly other commissions as well as my own have developed programs and experiences in this field which we can share together. I would suggest that such an interchange be directed to four points:

1. To what extent should our State commissions devote program time to the foreign visitor program of the United States?
2. What points about America's way of life do we wish to communicate in such programs? How?
3. What are some caveats in our conduct of such programs?
4. What program procedures can we work out in cooperation with those Federal and private agencies whose primary work is in the foreign visitor field?

To this end, I recommend that we, the State and local commissions against discrimination and for human rights, develop a coordinated program for foreign visitors and foreign students in the field of race relations.

This is one concrete and constructive move which we can take toward removing the concept of boundaries as we face up together to the global dimensions of our responsibility. Through our action, we may help to protect and foster the economic, intellectual and spiritual fulfillment of all people, not only in our own States, but in the world; not only in our own time, but for all time. This, in part, can be our answer to the demands of our age.

Appeasement in New Guinea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

APPEASEMENT IN NEW GUINEA

The compromise plan for New Guinea, still to be sold to President Sukarno, permits Indonesia to take over from the Dutch next year instead of this year. After 5 years the natives would vote whether they want the Indonesians to stay.

Does anyone seriously believe that the Indonesians, after their brazen anschluss of this primitive half island, would move out if the vote went against them

Like the recent accommodation in Laos, this is a face-saving deal—for the Dutch who don't mind leaving but don't want to be chased; for Sukarno and his Indonesians who won't have to back up their bluff to take the place by force.

Economically West New Guinea is worthless, costing the Dutch administrators some $30 million a year. It is of no economic use to the Indonesians which, moreover, have no honest claim to it, in history, tradition, or race.

Military strategy could be another story. New Guinea lies between the Philippines and Australia. The Soviet Union, for its devious purposes, has backed Indonesia, extending hundreds of millions in aid, mainly military aid.

Throughout this whole controversy there has been no decent consideration of the rights of the native, primitive, black Papuans, living in naked and illiterate ignorance of the stir their ragged homeland is causing in the world. No world organization has suggested that neither the Dutch nor the Indonesians have any business there. No great power has urged that the Papuans be let alone.

This Indonesian takeover is the rankest kind of colonialism which, if attempted in Africa by a Western nation, would burn the lights far into the night at the United Nations. But this is Communist-backed colonialism. It is the Communist camp which is promoting this aggression. And the United Nations is going along on the specious theory that it is helping avoid a war.

Included in appeasement forces at the U.N. is the U.S. Government. An American diplomat is given credit for mediating the dispute and devising the plan. Neither in ethics nor in long-range regard for the defenses of the free world does this make any sense.

Transfer of Foreign-Built Vessels to Alaska Steamship Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Anchorage Daily News on July 31 editorially endorsed S. 3115 and the companion bill in the House of Representatives to permit the transfer to American registry of the train ship *City of New Orleans*. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT ON TRAIN SHIP BILL

A bill in Congress by Senator BARTLETT to transfer a foreign-built vessel to operation by the Alaska Steamship Co. is making progress. It has now come out of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and is ready for final congressional action.

A natural reaction is: Why should the Senate or the U.S. Congress, for that matter, help Alaska Steam out of a jam?

Actually, the transfer of the *City of New Orleans* from Liberian to American registry, will add to the Alaska Steamship Co.'s freighter fleet at about one-half the cost it would require to build a new ship, that is true. But it is also true that the addition of the *City of New Orleans* to the fleet will mean a substantial saving in freight to Alaskans. This end result is what we are interested it.

It is hoped Congress will not dally too long in enacting the statute which actually is a special amendment to the Merchant Marine Act.

This act, among other things, restricts American coastwise trade to vessels built in the United States and operated under the

American flag. The *City of New Orleans* is neither of these. It was built in Japan and it was operated under Liberian registry in trade with Cuba. That's a pretty black record for any steamboat, but still in all, it is a very modern, very fast, and very excellent ship for the use it will be put to. It is a trainship with a capacity of 56 loaded boxcars or flatcars. It is the only vessel of its kind available and can be bought for less than one-half of what a similar vessel could be built for in American yards.

The vessel would operate between Seattle and Whittier and would be the counterpart of the Canadian Pacific trainships already plying the waters between Prince Rupert or Vancouver and Whittier. Cheaper labor, cheaper vessel cost, and cheaper operation has allowed the Canadians to get a headstart on this new concept of freighting to Alaska. While Alaska Steam perhaps should be reprimanded for its long postponement of such service to Alaska, there is nevertheless no reason why Alaskans should not be able to enjoy the advantage of two-line competition.

That was the essence of Senator BARLETT's remarks last April when the bill was introduced. "There can be no mistaking my primary concern that Alaskans should enjoy reduced freight costs," he said in his preliminary remarks.

What these reductions will be has not yet been revealed in a published tariff but in some carload items it will be as much as $10 per ton.

BARTLETT's bill is backed up by similar one by Congressman PELLY, of Washington State. The bills are now out of their respective committees and it is to be hoped Congress will act with dispatch in authorizing this direct connection between Anchorage and the major railroads of the United States.

High freight rates have been anathema to Alaskans from time immemorable but at last we are beginning to see daylight.

Tribute to Federal District Judge George Bell Timmerman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 3, 1962, Federal District Judge George Bell Timmerman, Sr., announced that he will soon retire after approximately 22 years of distinguished service on the Federal bench. During this record of service as a Federal judge, Judge Timmerman earned wide applause and praise as a dedicated constitutionalist and an eminent student of the law. The announcement of his forthcoming retirement has already drawn editorial comments from three of South Carolina's leading daily newspapers commending Judge Timmerman for his distinguished service and for standing by his convictions so strongly in a long record of public service which also includes service in the State house of representatives and as chairman of the State highway commission.

Mr. President, I have known Judge Timmerman for many years. He practiced law with my father, the late John William Thurmond, and I have stood before his bench as a practicing attorney just as he has practiced law before me when I was a State circuit judge. I value his friendship and his dedicated service to his State and Nation, and I concur in the laudatory remarks as published in the editorials which I now offer for insertion in the Appendix to the RECORD. They are from the State of August 3, the Charleston News & Courier of August 3, and the Spartanburg Herald-Journal of August 5. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press article dated August 3 as published in the State announcing Judge Timmerman's retirement plans.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Aug. 3, 1962]

ENTITLED TO SOME REST: JUDGE TIMMERMAN ANNOUNCES HE'LL RETIRE WITHIN 6 MONTHS

BATESBURG.—U.S. District Judge George Bell Timmerman said Thursday that he plans to retire from the bench by the end of the year.

The 81-year-old jurist told the Associated Press he has delayed plans to step down because of a vacancy on the Federal bench in South Carolina. The vacancy was caused by the recent death of Judge Ashton Williams, of Charleston.

"I owe it to the people to hold on as long as I can," said Judge Timmerman from his Batesburg home. "I think I'm now entitled to some rest."

He said two-thirds of the work handled by Federal judges in South Carolina is done in the eastern district of the State which he principally serves.

Judge Timmerman complimented the State's two other Federal judges—C. C. Wyche and J. Robert Martin—for their dedication in handling extra loads of cases.

Judge Timmerman was appointed to the bench by President Roosevelt on January 23, 1941. Prior to that he had practiced law in Lexington. He was a former law partner of J. William Thurmond, father of STROM THURMOND, now U.S. Senator from South Carolina and the States' Rights presidential candidate in 1948.

Judge Timmerman was one of three Federal judges who ruled unanimously for separate but equal schools in the Clarendon County Summerton School District case. The ruling was later reversed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court has been a frequent target of the judge.

He once charged that the High Court "has been reading meanings into the Constitution and out of it that discriminate against white citizens, especially those of the so-called Deep South."

Judge Timmerman is the father of former Gov. George Bell Timmerman, Jr., with whom he now lives.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, August 3, 1962]

A STRONG JUDGE

Announcement that Judge George Bell Timmerman of Columbia will retire before the end of the year brings closer the inevitable but regrettable departure from the Federal bench of a strong and fair jurist.

Now 81 and in poor health, Judge Timmerman surely has earned retirement. He deserves the thanks of the public for his honorable service and we wish him many more years of life and happiness. The public deserves the same caliber of service from a successor, whoever he may be. We hope that the appointing authorities reflect carefully on the needs of the people in picking a new judge for the roving assignment serving both eastern and western districts.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald-Journal, Aug. 5, 1962]

OUR STATE IS LOSING A STALWART PROPONENT

South Carolina—and the Nation—will lose from public service one of its most stalwart defenders of fundamental rights upon the retirement of Federal Judge George Bell Timmerman, Sr.

The venerable jurist has been an anchor of reason in a long and storm-tossed period. He has not swayed with the political temper of the moment, nor in the face of what appeared to be inexorable trends.

Because of the strength of his convictions and his unfaltering devotion to constitutional principle, Judge Timmerman has been a protector of the South.

A few months ago, he gave this definition of his personal philosophy:

"I am opposed to the liquidation of our constitutional Republic.

"I am opposed to the installation of socialism, or despotism, or totalitarianism, or communism in favor of our Government, which is the best man ever devised.

"The closer we stick to our American system the farther away we will be from the worst forms of government."

The record shows Judge Timmerman's fearless adherence to his high creed.

As the State newspaper says: "He would be the first to concede, sadly, that his philosophy of the law and his concept of the clearly defined intentions for government in the United States are often pushed aside and trampled upon."

Aside from his notable career on the Federal bench, Judge Timmerman has been a progressive force in South Carolina government.

His friends claim for him the title of "Father of the State Highway System," a symbol of South Carolina's faith in the future. As a member of the house of representatives in 1924, Judge Timmerman wrote the bill which authorized the first real start in highway building. Later he served as chairman of the State highway commission.

George Bell Timmerman, Sr., is an eminent jurist whose steadfastness has been a comfort to his people. Let us hope—and expect—that those who will determine the selection of a successor will search for a man with the character and concept closest resembling those of Judge Timmerman.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Aug. 4, 1962]

A JUDGE AND THE REPUBLIC

The forthcoming retirement of Judge George Bell Timmerman will be more than the retirement of a man; it will be another step in the retirement of an era, or, indeed, a series of eras.

With this, the judge himself would immediately agree. He would be the first to concede, sadly, that his philosophy of the law and his concept of the clearly defined intentions for Government in the United States are now often pushed aside and trampled upon.

As recently as October 1961 in an interview for the State, Judge Timmerman said:

"I am opposed to the liquidation of our constitutional republic. I am opposed to the installation of socialism, or despotism, or totalitarianism or communism in favor of our Government, which is the best man ever devised. The closer we stick to our American system the further away we will be from the worst forms of government."

Many Americans, throughout the land, would say "amen" to the fidelity and statesmanship of these words, which take on a warming nobility in these times.

With constitutional devastation going on all around him in the country to which he is devoted, Judge Timmerman has adhered unbreakably and fearlessly to his own assessment of the Constitution. It could not have been otherwise with such a man. Those who agree are indebted to him for the part he has had, in his Federal jurisdiction, in efforts to check the erosion of the fundamental doctrine of America.

Those who choose in these times to distort or even relegate the Constitution would be quick to say a man holding Judge Timmerman's views must be classified as a reactionary. This they would say even while under compulsion to recognize his sincerity.

But the judge is not a reactionary. He had perhaps most to do with one phase of the introduction of his State to the future. He was a father of our great highway system, which has been an essential to progress. While a member of the house of representatives in 1924, he wrote and introduced the bill which authorized the real start in highway building in South Carolina. Later he served as chairman of a State highway commission which was progressive and constructive. Its policies and practices were the opposites of reaction.

As an attorney, a solicitor, a member of the general assembly and citizen, Mr. Timmerman entertained, and implemented, ideas and ideals for the advancement, not the holding back, of the people of South Carolina.

As a U.S. district judge, his clinging to the Constitution reflected (1) his absolute convictions, (2) his sense of certainty as to the best route for the ongoing and safety of his country, and (3) his loyalty to his oath.

Do we face a future in which there will be a catastrophic paucity of men who oppose the liquidation of our constitutional republic? We can ill afford the loss of men of Judge Timmerman's unswerving convictions.

FHA Mortgage Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill to authorize payment of certain claims for major defects in homes protected by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under such mortgages. The scope of this bill is confined to one- to four-family dwellings covered by FHA mortgage insurance, so it deals with the family resident or the small piece of investment property.

In the case of such dwellings previously or subsequently covered by FHA mortgage insurance, this bill would permit the Commissioner to reimburse the mortgagor, within 3 years after issuance of the insured mortgage, for the reasonable costs of correcting structural or other defects in the dwelling that are necessary to bring it into substantial conformity with the Commissioner's plans and specifications, or to make the dwelling safe and habitable. The bill would confer a maximum of administrative latitude upon the Commissioner, who would be empowered to prescribe the terms and conditions under which he would honor mortgagors' claims.

With respect to dwellings on which the mortgage is insured by FHA after enactment of this measure, the Commissioner would be empowered to require that a bond be posted, by the builder or seller, for example, to indemnify the Commissioner in the event that he is subsequently required to reimburse the mortgagor for correction of structural or other defects.

I believe that this bill will provide a workable and economical procedure for correcting what often are tragic and sometimes unavoidable situations which leave a helpless homeowner saddled with a defective dwelling and without a legal or financial remedy. I urge its favorable consideration and enactment.

Gleason's Train Trip Recalls Late "Butch" McDevitt's New York Visit in 1912

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Tuesday, July 31, 1962, carried a most enjoyable and amusing feature article on Comedian Jackie Gleason's proposed private train trip from Hollywood to New York and that taken a half-century ago by one of the most colorful personages ever to reside in my congressional district, the late John J. "Butch" McDevitt. I knew "Butch" McDevitt well and it, therefore, gives me added pleasure to insert in the RECORD the aforementioned article from last Tuesday's Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader.

The article follows:

GLEASON'S TRAIN TRIP RECALLS LATE "BUTCH" McDEVITT'S NEW YORK VISIT IN 1912

Comedian Jackie Gleason's plans to travel to New York from Hollywood by private train next week harks back to the days when people did things in style.

And a late Wilkes-Barre resident would applaud the move. For he did the same thing more than 50 years ago, though Gleason's jaunt will be longer and much more costlier.

Wilkes-Barre and the Lehigh Valley Railroad commanded the spotlight in January 1912, when John J. "Butch" McDevitt hired a train for a trip to New York City.

McDevitt, known as the "millionaire-for-a-day," spent $316 for his 4¼ hours' trip, while Gleason will put out $90,000. McDevitt's entire sojourn cost him about $600.

Local newspapers, in reporting McDevitt's antics, described him in the accounts as "pink-haired town jester of Wilkes-Barre."

When "Butch" made the trip, the only ones he permitted on his private train were his physician, secretary, valet, and a host of newspapermen, including representatives of six of New York's big dailies.

Gleason, the high-living comedian, said his private train will depart from Union Station, Hollywood, on August 9 and will follow a zigzag course making layovers along the way to Gotham City. His entourage will include dancing girls and a six-piece Dixieland band.

Describing how the "millionaire-for-a-day" spent the day before his trip making final preparations, a newspaper report at the time stated: "He was also busy explaining to visiting newspapermen that he did not make his money in the coal mines, but that he was simply lucky in politics, that all he did was to register as a candidate at the primaries, spend a dollar for campaign expenses, and then woke up the day after election to find that he had been nominated on the Democratic ticket for the county treasurership.

"He retired from the ticket for a consideration, so he says. Now he is having his fling with his dollars."

A story datelined New York gave this account of "Butch's" arrival in that city: "'Millionaire-for-a-day' McDevitt flashed into town from Wilkes-Barre, Pa., tonight on his special, dined amid the gilt and gorgeousness of the Waldorf-Astoria, saw 'The Little Millionaire,' thrust back a cruel policeman who had pushed with a club an old beggar woman who was tottering in the snow outside of the theater (beautiful real life drama stuff), gave her $5 of what he had left, toured in a taxi to Stanley's, Rector's, and the Friar's Club; returned to the Waldorf-Astoria, where he purchased a $30 a night suite for himself, his doctor, his secretary, and his valet, and said over the telephone to a reporter last night that he thought by hard conniving he would be able to buy bacon and eggs and coffee for his entire retinue in the morning, but was not what you would call sure of it."

At the Broadway play, McDevitt spoke for half an hour between acts and gave George M. Cohan a baton of coal.

"Butch" took a bath in milk and wine, explaining he understood it was a practice of millionaires and he did not want them to have anything on him. He also took a trip to New Haven to see Sylvester Poli, the theater owner. McDevitt said the only reason he went to see Poli was "I have been paying an average of 20 cents a week for the past year for the privilege of sitting in the "coop" in his Wilkes-Barre theater. Altogether this has cost me $13.60. I was entitled to see the man who got the money."

Wilkes-Barre's town jester received a number of contract offers, all of which he refused. They included one from Poli and one from Hammerstein for 2 weeks at $1,000 a week for an engagement in his New York theater. McDevitt told Hammerstein: "The reason I won't accept your offer is that this stunt is the extreme in high art and must not be tainted with commercialism."

He returned home with exactly 10 cents in his pocket.

Recreation Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the appended article by Louis Cassels from the Washington Post for August 5, 1962, points up the deficiencies in our national park system at a time when the citizens of the United States are making a concerted effort to enjoy the recreational facilities that are available in this country. Edward C. Crafts, director of the Interior Department's new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, notes that most of the public land for State and National parks is where the people are not. Fortunately there are public lands adjacent to the District of Columbia and accessible to all the residents of several great metropolitan areas. I believe that the

87th Congress should act without delay in establishing a C. & O. Canal National Historical Park. This can be done with no immediate cost. It will help to right the balance between parks and people. This park of unusual historical significance to the development of our Nation and others like it must be provided to the citizens of the United States, investing against the future and providing a permanent contract with the heritage of the past and the out of doors.

The article follows:

MOST OF OUR RECREATION LAND IS WHERE THE PEOPLE AREN'T

(By Louis Cassels)

America's outdoor playgrounds are desperately overcrowded this summer.

The situation will get progressively worse unless the Nation moves swiftly to provide more parks, picnic grounds and swimming holes for a growing population with a growing amount of leisure time.

So says Edward C. Crafts, Director of the Interior Department's new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Crafts' bureau was established for the express purpose of promoting more and better facilities for recreation, hiking, fishing, swimming, boating and other outdoor recreation.

Crafts said in an interview that Americans, who now live mostly in cities, are becoming more avid every year in their pursuit of a patch of nature in which to picnic, swim, take a walk or just look at the scenery. During the 1950's, while the U.S. population grew 15 percent, visits to national parks rose 86 percent.

The result, said Crafts, is that "some of our more popular parks now look like Times Square at the peak of the tourist season."

On paper, it looks as though America should have abundant space for outdoor recreation. More than 250 million acres are publicly designated for that purpose, including 26 million acres of national parks, 6 million acres of State parks and 180 million acres of national forests.

But, Crafts pointed out, "most of this land is where the people are not." Specifically, 72 percent of the public recreational acreage is in Western States, where 15 percent of the population lives. The Northeastern States, with 15 percent of the people, have only 2 percent of the park lands.

Providing more outdoor recreation opportunities within easy reach of major population centers in the East is the major goal of the new bureau.

It will not build or operate any facilities itself. Its main jobs are (1) to coordinate the activities of the 20 or more Federal agencies which are already involved directly or incidentally in the management of lands which can be used for outdoor recreation; and (2) to stimulate greater efforts by State and local governments, and private enterprise, to meet the rising demand for open-air playgrounds.

Crafts expressed hope that Congress will complete action soon on a bill authorizing his bureau to distribute $50 million in matching grants to encourage States to develop plans for outdoor recreation programs. Most States are dragging their feet.

Another bill before Congress would set up a land acquisition fund to be financed by proceeds from admission fees at Federal recreation areas, motorboat gasoline taxes and other charges. This money would be used to buy new lands for national parks and seashores.

Expenditures for new recreation facilities are not frivolous, Crafts said, but an overdue national investment in assuring all Americans "permanent access to their outdoor heritage."

Mr. Tshombe's Red Flirtations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, Miss Marguerite Higgins, correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune, has recently written a column which I think will be of great interest to Members of the House who will shortly be called upon to vote on the President's request for authority to purchase $100 million in United Nations bonds.

The point of Miss Higgin's column, Mr. Speaker, is that a frightening alliance against the United Nations has developed in the Congo: an alliance between rightist Premier Moise Tshombe, secessionist leader of Katanga Province, and pro-Communist Antoine Gizenga, leader of the faction formerly dominated by Patrice Lumumba.

It goes without saying that the interests of the United States are diametrically opposed to those of any far-right Communist coalition. We have had enough experience with the Communists to know that the minute their support permits Tshombe to come to power they will devote every effort—not stopping short of murder—to replace their rightwing puppet with a dictator whose fidelity to the party line is more dependable. And should a Communist ever come to power in the Congo, the United States and the rest of the free world will have suffered a major international defeat.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has been waging a courageous battle for at least a year to prevent an armed East-West encounter in the Congo. To date, that effort under the most trying circumstances has met with success. If any Member of the House believes that United Nations support for Premier Adoula is sufficient reason for a vote against U.N. bonds I urge a careful reading of the shocking and revealing facts presented by Marguerite Higgins in the timely article reprinted below:

MR. TSHOMBE'S RED FLIRTATIONS

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—The Congolese time bomb is largely forgotten by the general public, but last week Western capitals were put on notice that it is not only far from gone but likely to blow up at any time.

Why? Because the moderate government of Premier Adoula—the last, best hope of fending off the Communists, chaos, or another military dictatorship—last Thursday escaped by an eyelash being overthrown, and the next time could be fatal. For Adoula's main opponent, the Lumumba Party under the dominance of pro-Communist Antoine Gizenga (now under house arrest), is being strengthened in the Congolese Parliament by an unholy alliance with the Conakat Party. And what is the Conakat Party? It is—please take careful note—the party of secessionist Premier Moise Tshombe of Katanga—the same Tshombe who was once accused of having murdered Patrice Lumumba.

And in this age of images, the weird alliance between the Communist-prone Lumumbists and the Katangan Conakat brings up the question of how in the world secessionist Moise Tshombe has managed to hold onto the utterly false picture of himself as the friend of freedom, right-wing conservatism, and free-enterprise philosophies.

The answer seems to be threefold. First, the slick public relations job done on Katanga's behalf by the Belgian lobbyist, Michael Struelens. Second, Katanga's possession of enormous financial resources resulting from taxes on the British and Belgian-owned Union Miniere, the disposition of whose revenues is a main bone of contention between the Tshombe regime and the Congo Central Government. And, third, the New Frontier's silence—so far—about the hard facts at its disposal (and they are detailed, documented, and irrefutable) about Tshombe's cynical flirtations with the Reds and other shenanigans, including his scandalous bribe attempts with respect to several Latin American countries in an effort to buy diplomatic recognition of Katanga as an independent country.

The New Frontier's silence has been predicated on the belief that discretion was the best tactic so long as there was any hope that Tshombe would conduct in good faith his negotiations for federating with the Central Government and for sharing revenues from the giant Union Miniere company. That hope is gone. And since Tshombe's "good, dependable fellow" image is an impediment to imposing the only thing that can bring him to reason—economic sanctions—Washington has decided that the time has come to wash some of the Tshombe dirty linen in public. President Kennedy has been strongly urged to start the process at his press conference next Tuesday.

The President has plenty of embarrassing questions to ask that ought to make a particularly large dent on those rightwing Congressmen to whom Tshombe is a hero.

For example, how is it that Tshombe thinks so badly of American financial circles (sometimes classed as rightwing) that in a speech to the Katangese Assembly last February 15 he declared: "Washington is under the thumb of voracious financiers who will not rest as long as the Congo is not a colony under its domination and as long as Katangese copper is not eliminated from world competition"?

Why on March 6 did "anti-Communist" Tshombe instruct his deputies to join with pro-Communist Lumumbists to demand the release of pro-Communist Gizenga? And what about the joint press conference on July 17 of the Tshombe parliamentary whip and the Lumumbist acting chief in which they called for the overthrow of Adoula?

Mr. Tshombe's cynicism is not confined to ideological matters. When the time comes, it can be shown, for example, that in the past 2 weeks terrorists and assassins of the French OAS, who have fled from Algeria, have received jobs from Tshombe.

Mr. Tshombe's most spectacular attempt to buy international favors was in the attempted bribe of Costa Rica, which was offered nearly $2 million to grant recognition of Katanga as a separate country. Tshombe had this huge sum placed in a Swiss bank.

There are a number of other odd happenings under investigation by interested countries. How is it in the case of the Katangan riot against U.N. forces that newsmen were taken through a hospital at 10:35 of that day to witness surgery on a "wounded" Katangese boy when the shooting (nine shots into the air) did not occur till after 11? And why did Katangan agents inquire of certain Congressmen 2 weeks before the "riot" if American public opinion would be influenced against the U.N. bond issue if U.N. troops beat up Katangan women and children?

Reluctantly, Washington has concluded that Tshombe's intransigeance is the greatest present evil facing the Congo and that is why steps will shortly be invoked to compel him to change—or go. And if Washington finally reveals the real reasons why, hardly anybody will be sorry.

Ordeal at Albany, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., one of the most outstanding and outspoken daily newspapers in this country, has published an excellent front page editorial on August 4 entitled "Ordeal at Albany, Ga." These eidtorial comments are very strong and I commend them to the attention of the membership of this body, the President of the United States, the Attorney General, and to everyone interested in preserving respect for law and order. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDEAL AT ALBANY, GA.

At his press conference Wednesday, President Kennedy chided city authorities of Albany, Ga., for refusing to negotiate racial problems with agitators who have plagued the town with constant turmoil. He commented that the United States would negotiate with Russia, and he found it "wholly inexplicable" that the Albany City Commission would not sit down with Negro American citizens to correct "a completely unsatisfactory" situation.

Whether he so intended, the President correctly stated the relationship between Albany and the Negro agitators engaged in incitement to riot. Just as Russia is the enemy of the United States, Martin Luther King and the rest are enemies of law and order in Albany.

If anyone doubts it, the record is being spelled out by witnesses in U.S. district court at Albany. They were testifying in the city's plea for an injunction to prohibit further mass demonstrations.

Negroes have used vile language, the witnesses testified, in defying police. They have thrown rocks and bottles. Even as the witnesses described the potentially explosive conditions inspired by the agitators, demonstrations continued in the streets. In jail, Negro demonstrators prayed, sang, and clapped their hands in jungle rhythm. The whole atmosphere is reminiscent of African preliminaries for barbaric rites.

These are the conditions that President Kennedy ought to find "unsatisfactory."

He ought to know how rewarding are negotiations with the Russians. All over the world his emissaries are finding that the only way to appease the Russians is to surrender.

Surrender to mass movements such as Albany has undergone is racial suicide.

"We are going to attempt," the President said, "as we have in the past, to try to provide a satisfactory solution for the protection of the constitutional rights of the people of Albany, and we will continue to do so."

When will the Federal Government start providing for the constitutional rights of all peace-loving people, both white and Negro? The majority of Negro citizens in Albany are abstaining from tribal rites led by King and his allies. Their safety and the safety of white citizens are endangered by constant agitation. The patience of all is being strained to the breaking point.

If no incident occurs to create an explosion, somebody may manufacture one. The President's comment is virtually an invitation for further trouble.

Allan P. Kirby at 70 Is a Distinguished Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Wednesday, August 1, 1962, carried an editorial tribute to the Honorable Allan P. Kirby, who observed his 70th birthday on Tuesday, July 31. Mr. Kirby is a distinguished son of a distinguished father and the Kirby name is of historic significance in Wyoming Valley where Fred M. Kirby began his outstanding business career many decades ago. Allan Kirby, in his own right, has made an outstanding career in the fields of finance and business and is one of the leading philanthropists in the Nation. The district which I have the honor of representing in Congress is indeed most proud of the career of Allan P. Kirby, a native son, who has more than sustained the honored name of Kirby in the community and throughout the Nation. I am, therefore, especially happy to include the editorial tribute, made by the largest newspaper in my congressional district, as part of my remarks today. Editorial follows:

ALLAN KIRBY AT 70 IS A DISTINGUISHED SON

There are five milestones in the average life that stand out more than others, no matter what the individual's station. First, of course, is the date of birth. Next is the 21st birthday anniversary when he (or she) comes of age. Then follows the wedding anniversary, 70th birthday, and 100th birthday, if one's luck does not run out.

Allan P. Kirby, native son of Wilkes-Barre, who continues to summer at Glen Summit, although he is a legal resident of Morristown, N.J., attained the dignity of three score and ten yesterday. While the observance was noted at a family gathering, the occasion was of public interest because of the role Mr. Kirby has played and continues to play in the community and country as a financier, businessman, and philanthropist.

As a son of Fred Morgan Kirby, who, incidentally, would have been 101 in October if he were alive, Allan P. Kirby was heir to wealth and position. But he was not satisfied to rest on his father's laurels. He struck out on his own to carve a career that parallels, in many respects that of his distinguished parent.

Allan Kirby today is nationally known on the basis of his own achievements, not just as his father's son. At 70, we do not think of him as an elder statesman of business, but as a vigorous practitioner. And that he is and will continue to be, his old neighbors in Wilkes-Barre hope, for years to come. On this auspicious occassion, Wilkes-Barre extends congratulations and best wishes.

Top o' Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Pampa, Tex., is my hometown and I am very proud of it. It is populated by a fiercely independent group of people who believe in the United States of America and our Constitution. They strive daily to measure up to their full responsibilities as individual citizens and free people and are highly successful. Like all other cities they believe in growing and they want that growth to be a sound and healthy growth on a permanent basis.

In keeping with their general feelings on the subject a splendid editorial was printed in the Pampa Daily News of Sunday, July 29, 1962. I place that editorial in the RECORD today so that our people in other sections of this great country may have an opportunity to read about our city and to interest themselves in doing business with it:

EVERYTHING A–OK IN PAMPA—BUT SOME NEW INDUSTRY WOULD HELP

"Top o' Texas" residents have been hearing plenty of late concerning the Pampa Chamber of Commerce drive to bring new industry to this area.

The chamber of commerce is raising money for an advertising campaign in the Wall Street Journal and to finance followup activities when and if prospects are found.

The drive for industry can be an expensive thing, as witness costs of the campaign indicated at the outset. A series of 24 1-column-by-4-inch ads in the East, Midwest and Southwest editions of the Wall Street Journal, plus one full-page ad in the official State magazine, Texas Parade, will return statements to the chamber of commerce for approximately $3,000.

Add to this the additional advertising that is planned and contact work with prospects, and you can see that no small amount of money will be needed to do an effective job for Pampa.

And how is the chamber going to raise such amounts?

They hope to get it from you, Mr. Businessman, you, Mr. Professional Man, and you Mr. Individual.

This is an outstanding opportunity to make an investment in the future of Pampa, and we can do it in the good old Texas way sans Federal, State or local government assistance.

Here's a chance for local private enterprise to assert itself and finance its own improvement project. Let's not let the opportunity slip through our hands.

The fruits of the labor can be rewarding indeed.

New industry is the nucleus of an economic cycle healthy for all in the town. One industry, employing maybe 50, can send up to 400 payroll-filled pockets to town regularly, and, who knows, maybe some of them would wander into your front door to buy what you have to sell.

Pampa needs new industry. All of Texas and the great Southwest is out to get its share of the industrial growth the Nation is enjoying and if we don't answer this challenge with dollars, and right now, we could be left out in the cold. The competition from neighboring communities is fierce.

And why shouldn't Pampa have new industries? We have all it takes to feed them, plenty of raw materials like gas, oil, petrochemicals, helium, gasoline, butane, propane, grain sorghums, wheat, cotton, cattle, manpower, low taxes, and, perhaps best of all, an abundance of water now, and more to come through the Canadian River Dam project.

We have housing, fine educational, cultural, medical, and recreational facilities, hospitable, self-reliant people, money, technical know-how and a buoyant Texas spirit.

And before someone declares the "Top O' Texas" a disaster area because we want some more industry, let us point out some evidence to the contrary.

Pampa has enjoyed a steady growth for over 30 years. Our population increase has nearly doubled every 10 years since 1930 and the trend apparently is still in effect.

In 1930 we had 10,470 people; in 1940 it was 12,895; in 1950 we hit 16,583 and in 1960 we counted 24,664 human-type heads within the city limits.

We haven't counted ourselves since 1960, but the utility companies have some figures which would indicate we still are multiplying.

For instance: gas meters, 1960, 7,992 meters; yesterday 1962, 8,038; electricity meters, 1960, 9,136; yesterday, 9,394; telephones, 1960, 11,935; yesterday 12,778; water meters, 1960, 7,645; yesterday, 8,038; deposits in banks and savings and loan companies, 1960, $48,271,286; yesterday $61,383,368; scholastics, 1960, 6,257; currently, 6,630.

And to top it off, Pampa has been given a very high rating as a quality market in a nationwide business survey just completed by Sales Management magazine.

Sales Management reports that net income in Pampa last year after deducting personal taxes was $53,934,000. Net income per household was $6,827, an average obtained by dividing the overall income by the number of households.

This is more than was available to people in most parts of the West South Central States, where the average was $5,562, and more than the average in the State of Texas, which was $5,937.

Total retail sales in Pampa last year were $41,900,000.

Each community is rated by Sales Management to show its relative standing as a market, based on such factors as income, spending volume, population and growth potential. This is called Sales Management's quality of market index. Pampa was given an index rating of 116, or 16 percent higher than the national average.

And we want it to continue, don't we? It will take money to keep us on top so dig down in that lefthand hip pocket today, pull out some hard, U.S.-type cash and go stuff it in the front door of the Pampa Chamber of Commerce, located in City Hall.

Your grandchildren will be glad you did and so will you.

Fort Detrick Scientist Doubts U.S. Germ Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, recent stories of the death of a microbiology worker in England have naturally raised questions about the safety of our own program in this area. The appended news story from the Washington Post of Sunday, August 5, 1962, will answer many of these questions.

FORT DETRICK SCIENTIST DOUBTS U.S. GERM PERIL

(By Paul Healy)

The type of accident which fatally felled a British scientist with the pneumonic plague this week could happen here at U.S. germ headquarters but it is unlikely because of safety precautions.

Dr. Arnold G. Wedum, safety director of the biological laboratories at Fort Detrick in nearby Frederick, Md., recalled that the installation had a nonfatal case of pneumonic plague in August 1959, similar to the one believed to have killed Geoffrey Bacon, a 40-year-old laboratory worker in England.

Dr. Wedum said this was one of the very few instances of recovery from the dreaded disease, which is a variation of the bubonic plague or "black death," that decimated England's population in the 14th century.

TWO ANTHRAX FATALITIES

"We knew the man had been working with the pneumonic plague organism," he related. "so he was treated for it very promptly with tetracycline, a new antibiotic." The man suffered no ill effects afterward.

Dr. Wedum said the Fort Detrick laboratories in 1951 and 1958 had two fatal cases of pulmonary anthrax, a disease usually brought in on foreign hides and wool used in textile mills. (Anthrax is one of a score of diseases which the Fort Detrick laboratories are studying for possible use in germ warfare.)

During 1950–59 inclusive, he said, the labs had 249 other illnesses—all nonfatal—caused by the organisms studied there.

In 1958 Fort Detrick began to use a sealed-in cabinet system to protect scientists engaged in the more dangerous kinds of bacteriological research, Dr. Wedum said. This consists of a long sequence of nonleakable cabinets tested for absolute tightness with freon gas.

The researchers put their hands in the cabinets wearing rubber gloves that are attached to the cabinets; thus no part of the skin comes in contact with the organism. Similar cabinets are used by radioisotope workers.

Dr. Wedum said the excellent progress made in developing new vaccines during 1958–59 was another factor in the decline of the work-connected illness rate at Fort Detrick. All Fort Detrick workers were promptly vaccinated with the new vaccines.

"We are strong advocates of using living vaccines where available," Dr. Wedum said.

SAFETY PROGRAM CITED

The third factor in cutting the illness rate, he went on, was the whole safety program itself. It now has 32 civilians and 5 Army enlisted men working full time to promote safety consciousness among Fort Detrick's 1,750 civilian employees and 400 military personnel.

The result, Dr. Wedum said, is that for the fiscal year ending last June 30 Fort Detrick "had only six lost-time accidents, two of them being caused by laboratory illnesses, from which the men recovered."

Dr. Wedum pooh-poohed the concern expressed by inhabitants of the area in England where Dr. Bacon was struck with the plague.

"Such excitement * * * is not justified," he commented. "People fail to realize what great advances we have made in sanitary practices since the bubonic plague in the Middle Ages."

No "significant concern" of this sort has ever been heard in the Fort Detrick locality, he said, adding: "After all, we have a better safety record than most of the industrial towns."

The School Prayer Decision of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the July 1962 issue of a publication by the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order entitled "The Blessings of Liberty" has come to my attention, and I have been very impressed with an editorial contained therein entitled "School Prayer Decision of the Supreme Court."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SCHOOL PRAYER DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT

June 25, 1962, was a black day for Americans who believe in God after the manner of the Old and New Testaments and who have ever prized the unique relations between religion and government worked out in American institutions and traditions.

The legal cornerstone of the American church-state synthesis, which had endured for 173 years, is the first amendment. This amendment—article I of our Bill of Rights—reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The supreme aim of this primary formulation of individual rights, over against the Federal sovereignty of the United States, is in the free exercise clause. The aim is the preservation of freedom of religion.

It was to worship God according to the dictates of conscience that a large number of colonial Americans came to these shores. Others were satisfied with the established church of England. Still others—exemplifying the Puritan or Presbyterian tradition—had no objection to an establishment of religion, provided it was neither Anglican nor Roman Catholic. Gradually however and with a consensus that was impressive in its growing extent, the American Founding Fathers reached the view that liberty of religion required the rejection of any established or preferred church.

This is the background of the first amendment. Its main weight is on the free exercise of religion, and this is understood positively—as freedom of religious worship and practice, not as freedom from religion.

The authors of our Constitution and Bill of Rights were interested in equal rights for all religious denominations and for individuals in the matter of religious opinion and practice. They were not thinking of atheism and immorality as against theism and the moral law, for they took it for granted that God and morality were foundations of good government. If there were no God, there could be no inalienable rights. Reason itself would be overthrown.

These self-evident truths are the key to the rich combination in American history and tradition of religious liberty, separation of church and state, and national affirmation of trust in God.

This is the distinctive American position on church and state, religion and government. It is to be compared and contrasted with the ancient, preprophetic position of identification or totalism. On this view religion is a department of the state, an arm of rule and authority. Within Christian history this view reappears, mitigated by going through the motions of baptism, but in essence unchanged. We see it in the Byzantine Empire and later in czarist Moscow, self-appointed as the Third Rome. Nor is it absent in the West, in the post-Reformation advent of the dogma of the divine right of kings.

In between ancient identification and American cooperative plurality, there is the classic western Christian doctrine of the two swords, one temporal, the other spiritual. Each power is sovereign in its own sphere; yet the two spheres are not completely separate. Rather they are but different modes or dimensions of authority in the city of man or human society.

The French Revolution brought in, more as the vision of an apocalypse than in immediate reality, the fourth type of church-state relationship. This type represents the triumph and dominance of the spirit of secularity. Religion, the moving impress of eternity, is rejected and dismissed as something purely private. It is no concern of the state and has no business putting its fingers into public affairs.

The final term of secularism is the situation under communism. Here the intent is the abolition of religion, but the interim period is characterized by the reduction ruthlessly of religion to a private status. This is compatible with constitutional provisions announcing the complete separation of church and state and guaranteeing freedom of religious worship.

This background is absolutely necessary if we are to understand and assess the most recent decision of the Supreme Court respecting religion and public education. The earnest and undoubtedly well-intentioned Justices—six of them, one a Roman Catholic layman and another a Presbyterian elder—who struck down a simple prayer designed not by State officials but by Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish consultants anxious to rise to the tolerance demanded in a plural society, may be unaware of the road we are on. This very fact, the fact that rational and even devout men in a position of such grave responsibility proceed like sleepwalkers on a clearly marked path, is the thing that is frightening.

This is not mere assertion. Any student of the landmark decisions in the school field since World War II—Everson, McCollum, and Zorach—could be fairly sure that something more drastic and more of a reversal of previous precedents was coming. It has come and both the country and the Court are caught in a vast "judicial thicket"—Mr. Justice Frankfurter's phrase—with the whole distinctive American church-state position placed in jeopardy.

What shall ordinary, devout Americans do?

First, they must not panic and they must not be intimidated either by Court prestige or by the range and volume of contrary liberal opinion among intellectuals, including a surprising number of Protestant clergy.

Second, they must mobilize for education as to the real American tradition and for the formation of informed and militant public opinion. The Supreme Court ought not to be affected by intellectual and ideological fashions. Unfortunately the Justices are but men and the fashionable tide among intelligentsia in the United States has been for long a strong one and it has been secular liberalism. This is the ideology which has been in the ascendant in educated circles for two generations, but it by no means reflects the views of the great majority of Americans. The time is ripe for a sharp and sustained counterattack on secularism at all levels of our society, including the universities and the theological seminaries.

Third, there is the one sovereign remedy—a constitutional amendment clarifying the intent and limits of the first amendment. Forty-nine State Governors have come out for this. If there is no other way to stem the current, pellmell radicalism and reformism of judicial opinion at the highest level, we must secure such an amendment. But it is a drastic medicine. It opens up a course that is long and full of pitfalls. It will be much better if the Court, under the stimulus of vigorous discussion and a new rising tide of pronounced and reasoned opinion, recognizes the peril of overextending the judicial function and itself switches on to a more parsimonious and temperate course.

Meantime, let every American, including every high court justice in our State capitals as well as in Washington, D.C., hear and ponder the words of Abraham Lincoln, uttered 101 years ago in his first inaugural: "At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that of the policy of the Government, upon vital questions affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made * * * the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned the Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

White House Tour High Spot of Washington Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a most thoughtful letter from one of my constituents, Mrs. Frederick R. May, of Kingston, in which she highly commends the White House Police and tour personnel for the kind and courteous treatment which they extended to her and her family on a White House visit several weeks ago. The May family had a special problem—a youngster in a wheelchair and, as she states in her letter to me, "everyone was so courteous, the guards arranged for special parking, and once in the White House, they arranged for him to go upstairs in the elevator." I am happy to submit Mrs. May's letter for the Congressional Record as, additionally, she makes some very good suggestions for the future consideration and convenience of all visiting Washington who have special problems. The letter follows:

Kingston, Pa., *July 27, 1962.*

Dear Sir: Several weeks ago, I wrote you requesting passes to tour the White House which you graciously arranged. I wanted to tell you how very much we enjoyed the visit. You probably don't remember, but we had a special problem—a youngster in a wheelchair. Everyone was so courteous, the guards arranged for special parking, and once in the White House, they arranged for him to go upstairs in the elevator. The tour was really the high spot of our whole trip, I can't tell you how much we enjoyed it. We toured all the historic shrines and went to the House and Senate and came away with an impression of awe and pride. Washington is such a lovely, clean, well-kept city. We were very proud and delighted to have the opportunity to visit—indeed it should be a must on every American family's vacation.

I read in the paper recently that there is a motion being considered to eliminate architectural bars for handicapped people—if you have anything at all to do with this, please, do what you can. When architects are designing buildings, they never consider the handicapped people of the country—steps are too steep, there are too many steps—doorways aren't wide enough for wheelchairs to pass through or else there are revolving doors which are really impossible—even elevator doors are a problem—we know.

Again, thank you for your kindness, we appreciate it greatly. We are so glad to hear that you are well again and hope you will continue that way.

Sincerely,

Nancy May
(Mrs. Frederick R.)

GOP Offensive for a Better Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the noted colmunist, Roscoe Drummond, continues to perform a great public service in his objective writings on the merits of the two-party system and what can be done to make it more effective in the common interest. He has done a magnificent series on the danger to the American voters in having the committee staffs in Congress so heavily weighted in favor of the majority party. One of his most recent columns, "GOP Offensive for a Better Campaign," is an apprisal he has made of Senater Kenneth Keating's statement on how to elect a Republican Congress. I agree about the value of this document and in order to encourage more Americans to read it, I wish to place in the Record at this point the Roscoe Drummond column which should make every determined candidate and his supporters seek out the Keating blueprint for victory and put it in operation.

The column follows:

GOP Offensive for a Better Campaign

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Not often does a Washington reporter come onto a political document which he feels is constructive, must reading for every voter in the country—Republican, Democratic, Independent, and those who may be tempted to think they aren't going to vote in the fall elections.

Such a document comes from the typewriter of New York State's moderate-conservative Senator Kenneth B. Keating. It is neither a bland promise of a little something for everybody nor a partisan exhortation that all right and all virtue reside on one side.

It is a thoughtful, direct, lucid, meaty statement of what Senator Keating feels ought to be "the new Republican offensive." It sets out more clearly than usual the differences between the two parties.

I am not advocating its wide distribution and reading in order to elect a Republican Congress.

In order to provoke a national debate on the real issues which separate the parties as one method of helping elect the best possible Congress, I hope that the Republican National Committee will blanket the Nation with it. I would hope that the Democratic National Committee would produce its own version of "a new Democratic offensive" so that both sides of the argument can be fully heard.

Since the Keating statement is political, he cannot mail it by Government frank to those who ask for it. Therefore, if you want to read it, the best thing to do is to write the Republican National Chairman, Representative William E. Miller, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C., and ask for it. The new all-Republican conference, recently created under the aegis of General Eisenhower, couldn't do a more useful thing than to find the money to equip every party precinct worker with all the copies they can use.

What are the credentials of the Republican Party? That is the central question Senator Keating raises and, in part, his answer is that:

1. "Republicans have no cleavage on the great concept of equal rights for all citizens."

2. "Republicans support Government thrift to avoid saddling those to come with debt and taxes."

3. "Republicans have shown understanding and know-how in programs of health care, social security, and education." (He points out that the only Republican Congress during the Eisenhower administrations established the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, passed the St. Lawrence Seaway law, brought peace in Korea, extended social security to 10 million persons and unemployment compensation to 4 million.)

4. "Republicans have kept the Nation at peace."

5. "Two-thirds of the tax cuts since 1913 have been granted by Republicans."

I do not suggest that there are not fair arguments in rebuttal; there are. I am not urging a one-sided political debate, but I am urging a better national debate on national issues in order that the Congress which is elected this year will be equipped to transact the national business.

Senator Keating himself makes two valuable suggestions to this end.

He proposes a series of debates between the Democratic and Republican National Chairmen, Representatives Miller and John Bailey, patterned after the Nixon-Kennedy debates in 1960.

He urges that his own party recruit 500 intelligent young men and women, train them in Republican principles and public speaking and then assign them to the States to train in turn new party leaders—this to make up in part for the political manpower the labor unions contribute to the Democratic Party.

These suggestions stake out for the Republican National Committee some useful lines of political activity.

Their special value is that they tend to center attention on the national issues which, as they are better and more fully debated at the local level, will help a more nationally minded Congress.

Deficit Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Pickens Sentinel, Pickens, S.C., August 2. This editorial will be of interest to the Congress.

Never Too Old To Learn

Presidential Economic Adviser Walter W. Heller, who declared 18 months ago that budget deficits in the next 12 to 18 months would stimulate recovery, is not so confident of his crystal ball today. In briefing 100 Democratic candidates for Congress, he was requested to predict an upturn in the stock market, but declined. He thought, he said, it would be "the better part of valor, wisdom, and honesty" not to.

Washington keeps "a dear school" (in the Franklin phrase), but even college professors do learn.

Belated Thanks to Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to commend favorably an article written by David Lawrence and published on June 30 of this year.

For over 11 years ago now, Mr. President, one of the greatest Americans who has ever lived, and one of its greatest soldiers and heroes, has been living in almost complete seclusion without having received, in my estimation, proper recognition by the Congress.

Recently there passed through both Houses a measure calling the attention of the country to the gratitude of both of these bodies to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. David Lawrence has written of it so well that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Belated Act of Gratitude: More Than a Decade Later, Congress Tenders Thanks to General MacArthur

(By David Lawrence)

At last, in American history, a sad chapter of seeming ingratitude has been superseded by an act of gratitude. Congress now has passed a resolution tendering to Gen. Douglas MacArthur the thanks of the Nation for his distinguished military service to the American people.

So far as the official record is concerned, General MacArthur has been listed since 1951 as an officer removed from all command for alleged insubordination. A committee of Congress investigated at the time, but did not come to any formal conclusion, as obviously a Democratic Congress hesitated to censure the impulsive act of a Democratic President who was miffed by something that could have been handled more gracefully.

It happened that General MacArthur answered a letter of inquiry from the Republican leader in the House of Representatives, Joseph W. Martin, of Massachusetts, who had asked the general for his opinion on Far Eastern questions. Military officers can testify freely before congressional committees as long as they do not disclose military secrets. Yet a letter, which amounted to the same thing as testimony on broad policy problems, prompted the punishment that was meted out. The letter, incidentally, was never intended for publication.

General MacArthur had two commands at the time. He was commander of the Allied occupation of Japan, and to this day it is universally agreed he did a wonderful job. He was also commander of the United Nations forces in Korea. Had the American President wished, he could have changed commanders in Korea without disturbing the position of command which General MacArthur held in Japan. Mr. Truman was urged to do so by his own military chiefs in Washington and by some of his Cabinet officers but, apparently still resentful over the letter to former House Speaker Martin, chose to strip General MacArthur of all command and bring him home with a public repudiation.

For 11 years now the distinguished general has lived in retirement. Many of the men who served under him have not forgotten his remarkable acts of personal bravery and skillful command, and have felt that the Nation should be reminded in a formal way of those contributions. It has been a delicate subject to raise because of the old political controversy. But Representative L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat, of South Carolina, never gave up. He succeeded a few years ago in getting a resolution before a committee of Congress but couldn't somehow get it to the floor for action. This time, however, he was successful. Chairman Carl Vinson, of the House Armed Services Committee, and Speaker John McCormack gave permission to have the resolution brought up. It passed unanimously. Mr. Rivers also had the aid of the Democratic majority leader, Representative Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, who had served on General MacArthur's staff during World War II. Senator George Smathers, of Florida, Democrat, brought up the measure in the Senate, where it was also unanimously adopted. The resolution reads as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the thanks and appreciation of the Congress and the American people are hereby tendered to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur in recognition of his outstanding devotion to the American people, his brilliant leadership during and following World War II, and the unsurpassed affection held for him by the people of the Republic of the Philippines which has done so much to strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of that nation and the people of the United States."

In the formal report of the House Armed Services Committee submitted by Representative Rivers to the House, a detailed account of General MacArthur's record was given from the time he graduated from West Point in 1903 at the head of his class. He was the son of Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, who also had a distinguished military career.

This correspondent, along with other newsmen covering the War Department early in 1917, thought Douglas MacArthur, then a major, was one of the most brilliant public relations officers the Government had ever had and expressed professional regret when he suddenly announced that he was applying for oversea duty. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War in the Wilson administration, said to his news conference:

"Watch that young man. He'll be a general soon, and some day he will be Chief of Staff of the Army."

The prophecy came true. Major MacArthur was wounded in the war and, as commander of an infantry brigade, won a string of medals for his bravery in action. Later he did become Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. What he did in liberating the Philippines from the Japanese in 1945, together with his remarkable service in the Korean war, are events recent enough for most people in this country to recall.

It does seem unfortunate, however, that a political incident has caused such a long delay in giving full recognition to a brave man who performed a brilliant service for his country in many command posts. At last the record has been set straight, and, fortunately, this comes during the lifetime of the 82-year-old veteran, who said in his farewell address to Congress in 1951: "Old soldiers never die—they just fade away."

Congress apparently is not willing that in official history the memory of what Douglas MacArthur did for his country should fade away but wants it to remain instead an enduring example of devotion to the Nation's service.

President Kennedy Hails Representative Farbstein's Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article which appeared in the New York Times, Thursday, July 26, 1962. The article, which follows, reports President Kennedy's appreciation of Representative FARBSTEIN's support of his program:

LETTER MAY BE FIRST IN PLEDGE BY PRESIDENT TO HELP THE SUPPORTERS OF PROGRAM

(By Richard P. Hunt)

Representative LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of Manhattan, who is running for reelection, made public yesterday a letter from President Kennedy praising him for his work in Congress.

The letter, dated July 20 and addressed to "Dear Congressman," was the first of its kind to come to light here since the President said on Monday that he was "going to help elect Democrats" who supported his legislative program.

Although the President did not specifically endorse Mr. FARBSTEIN for reelection, he praised the Representative for "clear judgment, wisdom, dedication, and energy." Mr. FARBSTEIN left no doubt that he considered it an endorsement.

BACKED KENNEDY BILLS

Although the Representative has voted consistently for administration bills, he faces a contest for the Democratic nomination in the 19th Congressional District. The winner will run against Richard S. Aldrich, a cousin of Governor Rockefeller, who is unopposed for the Republican nomination.

The letter, written on White House stationery, said:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for sending me a copy of your bill which would provide for a Domestic Peace Corps to aid in combating juvenile delinquency. I shall be watching its progress with interest.

"I would like to take this opportunity, at this point late in the second session, to express my personal appreciation for your sustained support of our legislative program. In the important Foreign Affairs Committee and on the floor, your clear judgment, wisdom, dedication, and energy have significantly furthered our advancement toward our common goal of greater progress at home and the attainment of a peaceful world of free and independent nations.

"With warm regards and best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY."

The 19th Congressional District includes most of the area between the southern tip of Manhattan and 14th Street on the East Side and 86th Street on the West Side.

I hope that Representative FARBSTEIN will be successful in his endeavors. He has been a most loyal supporter of the Kennedy administration and President Kennedy's letter signifies his appreciation.

One Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate an excellent sermon entitled "One Nation Under God," which was delivered by Dr. J. Frank Alexander in the First Presbyterian Church of Charleston, S.C., on July 15, 1962. I have been impressed by these eloquent remarks by an outstanding minister on such an important subject.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that this sermon be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE NATION UNDER GOD

(Sermon written by the Rev. J. Frank Alexander, Ph. D., and delivered in the First (Scots) Presbyterian Church, Charleston, S. C., on Sunday, July 15, 1962)

Text: Psalm 46: 1 "God is our refuge and strength."

On June 14, 1954, Congress approved a bill inserting the phrase "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States. This action was applauded by the American people who recognized the insertion to be in harmony with their personal faith and the religious tradition of our land. The phrase "under God" declared our national trust in almighty God as already expressed on our coins, in the Constitution of the United States, in the constitutions of a number of our States, our national anthem, the openings of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, the U.S. Supreme Court, the State legislatures, the inaugural ceremonies of our Presidents and Governors. There was no objection to the inclusion of the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the American flag, for it was a further expression of our national orientation to Almighty God and of our acknowledged dependence upon Him.

On June 25, 1962, the Supreme Court of the United States by a vote of 6 to 1 declared the recitation of the following prayer unconstitutional in the schools of New York State: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country." Justice Hugo L. Black in his majority opinion states that the prayer prescribed by the State of New York violates that part of the first amendment which reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of a religion." Justice Black goes on to say, "We think that by using its public school system to encourage recitation of the regents prayer the State of New York has adopted a practice wholly inconsistent with the establishment clause." This decision surprised and shocked the American people. The present moderator of the Presbyterian Church, United States, Dr. Edward D. Grant, in a letter addressed to me dated July 6, 1962, says: "Like yourself I am very distressed over the Supreme Court decision. This, it appears to me, is a setback not only to the church and to church people, but to the state. It contradicts our history and I believe the wishes of our American people."

Justice Potter Stewart, the one dissenting judge, states: "The Court today decides that in permitting this brief nondenominational prayer the school board has violated the Constitution of the United States. I think this decision is wrong. With all respect, I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how 'an official religion' is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it. On the contrary, I think that to deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation."

Despite Justice Stewart's dissent, the Supreme Court's decision is that the regents prayer is unconstitutional. We wonder what the decision protends for the future. Some citizens, more optimistic than others, say that the Supreme Court has not outlawed God from the public schools, but has outlawed prescribed prayers; they reason that this is as far as the matter will go and that schools will be free to practice religious exercises in the future as in the past. I would like to think that this is the case, but if the Court is consistent with its June 25, 1962, decision, our national public professions of faith in God are in jeopardy. The words of Justice William O. Douglas foreshadow for me an intention to change many of our national practices which have to do with the recognition of God. In the first paragraph of his opinion he writes: "The point for decision is whether the Government can constitutionally finance a religious exercise. Our system at the Federal and State level is presently honeycombed with such financing. Nevertheless, I think it is unconstitutional whatever form it takes.

I am deeply disturbed by the Court's decision, for I fear that a number of religious customs and references to God will be lost in the course of time in our national life. Today when secularism and materialism are rampant in the world God-fearing people have the responsibility of declaring themselves for something more than "a loaf of bread, a jug of wine, and thou." This is the day when whatever else we may be saying to the world we ought to say "This, our beloved Nation, believes in God, depends upon God, is sustained by God, and exists under God." I believe this to be the sentiment of the vast majority of Americans and I do not believe that they will long tolerate a dictum that will destroy our faith.

I cannot imagine any American citizen, except militant agnostics and atheists, petitioning our courts to strike down any current religious practice of our Federal Government. As for myself, I find great comfort in the fact that we imprint on our coins "In God We Trust" and we confess to the world that our Nation exists "under God." Whether we acknowledge it or not, the awesome fact is that we are a people "under God."

I. WE ARE UNDER GOD'S DIRECTION

From the beginning our Nation had a strong sense of purpose and destiny; the Founding Fathers felt that God had led them, had directed them to establish this Nation. They felt that "unless the Lord build a house they labor in vain to build it." The very first Congress, which wrote the first amendment, provided for chaplains in both Houses and in the armed services.

Our Nation has not only acknowledged God, but has sought His Divine guidance. For the most part our attitude toward God has been "Show me Thy way, O Lord; teach me Thy paths, lead me in Thy truth, and teach me"—Psalm 25: 4–5a. As we look back across the years, we know that God has surely directed us as a people through joy and sorrow, through war and peace, through sunshine and shadow. We are therefore led to confession and prayer:

"Thy love divine has led us in the past,
In this free land by Thee our lot is cast,
Be Thou our ruler, guardian, guide, and stay,
Thy word our law, Thy paths our chosen way."

II. WE ARE UNDER GOD'S GRACE

Americans are born in a land of spiritual freedom and material abundance. We are a privileged people. If Canaan could be called a land flowing with milk and honey, how much more apt it is to call the United States the promised land. We are the temporal possessors of this land, this beauty, this abundance, this liberty. Truly "the lines have fallen unto us in pleasant places." Yet we did not earn these privileges, nor do we deserve them; they are the gift of God to us and we possess them by His grace.

Americans are born in a land which to this day has been protected from invasion in a remarkable manner. Some say that the two great oceans, the Atlantic and Pacific, have insured our safety and protection from the destructive forces of war. Our geographical location has undoubtedly been to our advantage in this regard. But this does not fully account for our good fortune. We believe that right will always ultimately prevail over wrong and that God's cause will finally triumph. We feel that our Nation has in the past fought for freedom against tyranny, for liberty against totalitarianism, for truth against falsehood. Even as we have girded ourselves for battle, we have known that in the final analysis the victory would be determined by God.

Americans are born in a land that claims God's forgiveness. Our national life has much to its credit; it also has much to deplore. We like to dream of our Nation free from avarice, pride, immodesty, and intemperance, yet we know that as a people we have too often fallen short of such an ideal. We acknowledge our need for forgiveness and we claim the forgiveness promised by God: "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness"—I John 1:9.

III. WE ARE UNDER GOD'S INSPIRATION

The Genesis account of creation beautifully describes God's forming man from the dust of the earth and then breathing into him the breath of life so that man became a living soul. Just as God breathed into a physical form and gave life, vitality, drive, purpose, and destiny to man, so God must inspire (breathe into) our Nation His ideal, purpose, and destiny for us. Without this inspiration there is no vision, and "where there is no vision the people perish."

If the American public is to be quickened and alerted to fulfill a worthy role of leadership in the world today, it must come by God's inspiration. I don't believe for a moment that a materialistic philosophy will be strong enough to motivate us to accomplish the colossal task to be done. This is the day of opportunity for Americans to lead the world in friendship, cooperation, righteousness, and reverence.

Many are asking what must we do at this critical juncture when our religious customs as manifested in schools, in Government, and in the Armed Forces appear to be threatened.

First of all, we must take whatever steps are necessary to guarantee the continuation of our religious traditions in Federal and State Governments. I agree with Justice Potter Stewart's decision, especially where he says: "I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle." Nevertheless, the Court has rendered its decision and unless there is a reconsideration we should proceed, I believe, to amend the Constitution so that it will be made crystal clear, both for us and the world, that our religious customs are to be respected and continued.

Second, we need to reinforce private instruction in our religious faith. The teaching of religion in the home is either ignored or deprecated by an alarming number of people. The home, which was the center of the early Christian church, is still a place of rare opportunity to instruct the young and to nourish the old. There is also an unfortunate attitude toward religious instruction offered in church schools. Many parents have a casual attitude as regards their children's attendance for weekly instruction. Too many parents and grandparents send their children to church schools instead of accompanying them there. No adult should ever stop searching, learning, and growing, and no one ever outgrows his need for spiritual food. It behooves all who are concerned about the Supreme Court decision to witness to their faith by attending their church, church school, and maintaining religious instruction in their homes.

In conclusion, let us recall that God works in mysterious ways His wonders to perform. The Court decision which troubles us may serve as the catalyst needed to precipitate the turning to God by the masses of Americans. This whole matter could shake us out of lethargy and indifference and awaken us to the instant claim of God. As we acknowledge Him as our refuge and strength, we pray His will may be done in this, our beloved land.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, delivers a ringing challenge for a spiritual renaissance in the following words: "Throughout the entire earth today, powerful atheistic forces are striving to destroy every form of worship of God. In the Western World, these forces seek to substitute materialism for Christianity and the extent of their progress can be measured in terms of crime and communism—the twin offspring of materialism.

"Do men imbued with spiritual values betray their country? We know they do not, just as we know that children reared in morally sound homes rarely become delinquent.

"What, then, is the answer?

"I believe that the answer lies in a spiritual renaissance—a vigorous, new look at the age-old principles which are the foundation of our civilization and which alone guarantee the dignity of man. The key to such a renaissance is the Bible."

The National Lottery of Bolivia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Bolivia. This lottery is operated solely for the benefit of health and welfare agencies in the country.

In 1961, the gross receipts of the Bolivian lottery came to over $1 million. The profits in that year amounted to over $400,000. This income was not retained by the Government but was distributed to several welfare and charitable organizations. Half of the money went to the Bolivian Red Cross.

Bolivia is not a rich country by any means, and a national lottery offers needed revenues. These moneys are well used. America, with all its affluence, could derive tremendous financial benefits from a lottery. Why are we holding back?

Mr. Speaker, if we could operate a national lottery in the United States we would raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue. This needed income could bring happiness to our overtaxed wage earners.

Mukwonago, Wis., Picnic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record excerpts from an address prepared by me for delivery at the Mukwonago, Wis., picnic, on August 5, 1962.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Friends: The "happy air" of a picnic—wonderful in itself—does not provide an atmosphere in which to easily discuss the great, solemn and sometimes grave, challenges of the times. For you might rather be eating another hotdog; the children might rather be scampering around the playgrounds; and I, too, might rather be slicing another delicious piece of the watermelon.

Even at such a festive time, however, perhaps we justifiably could pause to think of a few of the achievements which make possible our freely picknicking here; some of the wonders around us in our national life and the world; the challenges of the times in which we live.

Through the ingenuity, creativity, imagination and hard work and sweat of a forward-striding people, we: Agriculturally, feed more and more people on less and less land than ever before; industrially, turn out millions of types and kinds of products and goods to provide the best standards of living in the history of humanity; scientifically, too, we are literally "reaching for the stars"—talking and televising through satellites such as Telstar—traveling almost at supersonic speeds in jet planes—rocket-powering manned X-15's upward into space—orbiting the earth—planning trips to the moon, and perhaps ultimately, to the other planets of the universe. On earth, too, we enjoy ever-better homes, food, clothing, schools, cars, and other good things of life.

In such a miraculous age then, our heads, at times, may be in the stars; however, we must "keep our feet on the ground." Why? Despite great benefit—much still unknown—from such progress, there are also serious built-in problems. These must be resolved: If we are to adequately meet the needs of our people; if we are to maintain a strong, forward-striding nation; and if we are to create and preserve peace in the world.

AGRICULTURAL OUTLOOK

First, let us take a look at agriculture. According to the Secretary of Agriculture, we—in the next 20 years—will be feeding 77 million more people on 50 million acres less land than is now in production.

Normally, high efficiency and productivity would—and should—be considered a great national asset—not a liability—as, indeed, for the most part, it is. Unfortunately, however, inadequate consumption, lack of effective distribution channels, and too little effort to utilize farm commodities for commerce—industrial purposes have resulted in:

A national surplus stockpile of about $9 billion worth of farm commodities, including now about 93 million pounds of cheese, 376 million pounds of butter, and 472 million pounds of dry milk.

Too-low returns to farmers for the sale of produce—even though the farmer, himself, has to meet ever-higher taxes and costs of labor, machinery and equipment, and general operations of the farm; and for the future, other serious readjustments in farm life itself.

Now, what can be done?

In Congress, the outlook for miracle-type, problem-solving legislation is extremely dim.

Recently, the House of Representatives passed its version of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

As of now, the Senate bill is still pending.

In general, the Senate Agriculture Committee recommended legislation to create a revised land-use program, including: Permanent agricultural conservation programs on a national basis; assistance to producers under long-term agreements (not to exceed 15 years) to conserve and develop soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreational resources; appropriations would be restricted to $10 million annually. A loan program to State and local public agencies for carrying out more effective land utilization programs; special assistance for Federal participation in installation costs of recreation projects and in land costs for fish, wildlife and other purposes.

The committee also recomended extension of the existing law relating to feed grains; a modified wheat program; revised laws for shipping surplus food abroad; liberalization of farm credit; and expanding research for industrial uses of agricultural products.

The pending bill, then, contains some highly controversial provisions—particularly those relating to extending Federal control.

Consequently, the outcome at this point is unpredictable.

Regrettably, the outlook for price improving legislation for dairying—of major interest to Wisconsin—however, is extremely poor. To the contrary, the existing policies have resulted in (a) greater surpluses, and (b) lower prices. As things stand now, there is little hope for immediate legislative action for improving the dairy farm income—significant, of course, not only to the farmer, but to the whole economy, particularly that depending upon farm buying power.

For the days ahead, we need, then, a more realistic, imaginative and creative effort to improve the outlook in agriculture. Among the proposals I included the following:

1. Expanding rsearch, as I mentioned, for greater industrial-commercial utilization of dairly and other farm commodities.

2. Greater utilization of food, as a strategic weapon in the cold war.

3. Establishment of an Advisory Production Board within the Department of Agriculture—utilizing existing, not hiring new, personnel. The purpose would be to provide better guidance to farmers in long-range production planning.

4. Promoting greater efforts to sell, not just give away—food elsewhere in the world. As of now, about two-thirds of the world is hungry. During World War II, you—the Wisconsin and American farmer—produced food for the people of many nations. Why can't we try this now? The idea would be to explore for contracts—by individuals, organizations, and government—for the sale of food to nations that have an inadequate food supply. Wisconsin, for example, could well supply a whole country with high-quality milk and other dairy products, for 1, 2, 5 or 10 years. Unfortunately, a great many of the food deficient countries are poor. Nevertheless, the available resources could be invested in no better way than providing healthful food for their people.

5. Finally, early completion of the family farm study—now underway by the Department of Agriculture—is essential. The purpose would be to help solve some of the great problems, particularly those confronting the farm family in the years ahead.

MUTUAL FARM-CITY INTERESTS

As a nation, we—after a long time, perhaps too long—are also realizing that farm-city interests are mutual—not conflicting. Realistically, a dynamic, forward-moving economy depends upon: Greater town-farm cooperation on community-wide development projects; stimulating greater industrial growth in both city and rural communities; expanding rural development programs for improving the economic outlook in chronically low-income areas; improvement in rural buying power, of course, affects the growth and development of local villages and towns; and improving town planning, development and administration to better meet the needs of the citizens.

GETTING OUT OF THE RUT

Unfortunately, we, as citizens, farmers, businessmen, professionals, teachers, conservationists, sportsmen: all of us—often get into a rut—adhering to, and practicing, outworn and outmoded ideas.

For this reason, we need, from time to time, to take a new look at ourselves; to reevaluate our progress; to reassess our potential; and to determine whether or not we are best utilizing our citizen and community resources to serve the well-being of our people and promoting progress.

How could this be done? Possibly by:

First. Reestablish the town-meeting-type council—for farm; for city; for farm-city groups and then appoint special community committees to undertake the following action: Study economic problems and trends; reevaluate the pace, and direction, of progress; consider alternative steps for solving problems and getting ahead faster; and encourage local citizens to pool efforts, material, and finances to undertake needed projects.

Second. In attempting to speed up progress, obtain guidance and assistance from the available outside sources, such as: State agencies, educational institutions, bureaus of business research; bureaus of economic research; etc.; the Area Redevelopment Administration of the Department of Commerce; the Small Business Administration; agricultural or conservation programs that may be applicable to local problems; and rural development programs, particularly in developing farm-village projects for mutual benefit.

Third. After determining the needs of the community, and establishing plans to promote progress, there must be efforts to mobilize the people, in spirit and action, as well as resources, for promoting economic and other types of progress.

ECONOMIC ILLITERACY

Historically, free enterprise—the establishing and successful operation of business—has represented a fundamental working principle of action, of progress, of our way of life.

Over the years, however, we have gradually diminished our appreciation of the significance of our economic system to our progress and security.

How then, can we better understand and strengthen free enterprise?

This can, I believe, be done by the following steps:

1. By better educating our citizens, adult, and in school, of the significance and working principles of our economic system.

2. By encouraging more people, not only to understand and appreciate—but also confidently invest in—enterprises, small and large, serving as a hub of economic life for a community.

3. By undertaking renewed efforts to brighten the economic prospects for enterprise, over 95 percent of which fall into the category of small business, such as: by encouraging community support of community development corporations to provide financing for necessary projects; formation of farm, small business and other type pools—to undertake research, tackle production problems too large for single operations, or shoot for higher goals; cooperative efforts to foster new enterprises under the area redevelopment program—now beginning to get underway in Wisconsin and elsewhere; by reawakening our citizens' enterprising spirit, full of faith and confidence, to improve the economic status of existing, and creating new enterprises for a strong, free economy.

The Albany Struggle for Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, I returned from Albany, Ga., and reported my findings to the House. I went to Albany at the request of the Congress of Racial Equality and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. One of the most impressive persons I met in Albany was Dr. William G. Anderson, the leader of the Albany movement. The aims of this movement and the real meaning of the events in Albany were eloquently explained by Dr. Anderson in a "Meet the Press" interview on July 29. Excerpts from this interview were reprinted on August 5, 1962, in the New York Post. I wish to bring these excerpts to the attention of my colleagues with the hope that they will recognize the immense importance of the Albany struggle for liberty:

SOME ANSWERS FROM ALBANY, GA.

(Because Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was jailed in Albany, Ga., shortly before he was to appear on NBC's "Meet the Press" last Sunday, he was replaced by Dr. William G. Anderson, leader of the Albany movement for desegregation. Questioning Dr. Anderson were James A. Wechsler, editor of the Post's editorial page; James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond, Va., News Leader; Edwin Newman, of NBC News, and regular panelist Lawrence E. Spivak. Excerpts from the discussion follow.)

SPIVAK. Dr. Anderson, you have made very little progress toward desegregation in Albany with these demonstrations. Have you accomplished anything at all, in your judgment?

ANDERSON. I think we have accomplished a good deal, not so much materially, but we have accomplished a good deal so far as the individual Negro is concerned. He has a new sense of dignity and respect that heretofore has not been made manifest, and this, I believe, will be the ultimate salvation of the Negro in the South.

SPIVAK. Governor Vandiver of Georgia recently blamed the trouble in Albany on Reverend King and what he called outsiders.

What do you think would happen to your movement if Dr. King went back to Atlanta and the other outsiders left?

Anderson. Well, in the first place we do not consider Dr. King and Dr. Abernathy and the other civil rights fighters who have come into our midst as being outsiders. They are disciples of peace; they are disciples of freedom and liberty and justice, and they go wherever there is a need, and we certainly feel as though there was such a need in the city of Albany.

Spivak. What do you think would happen though, if they left Albany?

Anderson. I think that the Albany nonviolent movement would be further frustrated, because Dr. King and his advocates of nonviolent resistance have kept it on a nonviolent plane.

Spivak. You and the other Negro leaders of Albany keep saying that all you want is negotiation. Is that really so? Is it negotiation you want or are you seeking acceptance of your demands for desegreation?

Anderson. We recognize the fact that complete desegregation cannot occur overnight? There has to be a starting place, and certainly we feel that an opportunity to talk face to face with the city commission concerning the issues would be a reasonable starting place. We seek to desegregrate all of the public facilities in the city of Albany and we feel that this is essential if we are to maintain the democratic status for the United States.

Spivak. The late William Faulkner once said this to the Negroes of the South: "Stop now for a moment. You have shown the southerner what you can do and what you will do if necessary. Give him a space in which to get his breath and assimilate that knowledge." What do you think will happen in Albany if you take that advice now?

Anderson. I think the Negro has been patient long enough. It has been nearly a hundred years since the Emancipation Proclamation. The Negro has been afforded few of the rights guaranteed to him by the Constitution. Why should he wait any longer for these constitutionally guaranteed rights?

Wechsler. There have been many suggestions by your associates and supporters that the Kennedy administration ought to be doing something about the situation in Albany. But could you tell us what in your view the concrete measures are that the administration can take without total and capricious intervention in the affairs of a State?

Anderson. I feel there has been sufficient indication of violation of constitutional law that the President could delegate the responsibility to a member of his Cabinet to go to Albany and investigate firsthand just where constitutional law has been violated. Moreover, I feel the President can make a firm statement himself as regards the matter.

Wechsler. Do you mean to suggest that there has been no investigative apparatus there? It was at least 2 or 3 weeks ago that the President announced that he was notifying the Attorney General to conduct such an investigation at the time Dr. King was imprisoned on a previous occasion. Have you not been conscious of the presence of investigative representatives? Has the FBI not been functioning?

Anderson. The FBI has been present and they have been conducting investigations as directed by the Attorney General, I do believe. However, as a result of their investigations I see nothing concrete that has been done. I have not heard of a report being made to the President and any directed action coming from the President as a result.

Wechsler. How do you explain the conduct of the local law enforcement officials if they feel that they are under the surveillance of the FBI?

Anderson. I believe that the power structure in Albany is more determined now than ever to stop the civil rights movement. It has been demonstrated most vividly that the power structure in Albany, as is demonstrated throughout the South, carries very little respect for constitutional law so far as the application is concerned in the just treatment for Negroes.

Kilpatrick. Let me ask about the events of the past few days. Can you tell us something about the incident Friday afternoon when you and Dr. King and others were arrested?

Anderson. We were immediately in front of the city hall near the curb on the sidewalk. We were standing there in silent prayer with our heads bowed. We were seeking to get an audience with the city commission that had repeatedly and consistently denied us an audience.

Kilpatrick. Didn't they tell you they would give you an audience at the proper time and under the proper circumstances, that sort of response?

Anderson. We feel that the proper time and the proper place should be predicated upon the circumstances which exist. And we certainly feel the circumstances surrounding our necessity to go before city hall and pray were of sufficient moment that they should have called an emergency session.

Kilpatrick. Were you in fact disturbing the peace, blocking the sidewalk?

Anderson. Absolutely not. As a matter of fact we were merely exercising a constitutionally guaranteed right, that to carry our protest to the source.

Kilpatrick. But don't you agree that the right of petition can in some way be regulated as, for example, not to block the sidewalks?

Anderson. I agree with you wholeheartedly. That is why we put forth an effort not to block the sidewalks, not to create any disturbance.

Kilpatrick. You had, in fact, invited the arrest, had you not? Didn't Dr. King want to get back in jail?

Anderson. Well, if exercising a constitutionally guaranteed right was inviting arrest, yes, we invited arrest.

Kilpatrick. But as a matter of showmanship he wanted to get back to jail. Didn't he resent being released from jail earlier this year? So he is there by his own choice.

Anderson. Out of conscience, he is there.

Kilpatrick. And out of showmanship, also.

Anderson. Not showmanship; he has a sincere desire to make the sacrifice in the name of freedom.

Newman. What proportion of the Negro population of Albany would you say is interested in this matter?

Anderson. I would say 100 percent of the Negroes are interested in this civil rights revolt.

Newman. How many are actively interested? How many do anything about it?

Anderson. Well, if you are to judge by the attendance at our mass meetings, there are as many as 2,000 to 3,000 people regularly attending, and if they represent as many families we would say safely as many as 10,000 to 12,000 Negroes are actively participating.

Newman. Among these people what would you say the frame of mind is? For example, is there any inclination in Albany among Negroes to join the Black Muslim movement?

Anderson. Absolutely not. And as long Dr. Martin Luther King and the other advocates of nonviolent resistance stay in Albany there will be no tendency or leaning toward the Black Muslim movement.

Spivak. Suppose the city officials did negotiate with you and came to the conclusion, wrong or right, that they felt your minimum demands were too much and they did not want to grant any of them. Would you stop your demonstrations? Are you really asking for negotiations or are you making demands of desegregatin?

Anderson. We are asking for meaningful negotiations and I think the conditions surrounding the initiation of negotiations would determine whether or not these negotiations would be in good faith and whether they would be sufficient to warrant a cessation of the demonstrations at this time.

Wechsler. Dr. Anderson, would you tell us approximately when you first sought the meetings with the city commission on this point?

Anderson. We sought to meet with the city commission as early as February 1961, before there was any Albany movement, and before there were any "outside agitators."

Wechsler. Have you ever obtained any such meetings in that period?

Anderson. No. As a matter of fact when I first went before the city commission asking for the establishment of a biracial commission to study means of peacefully desegregating public facilities I was told flatly there was no common ground for agreement.

Kilpatrick. Let me ask about some aspects of the nonviolence. The Associated Press reported on July 25 a sullen, jeering crowd of 2,000 Negroes blocked the street Tuesday night following the arrest of 40 demonstrators who had sought to march on city hall. The Negroes hooted, laughed and threw bottles, bricks and rocks. One policeman was struck by a rock and another missile hit a State trooper on the jaw, knocking out two teeth. It isn't altogether nonviolent.

Anderson. So far as the Albany movement itself is concerned, it is nonviolent.

Kilpatrick. Having sown the wind, are you a little surprised to have reaped any sort of whirlwind in return?

Anderson. Well, it is not surprising that there would be an element of violence within a community the size of Albany when there are this many people participating.

Spivak. Dr. Anderson, Governor Rockefeller, in a telegram to the Justice Department yesterday, asked the Federal Government to insure the safety of Dr. King. Is Dr. King in any danger at all? Is he being mistreated or is his life in danger or is this just a political telegram?

Anderson. Dr. King has not been mistreated as an individual, and it may be satisfying to some to know that he is afforded all the forces of the police department in protecting him. But other prisoners have been mistreated. A prisoner was beaten just yesterday. He was beaten very badly in the jail. One of the white persons who was participating in our protest demonstrations was put in a cell with other white prisoners and the police officers allegedly stated when they were placing him in the cell. "Here is a nigger lover." And this provoked the beating of this demonstrator.

The Washington World Presents Comprehensive Report on Committee Staffing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the July 31 edition of the Washington World carried a comprehensive roundup of articles on all phases of the issue of committe staffing in the Congress with the emphasis upon the imbalance which exists between the number of minority and majority staff members.

Those of us who are concerned about this issue and are making an effort to bring about a better balance, are particularly indebted to James R. Galbraith and the World editors for this objective study. The articles in the July 31 edition were carried under these headlines: "Committee Staffs Too Democratic, GOP Says"; "Leaders Loaf, Democrats Laugh at Plight of GOP"; "Constant Harassment Plagues Republicans"; "Resolutions Aim at Cure of Committee Imbalances"; "Republican Life Depends on Adjustment of Committee Staffs, Alger Declares"; "Democrats Fared Fine in 1953–54."

Under unanimous consent I insert all of the articles at this point in the Record:

Committee Staffs Too Democratic, GOP Says: Lack of Partisan Personnel Restricts Republican Efforts, Members Charge

(By James R. Galbraith)

"Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, whilst Congress in its committee rooms is Congress at work."—Woodrow Wilson.

(Note.—Three tables—appearing with the stories on congressional committee staff representation—were prepared by two Members of Congress. Senator Carl T. Curtis, Republican of Nebraska, compiled the Senate committee figures through a committee-by-committee search. Similarly, Representative Fred Schwengel, Republican of Iowa, compiled figures for the House and Joint committees.)

A handful of Republicans are fighting a bitter war in Congress—and openly wondering why nobody seems to care.

Cause for the agitation is simple enough: these Republicans, realizing their party is in a minority in both the House and Senate, believe the GOP is not receiving adequate numbers or aid on professional committee staffs.

This imbalance of congressional committee staffing—the overwhelming number of Democratic experts as opposed to Republican staffers—is viewed by Senator Kenneth Keating, Republican of New York, as the "No 1 issue" facing his party. "Cut off its professional aids and a party can be rendered mute," says Senator Keating.

SENATOR PROUTY ASKS ABOUT ABUSES

Senator Winston Prouty, Republican of Vermont, asks, "If the committee system—the backbone of our operation—is to have ribs (that is, adequate professional staff) on only one side, do we not abuse the greatest body in the world?"

On the House side of Capitol Hill—where the struggle is even more intense—Representative Tom Curtis, Republican of Missouri, declares, "We're playing with loaded dice."

Representative Fred Schwengel, Republican of Iowa, claims Republicans are faced with "an almost impossible and intolerable situation." He's introduced a resolution to provide more minority staff help.

Here's the story on the inside-Congress fight, largely ignored by the Nation's press:

In the House, Representative Schwengel, leading a band of researchers, conducted a committee-by-committee study. He learned that GOP staffmen are outnumbered 461 to 43.

In the Senate, Carl T. Curtis, Republican, of Nebraska, supplied the rundown—462 Democrats to 39 Republicans.

Democrats outnumbered Republicans, 70 to 2, on joint committee staffs, Representative Schwengel learned.

It adds up to a total of 993 Democrats compared to 84 Republicans—more than 10 to 1—despite the much closer proportion of elected Members to both Houses. In the Senate, Democrats hold the edge, 64 to 36. In the House, it's 262 to 174. Yet, the imbalance on committee staffs jumps as high as 35 to 1.

In the House Education and Labor Committee, there are 45 Democratic staffers. Of the two minority employees, one is a secretary and the other is a labor expert. "It means," says committee member Representative Edgar W. Hiestand, Republican, of California, "that the minority must function without an education aid, someone who can help us in preparing for hearings, writing reports and researching the raft of Federal aid-to-education bills swamping our committee."

In the Senate Judiciary Committee, Democratic staffers outnumber Republicans, 146 to 11.

The House Agriculture Committee has only 1 Republican staff aid, compared to 10 for the majority.

The House Ways and Means Committee—the busiest on Capitol Hill with tax, trade and medical care for the aged proposals—has but 4 minority employees while the majority has 17.

The full impact of the imbalance may be seen in the accompanying charts. Republicans, lacking adequate help, are having a tough time presenting their case.

"It's an issue of fairplay," says Representative Curtis, prime mover of the fight for more minority manpower. "I've told my Democratic friends that even if we Republicans gain control in the November elections, I'll still be in their corner. It's important to the Congress. It isn't healthy the way it is now. The minority must have a voice."

Representative Curtis and other Republicans are often faced with writing their own minority reports—and, somewhere in their jam-packed schedules, find the research time required to present a solid minority view. This is a task which should be performed by professional staff members.

As Representative Curtis sees it, the majority-minority imbalance is only one aspect of the problem.

"The major problem is for Congress to hold its head up in conflict with the executive branch," he says. "The Congress must remain independent of the executive. We must have adequate staffs to weigh and appraise executive proposals."

The Missouri Congressman favors better staffs for everybody. On his Ways and Means Committee, Representative Curtis found that not one staff person covers social security or unemployment insurance programs on a full-time basis. It means that technical information must be obtained from the executive branch, "the people who are pleading for the legislation."

Interlocked in the struggle to correct the staff imbalance is the struggle to get the Republican leadership in Congress to take bold action.

"Charlie Halleck in the House and Ev Dirksen in the Senate just won't budge," says one disappointed freshman Republican Congressman. "We can't build a fire under them. We can't correct this horrible staff problem unless the leadership seizes some initiative."

One of the reasons the leadership hasn't grabbed the ball is because of a column by syndicated Columnist Roscoe Drummond, which appeared early last year. In pointing to the staff imbalance, Drummond wrote, "They (the Republicans) are permitting the majority to rule them off the course."

House Minority Leader Halleck was sore. "His first reaction was resentful," one of his aids admitted. "He thought Drummond's article reflected on his (poor) leadership."

Senator Dirksen, too, was upset over the article by Drummond who is the only national reporter who has interested himself in this backstage congressional struggle.

Drummond, writing in a vacuum of media silence, calls the representation problem a scandal of national proportions which goes to the very vitals of our two-party system.

Some Republican Congressmen are becoming keenly disappointed with Leader Halleck. "He apparently just wants to trade Cadillacs rather than come face to face with a serious threat to our party," one Republican said.

Meantime, Representative Curtis and others are whipping up comment. Representative Schwengel and Senator Curtis hope for broad support for their resolutions to allow for more minority staff representation.

All concede that a chance for corrective action this session of Congress looks bleak, but they hope to lay the groundwork for a major revamping when the Congress reshapes itself in January.

Joint committee staffs

	Democrats	*Republicans*
Atomic Energy	20	0
Defense Production	5	0
Disposition of Executive Papers	0	0
Economic	16	1
Internal Revenue Taxation	19	0
Library	0	0
Printing	8	1
Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures	2	0
Total	70	2

Leaders Loaf, Democrats Laugh at Plight of GOP

Just what the leadership's role is in the squabble over adequate minority staff representation on congressional committees has been the center of much comment in the cloakrooms on Capitol Hill.

Republicans anxious to see some changes say the Republican leadership is dragging its feet. And they say the Democrats, obviously elated over a 10 to 1 staff majority, aren't about to make any changes—at least, not without considerable pressure.

Representative Halleck, Republican, of Indiana, House minority leader, prefers to work "behind the scenes." So does the Republican's Senate leader, Everett Dirksen, of Illinois. Other Republicans want them to move to the forefront.

NO EFFORT MADE TO CORRECT IMBALANCE

Representative Halleck says he is not making any general attempts to correct present imbalances. He wants ranking Republican members on committee to effect their own changes.

Senator Dirksen recently took a more direct look-see into the problem. He and Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, Democratic floor leader, have asked the Library of Congress' Legislative Reference Service to compile a listing of majority-minority staffing on Senate committee. They apparently are unwilling to accept Senator Curtis' study, which showed Democrats outnumbering the Republican staffers by 462 to 39. On the Hill, the Library of Congress would like to get off the hook. The issue is becoming sensitive and Library insiders do not want to damage the independent status the Library has retained through changing administrations. The leaders set a deadline on the study for January, which indicates any action is probably months away.

The leaders of the fight for change, however, are unhappy with the leadership's apparent lack of concern. They feel the Republican leadership must step boldly before decisive action is taken. Things are done through channels in Congress and the most important channel is the leadership route.

Former President Eisenhower recognizes this. Here is what he recently wrote to one Republican House Member, who is upset over the party leadership:

"I am very much in sympathy with your hope of securing adequate Republican staff help on congressional committees." Eisenhower added, however, "I suspect that anything constructive to be done in this field would have to be done through the leadership."

Several Republican Congressmen view the issue as going a step beyond simple partisanship. It is both Republican views in general and conservative views in particular that are stunted and shunted by the staff imbalance. Affected, they say, are both Congressmen and all groups or persons who might try to place conservative views before committees.

In the House, where several Congressmen are pressing for swift remedial action, Democrats are reluctant to even admit there is an imbalance.

In what could be called a recent test case, however, Democrats in the Senate turned back a bid by Senator Carl Curtis, Republican, of Nebraska, to provide more minority staffing. Senator Curtis offered an amendment to a money resolution providing that for every 10 employees of Senate investigating committees the minority party would be entitled to 1. After debate, his amendment was rejected by a straight party line vote of 55 to 30.

Senate committee staffs

	Democrats	*Republicans*
Astronautics and Science	11	1
Agriculture and Forestry	6	1
Appropriations	33	3
Armed Services	25	1
Banking and Currency	17	3
Commerce	27	3
District of Columbia	7	1
Finance	5	1
Foreign Affairs	28	0
Government Operations	44	4
Interior and Insular Affairs	17	1
Judiciary	146	11
Labor and Public Welfare	28	4
Post Office and Civil Service	10	1
Public Works	11	2
Rules and Administration	10	1
Small Business	18	0
Aging	19	1
Total	462	39

House committee staffs

	Democrats	*Republicans*
Agriculture	10	1
Appropriations	48	13
Armed Services	15	0
Banking and Currency	12	2
District of Columbia	8	1
Education and Labor	45	2
Foreign Affairs	15	0
Government Operations	46	3
House Administration	4	2
Interior and Insular Affairs	7	2
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	25	0
Judiciary	42	1
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	8	1
Post Office and Civil Service	16	0
Public Works	40	5
Rules	2	1
Science and Astronautics	16	0
Un-American Activities	15	1
Veterans' Affairs	12	2
Ways and Means	17	4
Select—Small Business	18	2
Select—Export Control	4	0
Total	461	43

CONSTANT HARASSMENT PLAGUES REPUBLICANS

Some of the uproar over committee staffing has been precipitated by harassments.

Representative Tom Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, says, "This harassment is continual." He cited the example on the Joint Economic Committee, of which he is a member.

"First, a partisan Democract was hired, who is incompetent and unqualified. After considerable argument, we finally succeeded in getting a minority staffman. But what happened? It took us 2 weeks to get him an office.

"Then, we acquired a secretary and it was a problem of telephones. Furthermore, information has been concealed from the minority personnel."

An example of almost overpowering harassment can be found with the House Education and Labor Committee, chaired by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Democrat, of New York.

Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Republican, of New Jersey, a committee member, says the staff has been enlarged to twice its size a year ago. He adds, "Unfortunately, the increase in the size of the committee staff has not resulted in any additional strength for the benefit of the minority members of the committee."

The Education and Labor Committee has almost 50 employees, with an authorization to spend $633,000. All of the employees, except two, owe their jobs and loyalty to the majority.

Representative Frelinghuysen said Chairman Powell advised the minority that unless long-distance calls were approved in writing by the chief clerk, the calls would be charged to the individual making the call. The chairman also advised the minority that if the chief clerk was not notified, the charges would then be doubled. Copies of wires and cablegrams also must be filed with the majority.

Then, Representative Powell advised the minority that it would have to yield the rooms which it had held since 1949; the swelling majority staff needed more space. Ranking Republican member Carroll Kearns promptly staged a sitdown strike. He won a battle, but not the war.

Representative Powell advised Representative Kearns that a minority clerk would be released. Although protested, one of the minority's two experts then on the payroll was of necessity, not by the desire of the minority, transferred to the majority payroll in lieu of having his services terminated. The Republicans had lost their education staffman on the Education Committee and they haven't been given one yet.

Representative Curtis believes there are nonpartisan or bipartisan staff people, but says much of the trouble is caused by the fact that these people are directed by majority staff directors.

"If a staffman is paid by the majority, it obviously follows that he owes allegiance to the people who provide his pay."

RESOLUTIONS AIM AT CURE OF COMMITTEE IMBALANCES

Representative Fred Schwengel, Republican, of Iowa, is quick to point out that there are some committees that are "truly bipartisan or nonpartisan and where the minority is very well satisfied."

He says it is why he has written into his bill, House Resolution 570, a provision so that those staffs and arrangements would not be altered.

"My resolution proposes that when a minority, by a majority vote of the minority, is dissatisfied they may call for arrangements whereby they will be given 40 percent of the professional staff and 40 percent of the clerical staff," he explained.

Senator Winston L. Prouty, Republican, of Vermont, took a different approach with his Senate Resolution 309. It seeks an expression by the full Senate that the rights of the minority should be fairly recognized.

Following the passage of such precedent-setting resolutions, the Rules and Appropriations Committees—in apportioning funds for staff personnel—would presumably recognize that the minority was entitled to "fair representation."

REPUBLICAN LIFE DEPENDS ON ADJUSTMENT OF COMMITTEE STAFFS, ALGER DECLARES

Representative Bruce Alger, Republican, of Texas, believes that an adjustment in the imbalance of congressional committee staffing is vital to the preservation of the Republican Party.

"If we do not have a loyal opposition providing a viewpoint, we're going to see the demise of the party out of power," he says. "The preservation of the two-party system hinges on the correction of staff imbalance. We can't present a viewpoint without a staff."

Former Speaker of the House, Representative Joe Martin, Republican, of Massachusetts, takes a similar view. He says his support of more minority representation is "not based on partisanship but because I believe it is in the interest of efficient government and would be helpful to the welfare of the country and would improve the standing of Congress."

Representative Martin adds, "Both parties should be adequately prepared to present their views to Congress. The minority should be given an equal chance so that all Members of the House can have available all the facts when they make the decisions.

"The United States is spending huge sums abroad to promote popular government and must not err here at home in failing to spend necessary money to maintain both parties in their work in Congress," Representative Martin says.

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, who served in the House and Senate, says the staff situation "is as dangerous to responsible democratic government as it is a roadblock to effective party representation."

Nixon claims the issue is not partisan at all. "The shoe, after all, may well be on the other foot as early as January 1963," he wrote to Representative Fred Schwengel, Republican, of Iowa, sponsor of a resolution to gain more minority staff help. Nixon said, "The overriding consideration, all political preferences aside, is simply that democratic governmental processes demand an informed and responsible opposition."

Representative Walter L. McVey, Republican, of Kansas, says: "Constructive and honest opposition is a healthy balance preventing one-sided rule and also preventing any tendency toward improprieties; however, this type of opposition is very difficult to maintain in the Congress where the rights of the minority party are not adequately protected in the committees, which are the workshops of this great body."

Representative William E. Miller, chairman of the Republican National Committee, says: "This is a matter of extreme urgency because the condition is so serious it can undermine the very effectiveness and even routine functions of Republican Members of the House. I am sure we all realize that under our two-party system this wide disparity between Republican and Democratic staff operations is not good for the Nation as a whole."

At its recent meeting in Seattle, the national committee unanimously supported the House resolution which would increase minority staff.

DEMOCRATS FARED FINE IN 1953–54

How did the Democrats fare on committee staff representation when Republicans were in control of Congress in 1953–54?

Figures are scattered, but most Congressmen and Senators recall that there was not the imbalance which exists today. In 83d Congress (1953–54), for example, the House Education and Labor Committee had a budget of $50,000 and 10 employees, 2 of whom were assigned to the then minority, the Democrats. Today, that committee has a budget of $633,000 and 17 employees, 2 of whom are assigned to the minority, the Republicans.

The situation of the past, however, is framed in memory.

One Congressman recalls, "When the Republicans had control, they were unbelievably naive. They should have cleaned out the staffs before the Democrats won control again."

Our Crazy Foreign Giveaway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, many words have been used to describe our crazy foreign giveaway program. About the most accurate description is that it be called Operation Rathole. Unfortunately, the damage this program is doing to us as a nation is not being publicized. Few people realize how many billions of dollars of our money has gone down this "rathole." If the people knew they would become more concerned.

No program has demoralized the whole world more than this program. No program has resulted in hardship and disaster to many of our areas as has this program. We have bled our people with taxes to a breaking point. Our industrial growth is dwarfed because of taxes. The rank and file of our people have little left after taxes to eke out a living. We have almost a thousand communities in our Nation called depressed areas while the money in taxes from these communities builds industry in foreign lands. We have over 5 million unemployed in our Nation while our jobs are being transferred overseas to people who burn down our embassies and spit at our Nation's leaders and call us vile names.

Even the Communists get their share of billions of these dollars while our own people are taxed to death. Just about one-fourth of our billions under this program winds up in Communists' hands. Yet, we are spending almost $50 billion to defend ourselves against communism. When one really knows how the foreign aid program works, you wonder if we are really trying to help the Communists or stop them.

Do you want to take over a country for the Communists? If you do, just apply for foreign aid. Castro did it that way. The money and guns he used to take over Cuba he got from our foreign giveaway program. He got far more than he needed. We paid the cost of the Communist take over in Cuba.

Do you want to serve Khrushchev in the United Nations, among the neutrals, and all over the world? If you do, apply for foreign aid. Tito did and still does just that. He got over $3 billion from our foreign giveaway program. Whenever Khrushchev needs a friend, Tito always speaks up for him, be it the Hungarian massacre or excusing Khrushchev for violating the nuclear testing moratorium.

Do you want to buy a wife or several wives? If you do, move to Africa and apply for foreign aid. To soothe the leaders our foreign-aid money has actually been used for that purpose.

Do you want air-conditioned Cadillacs for your harem? If you do, move to the Middle East and apply for foreign aid. This has happened in nations receiving money from our foreign giveaway program.

Do you want to stash away millions in a Swiss bank so that you can be secure for the rest of your life? If you do, move to South America, take over a country and apply for foreign aid. Even if you last a few days as ruler, from our foreign aid program you can stash away millions in a Swiss bank under a number so that no one will ever find out. About half the money we gave South America under this crazy program has wound up in a Swiss bank.

Do you want to sleep in an $18,000 gold-plated bed? If you do, move to Africa and apply for foreign aid. This has happened in one of the new African nations, now friendly with Khrushchev. There is no limit to the demoralization that this foreign giveaway program has inspired.

Do you want to buy $700 million of jet planes from Russia? If you do, go to India and apply for foreign aid. Nehru is getting more than $800 million in the current foreign aid program. At the same time he is negotiating the purchase of $700 million of jetplanes from Russia. This way our money winds up in Khrushchev's hands so that he can get bigger and stronger and make us dance to his music.

Do you want to go to the United Nations and ridicule and insult the United States? Then move to Cuba, Yugoslavia, or any Communist nation and our country will foot the bill. Yes, our Nation has paid the delinquent dues of many Communists nations. We even paid the expenses of Castro's chickens—human and fowl—at that sorry exhibition when he and Khrushchev embraced each other.

I could go on but what's the use. I shall merely point out how we have drained our people of money for a program of the biggest giveaway of all times. Maybe this will help awaken the conscience of our people when they learn the extent of this waste of money.

As a nation, our growth industrially and economically is behind that of every industrial nation on earth. We are way on the bottom in this respect. Even little countries like Denmark and Belgium have surpassed our annual growth. How can we grow when taxes drain our gold and earnings so that there is nothing left to grow with? No wonder we have 5 million unemployed and almost a thousand depressed communities. Our Government has spent 10 times more for industrial development and jobs in foreign lands than it has spent at home for the past 16 years.

We are only 5 percent of the population of the world. Yet we try to carry the whole world on our backs. Our Government owes twice as much as all the nations of the world put together. Yet the giveaway goes on and on.

SUMMARY OF U.S. GIVEAWAY

In order that the people might know here is a list of the biggest and grandest giveaway in the entire history of all mankind:

TOTAL MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND NONMUTUAL SECURITY

Afghanistan, $275,600,000; Argentina, $1,027,300,000; Austria, $1,618,300,000.

Belgium-Luxembourg $2,166,700,000; Berlin $143,900,000; Bolivia, $286,400,000; Brazil, $3,193,400,000; British-Guiana, $2,600,000; British Honduras, $2,600,000; Burma, $138,900,000.

Cambodia, $298,000,000; Cameroon, $2,400,000; CENTO, $25,000,000; Ceylon, $124,100,000; Chad, $100,000; Chile $904,700,000; China (Republic of), $4,789,600,000; Columbia, $576,100,000; Congo (Brazzaville), $100,000; Congo (Léopoldville), $24,100,000; Costa Rica, $136,700,000; Cuba, $90,500,000; Cyprus, $19,000,000.

Dahomey, $4,200,000; Denmark, $887,400,000; Dominican Republic, $9,400,000.

Ecuador, $139,000,000; El Salvador, $23,400,000; Ethiopia, $228,400,000; France, $11,397,300,000.

Gabon, $100,000; Germany $7,576,900,000; Ghana, $28,700,000; Greece, $3,943,200,000; Guatemala, $207,900,000; Guinea, $5,700,000.

Haiti, $127,700,000; Honduras, $54,300,000.

Iceland, $78,800,000; India, $5,208,300,000; Indochina, $1,535,200,000; Indonesia, $976,100,000; Iraq, $69,900,000; Iran, $1,340,700,000; Ireland, $146,200,000; Israel, $1,211,400,000; Italy, $7,466,800,000; Ivory Coast, $2,100,000.

Jamaica, $11,200,000; Japan, $6,146,800,000; Jordan, $349,500,000.

Kenya $9,500,000; Korea, $6,143 million.

Laos, $372,700,000; Lebanon, $110,500,000; Liberia, $199,200,000; Libya, $243,600,000.

Malagasy, $500,000; Malaya, $24,400,000; Mali, Republic of, $3,100,000; Mauritania, $1,700,000; Mexico, $1,246,500,000; Morocco, $395,500,000.

Nepal, $64,800,000; Netherlands, $2,687,400,000; Nicaragua, $98,400,000; Niger, $2 million; Nigeria, $19,800,000; Norway, $1,159,700,000.

Other British territories, $1,110,000; other French possessions $6 million; other Portuguese possessions, $25,300,000.

Pakistan, $1,982,100,000; Panama, $121,100,000; Paraguay, $68,600,000; Peru, $630,600,000; Philippines, $2,683,700,000; Poland, $967,900,000; Portugal, $436,800,000.

Regional African countries, $22,300,000; regional European, $2,641,500,000; regional Far East, $427,800,000; regional Latin American, $240,500,000; regional south Asia, $773,500,000; Rhodesia and Nyasaland, $55,700,000.

Saudi Arabia, $65,800,000; Senegal, $3,600,000; Sierra Leone, $1,300,000; Somali Republic, $13,400,000; Soviet Union, $500 million; Spain $2,195,600,000; Sudan, $51,200,000; Surinam, $3,400,000; Sweden, $110 million; Syria, $100 million.

Tanganyika, $6,300,000; Thailand, $676,800,000; Togo, $2,700,000; Tunisia, $372 million; Turkey, $3,741,400,000.

Uganda, $1,200,000; United Arab Republic, $684,300,000; United Kingdom, $12,528,300,000; Upper Volta, $2 million; Uruguay, $120,400,000.

Venezuela, $333,600,000; Vietnam, $2,214,200,000.

West Indies, $12,600,000.

Yemen, $25,900,000; Yugoslavia, $3,290,300,000.

Total $121,400,000,000.

And there is $8 billion in the pipeline now being dished out which brings the giveaway close to $130 billion. Even the Soviet Union has not been neglected since 1946 in this greatest giveaway of all time. Note this is after the war since 1946. But remember we gave Russia $13 billion during the war on which she has not paid back one dime. There is $13 billion due us on loans we made during World War I and World War II. Russia will not even sit down and talk about the money due.

UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTES TO WORLD BANKS

Besides our crazy giveaway program, to play the part of a real Santa Claus, the United States has participated in the establishment of seven world banks. By a world bank is meant that the United States puts in the money and the other countries and the people of other countries can borrow. In other words we put the money and the others borrow from it.

To give an idea of the extent of U.S. money involved in the seven world banks, here is the list in order that the people might know.

U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO WORLD BANKS

	U.S. contribution
Export-Import Bank	$1,000,000,000
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	635,000,000
International Monetary Fund	4,125,000,000
International Finance Corporation	35,168,000
International Development Association	320,300,000
Inter-American Development Bank	450,000,000
Inter-American Social Progress Fund	394,000,000
Total	6,959,468,000

By way of summary, since 1946, the end of World War II, the United States of America has given away more than $137 billion. If it were not for our building up Communist Russia the way we have, this amount would pay all the expenses of the U.S. Government for almost 5 years. We have spent on an average of $23,500,000 per day for our foreign giveaway program. Every day that has passed since 1946, $23,500,000 of our money has gone into "Operation Rathole."

I NEVER VOTED FOR THIS GIVEAWAY PROGRAM

The people should also know that I have been one of the very few Members of Congress who has never voted for this greatest and grandest giveaway of all time. In fact, if it hadn't been for a strong minority including myself, this program would have cost the taxpayers an additional $20 billion. This is the amount of money that I and a strong minority in Congress have saved the taxpayers of America. By our constant exposure of the waste in this program, this strong minority including myself has been able to cut the requests for our foreign aid applicants. The bright spot is that the people back home must be awakening because just a few weeks ago there were 169 votes against this grandest giveaway. This is a far cry from 18 Congressmen, including myself, who voted against it from 1946 to 1950.

I predict that if the American people learn the facts, this waste of taxpayers money will be ended in the next session of Congress. It's up to the people—they alone can end it. Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev said, "The United States will spend itself into destruction. We will make them pay our bills." Look at the 1,000 depressed communities in our land and it makes one shudder.

CAN WE AFFORD IT?

We can afford it. As explained above, half the problem can be solved by an honest tax-reduction program. One-fourth can be solved by increasing social security and retirement benefits. More can be solved by increasing the limits the retired can earn. The balance can be solved by the State buying nonprofit or private insurance for the aged as is done in Colorado for those who cannot afford it. No one in our Nation should be a pauper or give up his last possession such as house and self-respect to get medicare.

With loss of tax revenue from tax deduction and Federal grants to States, it will total about one and a half billion dollars ($1,500,000,000). I say deduct this one and a half billion from our crazy foreign aid giveaway program. We cannot afford not to do it. If we do this, the actual cost to the taxpayers will be nothing. It will be spent for the good of our own people—not our enemies.

Israel: Bulwark of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the State of Israel stands out as a shining bulwark of enlightened democracy in the Near East and the one great hope of advancing the future development of this entire area.

Contrast this with Egypt and its President Gamal Abdul Nasser. The people of Egypt today still lie under the throes of economic chaos and misery and the United Arab Republic is struggling to lift itself from a background of poverty and disease that has kept its people living in almost medieval squalor.

We have poured countless millions of dollars into Nasser's Egypt with the hope of aiding his stricken people but most of these funds have gone to develop his military dictatorship. Egypt as the so-called leader of the Arab nations in the Near East area has refused to recognize the existence of the State of Israel and it, along with its other allies, maintain a state of war with this tiny nation. Nasser's latest outburst comes in connection with the announcement that his country now has rocket power to attack the State of Israel.

It seems to me that General Nassar would do well to recognize the facts of life in his region, particularly since in his last attempt to overwhelm the State of Israel, he suffered a crushing defeat. It further seems to me that our State Department would do well to take a good long look at its entire Near Eastern policy, particularly as it concerns our dealing with Mr. Nasser and do all that they can not only to bring about a much-needed peaceful settlement in the Near East but to see to it that the American millions that are poured into Nasser's Egypt are used for the proper purposes.

Israel exists and is here to stay. The sooner Mr. Nasser and his allies recognize this fact the sooner we will finally have peaceful settlement in the Near East and the full benefit of Israel's knowledge and abilities can then be made available to its neighbors for the proper development of this area. Under leave to extend my remarks I include a recent editorial from the New York Journal-American which story points up the remarks I have made.

WHERE AID GOES

Egypt's President Nasser has rattled some new rockets and again indicated he plans—some day—to march on Israel.

Hundreds of millions in U.S. aid have gone to Egypt in recent years and more is on the way. Nasser's latest outburst shows where he spent a lot of it.

This should emphasize, even to the State Department, the fallacy and moral bankruptcy of aiding a government like Nasser's. American policy is apparently dedicated to maintaining peace in the Middle East, yet we continue to assist a dictator who openly proclaims he seeks war.

Nasser bragged his rockets can reach to "just south of Beirut," meaning in Israel. In our opinion he's asking for trouble. He got it once in 1948 and again in 1956, when on both occasions the tough Israelis inflicted a humiliating rout on the Egyptian Army. Nasser could find himself up the Nile without a rocket.

Israel has repeatedly urged the Arabs to sit down and negotiate a settlement, but Nasser, Inc., has vowed some vague day to invade Israel in a war of extermination.

Nasser is not rattling his rockets for defense. He is doing so for aggression—as he openly boasts. When will the State Department realize it cannot buy good will from such a character?

One Hundred and Seventy-second Anniversary of U.S. Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on August 4, the U.S. Coast Guard observed its 172d anniversary. In 1790, President George Washington, following approval of a bill by Congress, authorized the construction of "10 boats" to guard the coast against smugglers. Since then, the Coast Guard has grown to 30,000 officers and men, and now comprises a worldwide military service.

To these officers and men—from Wisconsin and across the Nation—and to the great traditions of the Coast Guard, the Nation extends a warm "happy birthday" in gratitude for outstanding performance of unique services.

Recently, the Superior Telegram published an article on the Guard's 172d birthday. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Superior (Wis.) Evening Telegram, July 31, 1962]

U.S. COAST GUARD TO NOTE 172D BIRTHDAY

On Saturday, the U.S. Coast Guard will mark its 172d anniversary as the oldest of the Nation's seagoing armed forces. The Coast Guard, now a worldwide military service with some 30,000 officers and men, was born August 4, 1790, after Congress passed and President George Washington signed a bill authorizing the construction of 10 boats to guard the coast against smugglers.

The Coast Guard received its present famous name in 1915. Prior to that time, this service was known as the Revenue Marine and the Revenue Cutter Service. Despite name changes, the Coast Guard has kept its identity as an organization, and in point of continuous service is considered the oldest of the Nation's seagoing armed forces.

Search and rescue, law enforcement, and military readiness are the primary activities of the modern-day Coast Guard. This service, smallest of the armed forces, is recognized as the world's foremost search and rescue agency. The Coast Guard as a part of the U.S. Treasury Department is the only armed force that has the authority to enforce all Federal laws. In reality, the Coast Guard is the Nation's seagoing police force. Coastguardsmen at all times maintain a state of military readiness. In time of war, or at the direction of the President, the Coast Guard becomes an integral part of the U.S. Navy. During World War II some 170,000 coastguardsmen served their country.

Today many persons are unaware of the many complex duties of the Coast Guard. Many realize that this service operates various lifeboat stations throughout the country ready to assist merchant seamen and pleaseur-boat men in distress. But few are aware that the Coast Guard operates some of the biggest icebreakers in the world, that the Coast Guard has charge of the various navigation aids and lighthouses maintained by the United States. Most persons are grossly unaware that the Coast Guard is a worldwide service. The 30,000 coastguardsmen are stretched from stations in Korea and Japan, across the Pacific Ocean, throughout the United States, across the Atlantic Ocean, and even into the Mediterranean. Various patrols are sent to the Arctic and the Antarctic. Yet, this worldwide service would be unable to completely fill the seats at the Milwaukee County Stadium.

Other activities of the Coast Guard include port security, merchant marine inspections, ocean, weather, and ice patrols, and loran navigation systems used by the Armed Forces and maritime and air commerce of the United States.

Persons interested in the history of the Coast Guard are invited to write for a free 32-page public information booklet. Copies of the booklet may be obtained by writing Coast Guard History, in care of U.S. Coast Guard, 777 North Plankinton Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

Scotland's John Paul Jones Made Naval History—Became Hero of American Revolution

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article by Anthony Cama of Lynn, Mass., in my congressional district, which appeared in the Lynn Sunday Post on July 29, 1962:

SCOTLAND'S JOHN PAUL JONES MADE NAVAL HISTORY—BECAME HERO OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

(By Anthony Cama)

(This is another of a series of patriotic articles which have been appearing in the pages of the duty-conscious Lynn Sunday Post. This writer has the solemn responsibility constantly to present to the younger generation of this most unique Nation of ours facts about great men of the past who courageously and unselfishly gave of their lives, health, and possessions to bring freedom to a young, virile, liberty-loving land.)

John Paul Jones, a Revolutionary War hero, was born July 6, 1747, in the parish of Kirkbean, stewartry of Kirkcudbright, Scotland, on the estate of Arbigland, belonging to Robert Craik, a prominent Member of Parliament. His mother was the child of a Highlander, and his father worked as a landscape gardener in Craik's household.

At the age of 12, when most American boys are still going to school and enjoying the fun of sports and TV, John was apprenticed to a shipmaster and taken away to Virginia. From that day on Jones seemed to be a part of the very ocean waves which sang him to sleep or whipped his rugged growing body into a frame of lean muscles and unflinching nerves. He was a third mate on a slaveship, making two profitable but disgusting trips between Jamaica and the Guinea coastal areas of Africa.

BOUGHT OWN SHIP

But he soon became sick of the revolting trade in human lives and took passage aboard the *John* to return to England. On the trip both the captain and first mate died of fever, Jones took over command of the vessel and brought it safely to its destined port. For this splendid act the owners made him master and supercargo. After two voyages to Tobago he purchased a ship, the *Betsy*. He had much trouble with the crew and, when they mutinied, managed to survive and be victorious by killing the ringleader in a battle. Then, according to history, Jones vanished from the island and finally appeared in Philadelphia, holding in his possession a commission as a senior lieutenant in the new Continental Navy.

It is said that in Virginia he met the influential Joseph Hewes, a member of the Marine Committee of Congress, who, overwhelmed by Jones' nautical skill and courageous reputation, procured for him his Navy commission in 1775.

CANNY ABILITY

The first assignment for Jones was to arm and man the ship *Alfred*, which he commanded in an expedition under the able Commander Hopkins. This naval force attacked New Providence in the Bahama Islands, and here Jones' canny familiarity with the waters and reefs thereabout proved to be a major reason for the success of the attack. This dauntless man of Scotland was to prove a most audacious and valiant navigator and seafighter.

In May, 1776, Jones received command of the *Providence*, handling his responsible convoy duty with great nautical skill to bring supplies to the defense of the battle area of New York. After this tour of duty he was given his captain's commission and allowed to sail on his own initiative between Bermuda and Nova Scotia, attacking any worthwhile craft. In 48 days of seeking and searching with the *Providence*, six brigantines, one ship, and one sloop were taken, and six schooners, one ship, and one brigantine destroyed. This was an amazing feat by the redoubtable Scot.

MASSES OF ICE

Again, in November, this amazing man sailed for Newfoundland in the *Alfred*, overcoming obstacles of ice and fog. One of his unhappy periods was the failure to release Americans imprisoned on the Isle Royale. Time and time again he was forced to retreat from the crushing, slashing masses of floating ice.

In anger and frustration he sailed aggressively in those waters, burning fish warehouses along the Arcadian coast and overpowering four important enemy transports, one of which was loaded with valuable clothing, and supplies for Burgoyne's army. On the way home he charged directly at a 16-gun privateer out of Liverpool and captured it with minimum losses to his crew. Out of Boston Harbor he was in great danger from the British frigate *Milford* but in the rapidly descending darkness lured her away from his string of prizes and then very cleverly outsailed her.

Jones was given a wonderful welcome and reception by the American people for these deeds of courage and distinction, but this was dampened by the pathetic attempt of Congress to apportion Navy commanders for each colony. In the shuffling about of the names Jones found himself 18th and on the lower end of the list.

"BON HOMME RICHARD"

Finally, after many political maneuvers, he was given command of the *Ranger*, which he altered into a fast ship. On November 1, 1777, he sailed for France with dispatches for the American commissioners, announcing the surrender of Burgoyne. In France he was stymied for months, since France was not yet ready to make a clean break with Britain.

At last, the great diplomat and patriot, Benjamin Franklin, procured for him the command of an old French ship, which Jones rehabilitated and named *"Bon Homme Richard"* in honor of the author of "Poor Richard's Almanac." On the way back to France later a large fleet of British merchantmen was discovered, escorted by the powerfully armed *Serapis* and the sloop *Countess of Scarborough*. The *Alliance* deserted, abandoning the fuming Jones to what appeared to be a sure trap of destruction. It was a clear night, with a brilliant moon illuminating the ocean and the vessels so clearly that men could be counted in the crow's nests.

TOOK "SERAPIS"

For three hours and a half the thunderous roar of guns shook the ocean waves September 23, 1779. Flashes spit out serpent tongues of flame through the night. Here more than ever this magnificient Scot, a Hercules of the sea, showed his superior fighting ability, for the desperate battle soon ended with the English commander asking for quarter. The *Bon Homme Richard* was so severely damaged and gutted that she sank the next day. Jones and his men took the *Serapis* and brought it to France, where the French nation went wild with acclaim and festive receptions.

Jones was brought to the court of Louis XVI, who made him a chevalier of France and gave him a gold sword. In 1787 he returned to America and was cheered and honored by Congress, where he also received a gold medal in recognition of his distinguished service.

In 1781, upon request of Catherine the Great and upon the advice of Jefferson, he went to Russia to help that powerful queen build a stronger and more modern navy. He was made an admiral and fought victorious sea battles in the Black Sea against the Turks. Credit for these victories were taken by his subordinates, who sent in false reports. Soon jealous officers managed to have him transferred out of that area by maliciously assailing his character and private life.

BODY BROUGHT HERE

He returned to France, disappointed and in ill health. On July 19, 1792, at the age of 45, the splendid, unforgettable Scotsman died. He was buried in the St. Louis Cemetery for foreign Protestants in Paris and was forgotten until Ambassador Porter in 1905 instituted a systematic search for the body. It was found, and, when identified beyond any doubt, a fleet of U.S. warships escorted it home with great ceremonial pomp. In 1913 it was placed in a crypt of the beautiful Navy chapel at Annapolis in belated recognition of this Scot's invaluable services for the preservation of liberty and freedom in his beloved adopted land.

This is the story to remember of a young lad from Scotland, who, in his unswerving love of human dignity and human rights, fought constantly against the titanic might of the British Navy. He made great sacrifices of personal gain and aggrandizement and finally gave his very health and life that this glorious land of ours could be preserved and endure as the inviolate shelter of all the hungry, hopeful, courageous peoples languishing under the despotism of the Old World.

Welcome to Jamaica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we citizens of the United States welcome our new sister republic Jamaica, which becomes our newest Western Hemisphere nation today.

Best wishes to Jamaica and her fine people for peace and progress. I hope for continued friendship and mutual good will with our people of the United States. Three cheers for Jamaica.

I include the following article from the Washington Star of August 6, 1962:

JAMAICA BECOMES NATION

Jamaica became the newest nation of the Western Hemisphere today to the thunderous cheers of Jamaicans in a ceremony watched by Princess Margaret and Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The petite princess, in dazzling icy white gown and tiara, was solemn as Britain's Union Jack came fluttering down and another of the empire's colonies broke away.

As 25,000 stood in National Stadium, massed bands played "God Save the Queen," a reminder that this calypso island remains a member of the British Commonwealth after 307 years of British rule.

Jamaica's gold, green, and black standard was run up.

EMOTIONAL MOMENTS

These were emotional moments for Britons who long had lived on this Caribbean Island. The Jamaica Regiment's tattered banner was lowered in royal salute to Princess Margaret.

Massed Commonwealth military units were drawn up on the grass infield of the stadium.

The Princess seemed to sense the feelings of her fellow countrymen. When the massed bands began playing, she arose and slowly moved over to her husband, Lord Snowden, who was standing on the platform several chairs away. She stared straight ahead.

This is a national holiday and no work is being done, but tomorrow the 50-member Parliament meets for the first time to begin the work of an independent nation.

Mr. JOHNSON, who was accompanied here by his wife, told cheering Jamaicans yesterday afternoon President Kennedy had sent him "because of friendship which will grow and prosper with our independence." Earlier he announced a $75,000 U.S. Government scholarship fund had been set up for Jamaican students.

UNION LEADERS CHEERED

The crowd also cheered when William C. Daugherty, vice president of the AFL–CIO, told them the labor movement pays no attention to the color of a man's skin. It also reacted enthusiastically when Serafino Romualdi, special envoy of the AFL–CIO, said the union would press for quota-free immigration from Jamaica to the United States.

Jamaica has long had a wide degree of autonomy, except over international relations and defense. Now it will assume these responsibilities.

Its government is headed by 6-foot-2 Sir William Alexander Bustamante, 78-year-old veteran of island politics, who became Prime Minister after an upset election victory last spring over his cousin, Norman Manley.

Sir William has proclaimed his new nation to be pro-American, Christian, and anti-Communist, and hopes to gain entry into the Organization of American States as well as the United Nations.

Insight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, as the Members are aware, California has the most productive agriculture in the United States and the most informed and alert farm organizations. One of these is the Council of California Growers, which has recently undertaken the publication of a report called Insight, which comments on various aspects of California agriculture. One of such reports is dated July 10, 1962, and deals with five myths relating to agriculture. I submit this worthy document for the consideration of the membership.

The article follows:

INSIGHT

SAN FRANCISCO.—What city dwellers think about the people who grow their foods and fibers has been the object of continuing research by the Council of California Growers.

Today, the Council listed five major "myths" revealed in a statewide opinion survey, and compared them with facts developed independently and by such organizations as Stanford Research Institute and the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics at the University of California, Berkeley.

Myth No. 1: That agriculture no longer is an important part of the State's economy.

Fact: California farmers last year produced $3.2 billion in new wealth—greater than the value of all gold mined in California since 1849—and bought $2.2 billion worth of manufactured products and services. The added value generated by the processing, transporting, distributing, and selling of California's farm products last year is estimated by the Giannini Foundation at well above $10 billion.

Myth No. 2: That all California farmers are subsidized.

Fact: More than 95 percent of the 200 or more crops grown commercially in California receive no subsidy at all. Subsidies represented only 2.2 percent of the $3.2 gross value of California farm production in 1961.

Myth No. 3. That large, corporate farming is replacing the family-type farm and that bigness is bad.

Fact: California farms are growing larger, but at a slower rate than throughout the Nation. Average size farm in California grew from 250 acres in 1920 to 371 acres in 1959, according to the U.S. Census of Agriculture. Census also shows family operated farms remain at about the same ratio as 50 years ago—roughly 97 percent.

Since farm sizes are determined by many factors, including the nature of the crops grown and the degree of mechanization required by the various crops, there is bound to be a wide variety in farm sizes throughout the State. As a consequence, farms—like other business—often must increase in size because of economic necessity.

Farm costs are up, prices paid for farm products are down. To keep ahead of this cost-price squeeze, farmers have been forced to increase unit production with larger acreages.

Myth No. 4: That farmers employ national farmworkers to drive down wages for citizen workers.

Fact: Farm wages in California, highest in the Nation, have continued to rise despite the hiring of supplemental Mexican workers for peak harvest times. Under terms of Public Law 78, Mexican workers must be paid the same wages as one paid domestic workers for similar tasks. Farmers, furthermore, are not permitted to hire nationals unless there is a shortage of domestic workers—a determination made by the California Department of Employment and reaffirmed by the U.S. Department of Labor. And a farm employer is required, by law, to hire a domestic worker at any time Mexican nations are on the job—even if it means replacing a national.

Myth No. 5: That farmers are responsible for the high cost of food.

Fact: Average family's annual food bill in 1949 was $769; in 1959 it was $1,010. But the farmer's added share was only $3. Farmer's share of the retail food dollar in 1961 was 38 cents, compared with 41 cents in 1955. In relation to earnings, Americans today spend 20 percent of their disposable income on food, compared with 26 percent 12 years ago.

Concluding, the council pointed out that farmers are responsible for thousands upon thousands of jobs for city people—in food processing, handling and selling; in transporting the raw and finished products of the farm; in manufacturing the hundreds of items used on the farm, such as petroleum and tires; and in providing numerous services for agriculture.

"It is abundantly evident that the interests of farmers and city dwellers are joined at many places," said Council President Keith Mets. "Therefore, we believe it is important that mutual understanding is maintained. To that end, the council will continue to perform its educational work."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of August 4, 1962:

The Republic Within a Democracy

(Washington Report, by Congressman Bruce Alger of Texas)

A Republic is representative govrenment, wherein at all levels the people (the components of the democracy) are represented by elected officials—the Republic in action. Elected officials must exercise their judgment based on the facts as they see them and then subject their decisions and the facts as they know them to the electorate for acceptance or rejection—every 2 years for House Members and 6 years for the Senate. Naturally, the Representatives are expected to be knowledgeable. To the extent their knowledge exceeds the knowledge of the electorate collectively the Representatives at any time on any issue may seem to be out of step. At that point, they must explain satisfactorily their conduct. So the element of choice is present always in each of these (1) to get the facts, (2) to act judiciously, (3) to explain. The danger (and politics encourages such weakness) is to take the easy way: (1) be loose with (not be bound by) facts, (2) act expediently and politically, (3) dodge or curtail explanation. The question unanswered—at least satisfactorily by our generation—will elected officials pursue courses not politically popular even though facts and moral rightness dictate the proper course? As a result deficit financing, debt, and staggering taxes have grown, wartime programs have not been terminated, and politically expedient (not commonsense) programs have been the rule. Without study and self-discipline by elected officials and constituents representative government will fail. Is this to be our course? I say not, but I cannot now prove when or how we'll take the right course to prevent it. In my own case, I make every endeavor to relate my conduct and votes to facts, use my best judgment, and do my best to report to the people of Dallas by newsletter, radio, and television, beyond the normal correspondence in soliciting of views and answering inquiries. The time is ripe for constituents throughout the United States to subject our Government (the body politic) to scrutiny, to determine how the Republic is functioning, just as we submit our physical body to the doctor for examination to restore good health, or our car to a trained mechanic for a tuneup.

The independent offices appropriations bill 1963 passed overwhelmingly (Alger against). This bill involved appropriations totaling $11,501 million for 26 executive agenceis and is approximately $2 billion more than appropriations for similar purposes last year, which is approximately $1 billion less than the President asked in the budget. (Note: Increased expenditures over last year but reduced expenditures below the budget request permit any Member of Congress to be for increased spending or reduced spending while voting for the bill). For my part, I disapprove the increase in size of the Federal Government which has averaged 6,500 people per month since President Kennedy came into office. Also the bill contained $155 million for 33 new public buildings, which, as I see it, is downright immoral in a period of deficit financing. Funds for the Dallas Federal Building are lacking in the bill. This is a glaring omission from any listing of new Federal buildings and makes it obvious that some projects have been included for reasons other than meritorious. Some new buildings approved in the bill, such as a Federal building in Boston, Mass., home of the President, and Austin, Tex., the political headquarters of the Vice President, seem to be far less necessary and far less carefully considered than the Dallas project.

The Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill 1963 conference report between House and Senate compromising differences passed 348 to 35. Disagreement centered around an increase of $120 million above the budget of the National Institutes of Health which by the testimony of responsible leaders was more money than was necessary to accomplish the task. Once again, it is obvious that the only solution for the liberals is to throw money into all the programs, a solution which has failed so many times as to have taught many of us the lesson that money alone will not solve problems confronting us.

The payment of balance of awards under Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 provoked sharp differences of viewpoint on the floor during debate. Admittedly the United States has repaid war claims for Philippine war damage and this bill was in the nature of gifts for rehabilitation to specific companies and individual groups. Many of those opposing this bill are not against further aid to the Philippines for rehabilitation but strongly object to financially aiding other countries when the United States itself is borrowing the money in order to give it away (through deficit financing). It's time we thought about strengthening the economy of our own country.

The Public Relations Society of America is composed of leading executives of large corporations in public relations and members of public relations organizations who meet annually to be informed on and to discuss isues of the day in all fields of our domestic economy. It was my pleasure to address this group at Cornell University this week. It was a most rewarding experience for me and, I hope, for them.

J. Craig Smith Article Cites Need for Effective Textile Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of my colleagues here in the House will be very interested in the article which my good friend and constituent, Mr. J. Craig Smith, has prepared for publication in the Avondale Sun. Mr. Smith is the president of Avondale Mills and has been most concerned that efforts to control cotton textile imports have not brought an effective solution to the problem.

The article is as follows:

Good Faith Is at Stake

Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, Assistant to the President Myer Feldman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Hickman Price, Jr., and other representatives of the Kennedy administration have repeatedly told our industry that under the long-term Geneva arrangement cotton textile imports would be held for 3 years to what came in during the Government's fiscal year which ended June 30, 1961, and that for the remaining 2 years of the arrangement there would be an increase of 5 percent per year. A rereading of the letter that President Kennedy wrote Congressman Carl Vinson dated February 26, 1962 would bring any reasonable person to the concluison that the members of the Kennedy administration who made statements to our industry were speaking with the knowledge and authority of the President.

During the Government's fiscal year which ended June 30, 1961, total textile imports came in equivalent to 430,000 bales of cotton. During the first 5 months of 1962, the equivalent of 295,000 bales of cotton has come in. Preliminary figures indicate that the relentless tide of cotton textile imports continued to rise during June and July. If imports continue at this rate, more than 700,000 bales will be imported during 1962 instead of the 430,000-bale ceiling we were promised.

The major reason for this all-time high in textile imports is due to the tremendous windfall that comes to the importer because of the difference in price paid for cotton by the U.S. mill and the foreign mill. So long as an extra profit of $42.50 a bale can be made on cotton textile imports, the incentive to violate the Geneva arrangement makes it almost impossible to enforce that arrangement. This fact is apparent to any thinking person.

In point four of President Kennedy's program for the textile industry, he recognized the need for eliminating or offsetting the disadvantage the U.S. mill is in in respect to its raw material cost. In November of 1961, he asked the Tariff Commission to investigate whether or not an 8½-cent offset fee should be imposed on textile imports. He asked for this investigation in November of 1961. It is now August 3, 1962 and no action has been taken. This same Tariff Commission took less than 60 days to determine that more than two bales of imported cotton in the form of picker lap was hurtful to the cotton price support program and must be stopped. How much longer is needed to determine that imports at the rate of 700,000 bales are breaking the back of the American cotton industry and negating the raw cotton price support program? What action does President Kennedy have in mind to implement has commitments to the cotton industry?

A Blow to Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over the action recently taken by this body in drastically reducing the amount to be budgeted for civil defense. Only time will tell whether civil defense measures were a necessity for our Nation's population or whether nuclear war will ever come. We all hope and pray that no citizen will ever have need for a bomb shelter. However, the decision to slash this year's civil defense appropriation will surely have been a disastrous mistake if war should come in the next several years. Representing, as I do, one of the cities being ringed by intercontinental ballistic missiles, I have a special concern about this Nation's responsibilities to civilian populations in the event of enemy attack. In the city of Tucson we have a livewire group of top-level planners who have started one of the best civil defense efforts in the Nation. The drastic reduction in our civil defense appropriation is likely to impair Tucson's program substantially.

The chairman of the Tucson-Pima County Civil Defense Commission has written me a letter in which he states better than I can the importance of considering anew this budgetary reduction. His letter follows:

TUCSON-PIMA COUNTY
CIVIL DEFENSE AGENCY,
Tucson, Ariz., July 30, 1962.

Hon. MORRIS K. UDALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UDALL: The Tucson-Pima County Civil Defense Commission (TPCCDC) was alarmed to read of the reduction of the Federal civil defense budget from $695 million to $65 million for the coming fiscal year by the House Appropriations Subcommittee. The reduction of the civil defense operating budget to half the expenditures for last year will mean a drastic reduction in administration staffs across the country. The efficiency and morale of such reduced staffs would be so low that very little productive work will be accomplished. If the appropriations cut is not restored civil defense in this country will be dead for a long time, which may be fatally long. The proposal of Representative ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, that the entire civil defense effort must be suspended for another year while additional basic research is carried out is not in line with the facts. Sufficient technical information is available now to give this Nation any degree of protection it wishes. Basic research should be continued in civil defense but the primary objectives here should be to develop new shelter designs that will lower building costs. The problems are not technical but are financial and lack of national leadership. The Nation needs leaders who have the capacity to analyze the technical aspects of our time and then have the courage to act decisively. Since many of our leaders have not bothered to do their homework and prepare themselves to handle the technical problems, when faced with a difficult decision, they evade the issue by asking for another study.

As you know from the progress report sent to you several weeks ago, Tucson is developing a new civil defense program that is much further advanced technically than the programs in most other parts of the country. Our program is designed to fit the needs of Tucson and is not based on conditions determined from national averages. Civil defense programs must be tailored to the needs of each community. The present civil defense statutes and regulations are having the effect of forcing the same "national average" solution on all communities, although this may not be the intention of OCD.

For example, school district No. 1 in Tucson recently applied for Federal matching funds for a study for school shelters to protect Tucson schoolchildren. The Corps of Engineers, which is administering the program for Arizona, those to make a very narrow interpretation of civil defense regulations for this study that was contrary to an earlier agreement reached with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense. Negotiations were dropped because the engineering firm wanted $13,000 for the study, while the Corps of Engineers would allow only $10,000. The commission advised dropping further negotiations because the restrictions that the Corps of Engineers wished to place on the study would have resulted in unsuitable plans for Tucson. This is an excellent example of the folly of blindly applying a program developed for "national average" conditions to a specific locality such as Tucson which has different problems.

You may wonder why we have criticized the national civil defense program and at the same time are urging that the entire budget request be restored. We have done this to show that the defects of the civil defense programs can be corrected by proper administration and a few changes in policy. Civil defense is not so sick that we should kill the patient.

The TPCCDC believes that Tucson will make an important contribution to the National Civil Defense Program. We have an outstanding group of engineers working on the program that has been obtained from the University of Arizona, Hughes Aircraft Co., Radio Corp. of America, and other engineering firms located is Tucson. This is the first attempt by a community (at least that we know of) to develop a civil defense system that will adequately protect the civil population from a number of near thermonuclear hits. One of the shelters we have designed will be able to survive 10-megaton weapons bursts only 2.1 miles away. We are working on shelter designs that will provide this type of protection at greatly reduced costs when compared to previous conventional methods of construction.

The "national average" program being promoted by the Office of Civil Defense has been concerned with radiation protection factors of 100, whereas Tucson requires factors of 10,000 to 100,000, which have been provided at an economical cost in our designs. Radiation protection factors of 100 may be adequate for places 100 miles or more from target areas but in Tucson they would keep the shelter occupant alive for about 1 hour.

It should be clear that a "national average" solution is not satisfactory for all areas. Since Tucson is one of the first cities that is attempting to come up with a CD system adequate for prime target areas, it would be tragic if the Congress, because of budget considerations, were to stop this work. The Tucson work will be applicable to other prime target areas which may be found in almost every State.

Assuming there is a thermonuclear war in the next 5 years, which is a possibility, an adequate civil defense system could mean the survival of roughly 120 million Americans, whereas with the present state of civil defense preparations it is impossible that only about 20 million Americans would survive.

In general terms we are talking about the chances of survival of about 100 million Americans, which is more than merely saving 100 million lives. The question is whether Western civilization will have the capacity to survive. The TPCCDC believes that this Nation can fight a thermonuclear war and survive, if and only if we are willing to develop adequate civil defense. In our opinion, this is necessary for the success of military deterrence, which is the only practical means we have at the present time for preventing another world war. The record $48 billion appropriated for active military defense will be a waste of money unless it is matched by at least the $695 million requested for civil defense. Once the Communist world realizes that the American public would not be willing, under any circumstances, to accept the risks of a thermonuclear war, then communism will continue to take over the free world and surrender of the United States to communism is only a matter of time. In order to make deterrence work, it is necessary for Russia and China to believe that the United States is willing to risk thermonuclear war if sufficiently provoked. This we cannot do without adequate civil defense. It can be shown (space forbids here) that certain multilateral disarmament systems could be safe national policies only with adequate civil defense. However, we are not recommending that disarmament be tried in the foreseeable future.

In our opinion, the success of military deterrence and the preservation of the peace is dependent on the United States developing an adequate civil defense system. We strongly urge that every possible means be taken to see that (a) the national civil defense budget be restored to at least $695 million; (b) the civil defense program be expanded to include provision for protecting prime target areas such as Tucson; (c) that the Tucson-Pima County civil defense program be supported financially and continued as presently conceived.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT H. MARSH,
Chairman, Tucson-Pima County
Civil Defense Commission.

"This Problem Is Much More Serious With Drugs"—Testimony in Opposition to Bills To Relax Delaney Clause on Animal Feeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I appeared this morning as the first witness before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on legislation to relax some of the provisions of the Delaney anticancer clause in the Food Additives and Color Additives Acts as it applies to animal feeds. While the legislation has one important redeeming feature—that is, in authorizing the Government to remove quickly from the market any previously approved animal feed ingredient if there should arise substantial doubt as to safety—primarily, it is legislation to aid some feed manufacturers to overcome a competitive and technical business problem, and is not, in any sense, consumer legislation.

It seems to me that in view of the urgent need for strengthening our laws to protect the consumer, we should get to that task quickly and not diffuse our efforts and energies by selecting out for special attention at this time just one obscure provision of the administration bills to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

In my testimony, I tried to outline the vital areas of the law which require corrective action at this time, including changes intended to strengthen the hand of Dr. Kelsey and her associates in the FDA in evaluating new drug applications. Because of the widespread interest in this whole issue as a result of the thalidomide incident, I am submitting my testimony this morning for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD. It stresses the need for action on H.R. 1235, which I introduced 19 months ago, or on H.R. 11581 and H. 11582, the two administration bills introduced recently to cover some of the same ground included in H.R. 1235. I do not think we should be diverted into consideration of a minor amendment of interest primarily to only one inudstry when so many major changes are needed in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—and needed urgently.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN OF MISSOURI

Chairman ROBERTS and members of the subcommittee, I have mixed feeling about appearing this morning to oppose a bill introduced by the chairman of this subcommittee, whom I regard not only as a good friend and an outstanding Member of Congress but as one who has probably done more than any single American to protect the safety of the American people on the highways of this Nation. The attack on exhaust fumes and the increasing use of seat belts in automobiles can be attributed largely to the work of this subcommittee and its chairmen. And in the general field of health legislation, hospital construction, and health professions education, this subcommittee has a proud record.

Thus, I would never take the position that this subcommittee, under Congressman KENNETH A. ROBERTS, is interested in weakening the protections of the American consumer from dangerous food products, or that it is interested in undermining, in any way, the effectiveness of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. On the contrary, I am sure the subcommittee joins me in wishing to see the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act 1938 brought up to date and made much more effective in protecting our lives and health and safety.

Nevertheless, I feel I must go on record here that I believe strongly that we should not enact as a separate piece of legislation H.R. 12437 by Chairman ROBERTS or H.R. 12420, the bill introduced by Congressman NELSEN, even though the language of these bills was taken out of one of the administration bills to amend and strengthen provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. When I testified before the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in June on H.R. 11581, the administration bill on drugs, and H.R. 11582, the bill dealing with cosmetics and therapeutic devices, containing together most of the major provisions of my own bill introduced 19 months ago—H.R. 1235—I raised some questions about the validity and the justification for this particular provision of H.R. 11582, the feed additives amendment, which hos now been reintroduced as a separate bill. After mentioning approvingly some of the few provisions of H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582 which are not in H.R. 1235 but which I would be willing to see added on to my bill, I turned to this particular provision on feed additives, relaxing the Delaney clause, and said:

"However, I have strong doubts, I must admit, over the retreat on the Delaney anticancer clause on feed additives, as contained in H.R. 11582, particularly in view of the Government's experience several years ago with the hormone-treated chickens. It cost us $10 million to remove from the market the fowl treated with a drug considered safe for the purpose—after it was learned that there were residues of the cancer-inducing substance in the skin of the chicken. Too often for complacency, new testing methods disclose the existence of harmful residues which had not shown up in earlier tests, but by then the damage is done."

NOT INCLUDED IN PRESIDENT'S CONSUMER MESSAGE

Mr. Chairman, it will be noted that my comments at the time on this particular provision of one of the administration bills were mild indeed. I thought I recognized why this provision had been included in the package of administration proposals making drastic changes to close loopholes and eliminate unsafe features in the 24-year-old Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Most of the administration proposals, like nearly all of those in H.R. 1235, are tough changes in the law—necessarily so—to cope with increasing evidences of danger to the consumer. The President touched on some of these in his March 14 message to Congress on consumer protection, but there was not a single word in the President's message about relaxing or changing the Delaney anticancer clause in either the food additives or color additives sections of the law.

On the other hand, he strongly endorsed proposals—all of them in H.R. 1235—for requiring pretesting for safety of all cosmetics; for requiring proof of efficacy as well as safety of all new drugs; for requiring proof of safety and efficacy for all new therapeutic devices; for tightening up drastically our powers to cope with the illicit sale of pep pills and sleeping pills; for rewriting the factory inspection authorization to enable the Food and Drug Administration inspectors to ferret out dangerous conditions in the manufacture, distribution, warehousing and sale of foods, drugs, and cosmetics; for promoting the feasibility of having doctors prescribe by generic terms instead of trade names as a means of bringing down the cost of prescription drugs, and, for enabling the Government to move quickly—immediately—in taking off the market any previously approved drug about which serious doubts have developed after the drug has gone on sale.

These are the major provisions of H.R. 1235 and of those sections of H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582 which amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. None of these purposes would be accomplished by passage of either of the two bills now before you this morning.

LEGISLATION BENEFITS ONLY SOME BUSINESS FIRMS

Instead, you propose in this legislation to take out of the administration package of proposals to strengthen the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act one obscure provision which does nothing whatsoever for the consumer, but puts profits into the pockets of some businesses making animal feeds.

Perhaps there are inequities in the feed additives "grandfather" clause which permit some feed manufacturers to continue to use cancer-inducing substances or coloring matter in their animal feed products if the particular firms were permitted to do so prior to the passage of the Food Additives Act of 1958 and the Color Additives Act of 1960, and as long as the Government cannot prove danger to the consumer on the other hand, a feed manufacturer not authorized before 1958 to use cancer-inducing chemical substances and not authorized before 1960 to use cancer-inducing coloring matter in animal feed cannot use them now, because of the Delaney clause, contained in both the 1958 and 1960 acts. So it is a competitive inequity.

But, gentlemen, let us look at it from the consumer standpoint. There is no value whatsoever to the consumer—none—in having our meat and poultry supply fattened for market with the aid of feed additives containing materials which could cause cancer. Some of the hormones are of economic value to the producer—fattening his livestock quicker with less feed.

I don't believe it means a single cent's difference in the consumer price of the meat, and it could endanger the consumer's health. That is why the stilbestrol-treated chickens had to be taken off the market several years ago at huge cost to the taxpayers. The Government had sanctioned the use of the stilbestrol pellets on the basis of evidence that no residue was found in the edible portions of the meat. Later—much later—with better testing methods, traces of this dangerous and cancer-inducing substance were found in the skins, and also in the livers and kidneys of the chickens. Who among us can guarantee that the further improvement of tasting methods in the near future—or the distance future—will not demonstrate similar consequences from use of the cancer-inducing materials now permitted in some animal feeds under the "grandfather's" clause?

PROBLEM MUCH MORE SERIOUS IN NEW DRUGS

I did not come here to be obstructive. I know there is a competitive problem among feed manufacturers based on when a particular firm happened to begin marketing a particular feed additive which competitors later going into the field could not legally use. But the problem goes much deeper than the competitive situation in the animal feed industry.

Our present law on new drugs requires very stringent proof of the safety of a new drug before it can be marketed. Thalidomide could not be marketed in this country because the manufacturer was not able to convince Dr. Frances Kelsey of FDA that such beyond-a-doubt proof existed. She has testified that, for a long time, she could not put her finger on the exact danger.

If she had approved the drug, based on what appeared to be very convincing proof of safety as a result of widespread usage abroad, she would not have been the heroine she is now, but I am sure she would not have been criticized for accepting the scientific proof presented to her as sufficient. This is a terribly complex scientific problem in the clearing of new drugs, since, as we know, any new drug carries dangers with it and the question is whether the good it can do—under proper medical supervision—outdoes the potential danger. Think how long it took before researchers connected this drug to the sudden increase in the birth of malformed infants.

But here is my point: If Dr. Kelsey had approved the application for sale of this drug, the Food and Drug Administration would then have had to wait for legal and incontrovertible proof of its danger before it could then have removed it from the market. The "tingling sensation" Dr. Kelsey had read about in a letter to the editor of the British Medical Journal—a piece of information which alerted her suspicions—would hardly have been the proof necessary to stop sale of the drug if it had already been approved for sale in this country.

That is the big loophole in our new drug law. The bills you are considering this morning seek to meet this problem as it involves feed additives by providing that the Secretary can quickly move to withdraw from sale any feed additive containing a chemical or color additive which he has once approved, if later he has substantial doubt of its safety. That part of the Roberts-Nelsen bill is all to the good.

OTHER CHANGES NEEDED IN DRUG LAW

But this problem is much more serious with drugs than it is with feed additives. We should not call forth a mouse when we need a massive solution to this problem of removing from the market drugs once approved but later found to be dangerous. Thus, if we are going to do anything on this, we should change all of the appropriate provisions of the food, drug, and cosmetic law to cover not only feed additives, but all drugs—in fact, I believe the feed additives involved in this matter are technically drugs under the act, and the safety feature of H.R. 12437 would be accomplished by H.R. 1235 or the administration bills.

Dr. Kelsey's experience points up the need for another important change in the drug laws: extending the period during which the Government has to act on a new drug application, as H.R. 1235 and H.R. 11581 both provide. Secretary Ribicoff and Commissioner Larrick testified on this during the full committee hearings in June. Dr. Kelsey herself has said that such a change in the law is needed to give her and other FDA scientists sufficient time for evaluating new drug applications. We don't need legislation to tighten up on experimental testing of drugs—FDA can now do that. But we need legislation to close other loopholes in the drug laws and it is urgent that we pass such legislation as I have proposed and the President has called for.

I know the present jurisdiction of the subcommittee is somewhat limited by the fact that H.R. 11581, H.R. 11582 and H.R. 1235 are pending before the full committee, and that this feed additives amendment alone, rather than any of the omnibus bills, is all that is before you right now.

But I think it would be most unfortunate if, out of all of the truly vital, urgent—changes needed in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act right now, the Congress should rush to pass only a bill giving profits to feed manufacturers who happened to have run into a technicality in the law which prevents them from marketing feeds containing cancer-inducing substances, while other firms may still do so.

Furthermore, I refer you to the information I supplied this committee 2 years ago in connection with the color additives bill—information from experts at the NIH—that there is no such thing as a harmless portion of a cancer-inducing substance in food or in drugs or in anything which might be ingested. Tests so far have shown that small quantities of some cancer-inducing substances fed to or injected in some classifications of meat animals, notably beef cattle, in animal feed, to speed the fattening process or for similar economic purposes, do not show up in the edible meat and apparently also do not harm the animal. But please keep in mind that the same "proof" existed on the use of stilbestrol pellets in chickens. That "proof" was faulty, just as the "proof" of the safety of thalidomide was faulty.

GIVE THE CONSUMER "SOMETHING FOR SOMETHING"

I ask that you put this legislation aside as a separate bill. If the Food and Drug Administration can give you incontrovertible evidence that this proposed change in the law is important or necessary, then—even then—I would say, make it part of an omnibus bill which also does something for the consumer. This is one of the few sections of any of the omnibus bills which any industry will enthusiastically support. I say: If you're going to go out of your way to provide relief, as this bill would, to some feed manufacturing companies, make it, to use the Latin, a quid pro quo—something for something—in other words, as part of the price the consumer must pay for getting a whole lot more consumer protection in the law. Otherwise, the industry gets what it wants, and the consumer gets nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I have the whole story of what happened on the stilbestrol pellets case involving chickens several years ago. This consists of a statement by former HEW Secretary Flemming, at a news conference December 10, 1959, when HEW announced its agreement with Agriculture that stilbestrol would not be used in chickens and that the Government would then buy up all fowl which had been treated with this previously approved drug. Also, at the same time, Mr. Flemming released a chronological report on how the crisis had developed. This is my only copy. I believe it should be part of the hearing record on this legislation. I ask that you include this material—that you obtain copies from HEW and insert this information in your hearings. It shows what happened when it was discovered that this harmless use of stilbestrol in chickens was not harmless after all—and why the Government could not move quickly on its own authority when the evidence indicated substantial doubt as to safety. The lesson we should learn from it is this: We should be extremely wary about authorizing any cancer-inducing substance under any circumstances in food, drugs or cosmetics, as the Delaney clause provides. I do not believe the Delaney clause should now be weakened. We fought too hard to get it into law to see it weakened merely to help some animal feed manufacturers improve their competitive situation.

Kastenmeier of Wisconsin: A Profile in Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, few newspapermen have done as admirable a job of catching the quality of a man as has Ivan Kaye, in his recent feature report "KASTENMEIER of Wisconsin: A Profile in Courage."

In printing this article on July 30, 1962, the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., has done a service to many Wisconsin people. I firmly believe that we must remain true to our finest traditions. I think that the Members of the House of Representatives will benefit from this article and will agree that the United States cannot condone brutality in any fashion in any part of the world.

After reading this article, Mr. Speaker, I asked Congressman KASTENMEIER for a copy of the letter he sent to the President which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the House. I include the article and letter under leave granted me so to do:

KASTENMEIER: A PROFILE IN COURAGE—YOUNG CONGRESSMAN FROM WATERTOWN ASKS UNITED STATES TO BE TRUE TO ITS FINEST TRADITIONS

(By Ivan Kaye)

WASHINGTON.—The capacity for true moral outrage is about as rare in this city as a balanced budget.

There are any number of Congressmen who can work themselves into oratorical tantrums over trivia, but there are only a few, who can focus an arounsed conscience on those issues that must be brought to the national attention if Americans are to be able to look themselves in the eye.

One of the few is ROBERT WILLIAM KASTENMEIER, of Watertown, Wis., and last week he applied his unyielding moral sensitivity to one of the real dilemmas of the cold war.

It all started when he opened a copy of Time magazine and found a picture of an American soldier standing by while a couple of good Vietnamese exhibited a little patriotic brutality toward a couple of bad Vietnamese.

The bad Vietnamese were two teenage boys who had some Communist songbooks in their possession. The good, or pro-American, Vietnamese wanted their captives to tell them certain things, and when they refused, several gallons of water were poured down one boy's throat as a way of inducing cooperation.

The fact that the boys survived the ordeal, and the fact that there are admittedly worse ways to torture a prioner were beside the point, as far as KASTENMEIER was concerned. So was the suspicion that there may be worse brutalities that have not yet come to light.

What he was really concerned about was the American in the picture, and the well-known fact that the Vietnamese are under the influence of our military advisory group there.

The question KASTENMEIER would now like answered, and it is perhaps the fundamental question about American posture in the cold war, is: How far are we willing to go?

To what extent, that is, are we as a nation willing to look away from these and other similar acts, and to rationalize them as a necessary aspect of the confrontation with Russia and China?

KASTENMEIER wants to know whether our complicity in such practices will be justified in official quarters on the basic of expediency.

He has fired off a letter to President Kennedy and a copy to Defense Secretary McNamara urging an immediate end to such goings-on as the water episode.

In the letter, written with a bright and burning eloquence, he left no doubt that if such acts could be justified officially as part of cold war policy, we would then have lost something of our essence as people dedicated to fair play—something that no totalitarian ever could have taken from us.

If brutality to children were to be accepted as a component of our foreign policy, KASTENMEIER wondered, how long would it be before the United States were called before the bar of world opinion as France was for its inhuman treatment of the Algerian rebels?

"It matters not whether the men are Algerian or Vietnamese, young or old; nor indeed how hostile may be their political views," KASTENMEIER wrote, "they are human beings and should not be treated in this way."

What he was asking, in essence, was for Americans to make a judgment.

They must decide whether there are some acts that cannot be justified under any circumstances, or whether, in a time of national peril, there are some otherwise reprehensible practices that will now be tolerated.

Wiretapping is another example, and KASTENMEIER has come out completely against it in every case.

It takes a kind of courage even to ask the question. It is so much easier to paint the Nation's enemies as devils, and thus to justify any inhumanity toward them.

It also takes a rare kind of fortitude to remind one's countrymen that they cannot evade responsibility when an American soldier—a representative of the Government, and thus of the people themselves—supervises the sadistic treatment of prisoners.

Since a great many citizens may not want to accept this responsibility, and since the electorate has never exactly idolized those who reminded it of its obligations, this is not an issue that has what the professionals here call political mileage.

Yet, if it does not have political mileage, KASTENMEIER obviously feels that it has moral mileage.

It is the sort of issue that may reveal only too well the real composition of the American conscience.

The way litmus paper tells a chemist when there is acid present, the public attitude on this may tell a sensitive Congressman the temper of the society he represents. And, more important, it may also tell the people something about themselves.

KASTENMEIER has a reassuring faith in his countrymen. He is certain that a great many of them have not been raised in this civilization to accept sadism as a means to any end.

There are those here who would disagree with him—who would say that we have become so progressively brutalized over the past generation, and so dedicated to creature comforts, that practically nobody is going to be willing to put himself out over the water torture of a couple of pink Vietnamese.

If some would call KASTENMEIER naive for expecting any better conduct from American soldiers in southeast Asia, it could be said in his defense that he is also naive enough to take American ideals seriously.

"There is no room for indifference to the value of the individual in American history, tradition, or mortality," he wrote to the President.

If KASTENMEIER turns out to be wrong—if there is now room for indifference to the value of the individual in a new American cold war morality—then he may have to ask one more question: If we must become brutalized in order to save our way of life, what have we saved?

JULY 20, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A picture in the July 20, 1962 issue of Time (p. 29) shows two young Vietnamese boys being led off to be tortured under the watchful gaze of an American adviser.

The story explains that the youths, who are said to be 15 and 19 (but look no older than 11 and 13) were captured with Communist songbooks in their possession: "The older boy was pinned to the ground and—as the Rangers call it—'taken for a swim.' His jaw was forced open and five gallons of water from a rusty old can gradually poured into his mouth. The youth gagged and screamed, but refused to talk, even when prodded with a rifle butt."

The fact that this scene took place under the eyes and camera of an American newsman indicates a callous indifference to the opinion of the world. It also indicates a strange insensitivity to the inhumanity of the actions, for these are men who do not seem to care who is watching as they supervise the brutal treatment of youths. To what depths must men sink before they feel shame and the fear of other men's judgments? And if we are permitted to witness these acts, we might well ask what is now being done that may be hidden from our view.

The U.S. soldiers advising the Vietnam soldirs represent both the Government and the people of this country. I am shocked to see them associated with these practices. There is no place for our help or cooperation, or even our complacency in the face of such facts. The world is fully aware of our deep involvement in Vietnamese affairs. We publicly proclaim that we are advising, training and, indeed, supervising the actions of the Vietnamese forces. We cannot escape responsibility for our participation in these less than human acts.

It was not long ago that we read with disgust of the tortures of Algerians by the French Army. Then the French clergy and men of conscience throughout the world joined in the protest against inhuman acts done in the name of necessity. I would hope our country will not be the next to be called before the judgment of the world. For it matters not whether the men are Algerian or Vietnamese, young or old; nor, indeed, how hostile may be their political views: they are human beings and should not be treated in this way.

In the past our men have been criticized for their lack of morale and fighting spirit in Korea and elsewhere. I have never doubted the courage or dedication of our soldiers. But these recent stories force me to question whether or not some really understand what they are fighting for. I do not understand how men brought up in America can condone the practice of torture in Vietnam or elsewhere. There is no room for indifference to the value of the individual in American history, tradition, or morality. And I am forced to the conclusion that these men must be instructed once more in the real meanings and demands of democracy.

I need not point out that the ends cannot justify the means in this situation. Nor need I say that the excuse of necessity or expediency should not be offered, and cannot be accepted in America. I can only ask that, before we begin the slow descent to a moral level where men pass off reports of torture with indifference and impatience, actions be taken to halt our complicity in these inhuman practices.

Mr. President, I respectfully request your response on this matter.

Yours respectfully,
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER.

CC.: Secretary of Defense.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a copy of a letter describing the brutal treatment of prisoners in Vietnam which I sent to the President today. I hope that on your trip to Vietnam you will have an opportunity to fix responsibility for these practices and call a halt to them.

Yours sincerely,
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Member of Congress.

Fantastic Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable but apparently true that many of our officials administering foreign aid do not know where and how the money is being spent.

The following Associated Press story appeared in newspapers throughout the country. This eposide indicates the utter fallacy of our foreign aid program.

On the record, the foreign aid program warrants a negative vote in this House. This ridiculous program should be terminated.

The Associated Press article follows:

PASSMAN DEPLORES LAG IN INFORMATION AID

"This is a hell of a way to run a railroad," commented Representative PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, today as he accused foreign aid officials of not knowing which nations are not receiving aid.

"They had to go to a congressional source to find out," Mr. PASSMAN complained. "They don't even know to whom they are giving the billions of dollars we appropriate every year for foreign aid."

Mr. PASSMAN, who heads an Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of aid funds, cited an incident that occurred at a committee session last Monday.

He told a reporter he asked officials of the Agency for International Development to supply a list of nations that have not received U.S. aid since World War II and are not scheduled to receive any this year.

SEEK INFORMATION

The officials, he said, didn't have the information with them but agreed to get it.

"Subsequently," he said, "I got an inquiry from the Library of Congress saying the aid agency had asked them for a list of countries that had not received aid since World War II and for which none was programed through 1963."

The Library, Mr. PASSMAN assumed, did not know that it was Mr. PASSMAN's request that produced the inquiry but did assume that he knew the answer. Also, he assumed, the foreign aid officials didn't expect the Library to go to Mr. PASSMAN for the information.

At a subsequent hearing, he said, "I told them it was a rather sad state of affairs that when I ask you for information, you go to the Library of Congress and they come to me to get it."

OFFICIALS EXPLAIN

He said the officials explained that they use all available sources of information when they seek data for Congress.

"The truth of the matter is," he commented, "that they probably don't know who is getting our money and who is not."

In response to Mr. PASSMAN's original query, the officials reported that at one time or another 101 nations have received United States financial aid.

He smilingly declined to answer when asked if the AID officials came up with the answer by way of the Library of Congress with some help from Mr. PASSMAN himself.

More Than 80 Million Slavonic Christians Observed Millennium of Slavic Apostles a Century Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I submit an article written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, an editor and journalist from Passaic, N.J., which appeared in the Katolicky Sokol, Wednesday, August 1, as well as several other newspapers, on the 11th centennial of the arrival of apostles SS. Cyril and Methodius to Slovakia.

The article follows:

MORE THAN 80 MILLION SLAVONIC CHRISTIANS OBSERVED MILLENNIUM OF SLAVIC APOSTLES A CENTURY AGO

(By John C. Sciranka)

Now that the 11th centenntial of the arrival of apostles SS. Cyril and Methodius to Slovakia was inaugurated with their feast on July 7 and will be observed until September 15, 1963, throughout the world, we recall with pride that a century ago (1862), the thousandth anniversary of these great apostles of eastern Europe was celebrated with a deep and sacred enthusiasm "by more than 80 million Slavonic Christions, without distinction of sect or denomination, from Prague to the Pacific, and from Baltic to Salonica."

This is recorded by Lady Muir Mackenzie and Miss Kirby, who have visited the Slavic provinces in Europe, then under Turkish domain, which they described in their travelogue. And in 1878 Edison L. Clark, quoted them in his History of Turkey, who also recalls two historical episodes, which were considered more or less as a legend by the Slovaks and other Slavic nations in connection with the missionary labors of these two brothers. One is about the "captives," which this writer mentioned recently in connection with the observance of the Captive Nations Week, in which it was stated that the two apostles, instead of accepting rich gifts of gold, silver and other precious gems, they begged for captives from their rulers and succeeded in two instances to free some 900 of them.

To substantiate this, we recall with above historian and travelers that the passes of the Balkans were the channels through which flowed the rich and extensive traffic between Constantinople and the vast regions of Central Europe; and of this source of wealth the Bulgarians soon learned to avail themselves. This social progress prepared the way for Christianity; and, strange as it may appear, the frequent cruel wars between Bulgarian kingdom and the Greek Empire, where SS. Cyril and Methodius were born and educated, had much to do in conveying the first knowledge of the gospel to the Bulgarians and other Slavonic nations. In every war, the historians claim, numerous captives were taken on both sides; and these captives of either party, proved efficient propagators of Christianity among the Slavonic nations. The Greek captives were rarely wanting in zeal for their faith; and not infrequently the Slav men and women, living in captivity for years among a Christian people, embraced Christianity, and returned to communicate their new religion to their brethren at home, as described in the Maclear's History of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages.

Historians claim, that Christianity was first actively preached in Bulgaria about the year A.D. 813, by a captive bishop, whose labors met with little success, and won him a martyr's crown. But in the year 861, a sister of King Bogoris who had been detained at Constantinople as a captive or a hostage, and had there embraced Christianity, returned to her brother's court and set herself with great earnestness to secure his conversion. At first, the story goes, her efforts were vain; but softened by trouble and famine, the King began at length to listen more thoughtfully to his sister's instructions, and even to call for help from the Christians' God. At this time there appeared at the Bulgarian court—purposely sent for, according to some accounts, by the King's sister—a monk named Methodius, who was a skillful painter. This monk was employed by the King to paint for him the walls of a hunting lodge; but instead of depicting the scenes and incidents of the chase, he improved the opportunity to paint a vivid representation of the Day of Judgment. The King and his attendants are said to have been greatly impressed by this painting and, by earnestly asking its meaning, to have given the artist what he desired—an opportunity to preach Christ and Him crucified. Soon afterward the King avowed himself a Christian and was baptized * * * and thus it was about the year 865 the Bulgarians became nominally a Christian people and the highest decoration in Bulgaria, until the present Communist regime, was the Order of SS. Cyril and Methodius.

I mention this, because the story about "captives" during the ninth century and applied to the present captive nations, may have seemed like a new innovation. But we can see that it was referred to by historians a long time ago. Also that the story I heard from my parents and teachers in my boyhood about the painting of the Day of Judgment by St. Methodius, was accepted not only by the Slovaks, but other Slavonic nations, who have in 1862, during the thousandth anniversary of these two great apostles paid them tribute with a deep and sacred enthusiasm "by more than 80 millions of Slavonic Christians without distinction of sect or denomination, from Prague to the Pacific, and from the Baltic to Salonica."

Considering that the Slavs are prolific and in spite of the world wars and famines, as well as Nazi and Communist persecution, they still number some 300 million in the world, we, therefore, hope and pray that during this 11th centennial of SS. Cyril and Methodius, at least half of them will pay them tribute with a deep and sacred enthusiasm. And having some 30 million Americans of Slavonic origin and descent in all our 50 States, when we consider that the heritage of SS. Cyril and Methodius is the only weapon, which can destroy communism, let us here in America be the first to lead the way in this sacred enthusiasm.

Beware of Handouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, many seemingly good things have been the trap by which people have lost their freedom and tyrants have come to power. This is the point of a little story by Dr. J. G. McDaniel, which appeared in the March 1962 issue of the Freeman:

WHOSE BREAD I EAT HIS SONG I SING

(By J. G. McDaniel, M.D.)

I remember, as a small boy in knee britches, going with my father to hear an address given by the Honorable Stephen Pace, then Congressman from the old Georgia 12th District. It was on the banks of the Ocmulgee River. There was a barbecue, and citizens, especially farmers, from all the counties gathered. This was before the First World War.

It seemed that someone in the Congress had introduced a bill that would give the farmers some money provided they did something. The Congressman vigorously opposed it. I have no idea what it was, because I was watching a dirt dobber making a ball of mud. The Congressman snapped me back to attention, however, when he said, "I'm going to tell you a true story about the wild hogs that once lived about 40 miles down the river."

"Years ago," the Congressman said, "in a great horseshoe bend down the river, there lived a drove of wild hogs. Where they came from no one knows, but they survived floods, fires, freezes, droughts, and hunters. The greatest compliment a man could pay to a dog was to say that he had fought the hogs in Horseshoe Bend and returned alive. Occasionally a pig was killed either by dogs or a gun—a conversation piece for years to come.

"Finally a one-gallused man came by the country store on the river road and asked the whereabouts of these wild hogs. He drove a one-horse wagon, had an ax, some quilts, a lantern, some corn, and a single barrel shotgun. He was a slender, slow-moving, patient man—he chewed his tobacco deliberately and spat very seldom.

"Several months later he came back to the same store and asked for help to bring out the wild hogs. He stated that he had them all in a pen over in the swamp.

"Bewildered farmers, dubious hunters, and storekeepers all gathered in the heart of Horseshoe Bend to view the captive hogs.

"'It was all very simple,' said the one-gallused man. 'First I put out some corn. For three weeks they would not eat it. Then some of the young ones grabbed an ear and ran off into the thicket. Soon they were all eating it; then I commenced building a pen around the corn, a little higher each day. When I noticed that they were all waiting for me to bring the corn and had stopped grubbing for acorns and roots, I built the trap door. Naturally,' said the patient man, 'they raised quite a ruckus when they seen they was trapped, but I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can jist get him to depend on me for a free handout.'"

We have had patient men in our Central Government in Washington for years. They are using our own dollars instead of corn. I still think about the trap door and the slender, stooped man who chewed his tobacco deliberately, when he spat and turned to the gathered citizens many years ago and said, "I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can jist get him to depend on me for a free handout."

Cultural Explosion: A Bandwagon Without Wheels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely article, "Cultural Explosion: A Bandwagon Without Wheels," on the problems of the arts in America. The authors, Ellen Straus and Polly Cowan, are distinguished constituents. I am happy to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The text of the article follows:

CULTURAL EXPLOSION—A BANDWAGON WITHOUT WHEELS

(By Ellen S. Straus and Polly Cowan)

At a luncheon meeting last January the ladies of the Washington press corps seemed particularly pleased when Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg reassured them that: " * * * This is the first time that any administration has raised the condition of the arts. * * *" A meeting of historians would have been less impressed. George Washington, reporting for the first time in his state of the Union message said, "* * * this will be worthy of a place in the deliberations of our Congress. The Arts * * * have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and mankind."

American Presidents have been acknowledging the need for the encouragement of the arts ever since, yet there is still no systematic program of understanding by or support from the Government. The political appeal seems to be clearer than the cultural need, at least to politicians. A leader of the U.S. Senate put it this way: "I don't know anything about culture—but there's a lot of mileage in it."

Journalists, by the same token, feel that art helps circulation. The newspapers lead us to believe that we are the living witnesses to a cultural explosion—the artistic counterpart of Hiroshima. "Symphony, Opera Pace U.S. Culture," says the National Observer. "U.S. Goes on Culture Kick," reported the New York World Telegram & Sun. "We're Cultured, Too," commented the Saturday Evening Post.

Culture, in the large economy-size package, is a must for every home. No pine-paneled rumpus room can be without it. America is climbing onto a bandwagon. Has the wagon any wheels?

In the 1960's, there are more bodies filling concert halls, more homes playing classical records, more children taking music lessons, and more people attending art schools than ever before. So, obviously, there is a cultural explosion." Or is there? Might it be a population explosion—substituting score for skill? In any case, the glamour of culture seduces us every day, in newspapers and magazines.

Mrs. Average American, reading these stories, thrills at the thought of the new, rich life of the spirit. But then she remembers the third installment on the children's TV. She realizes, a little sadly, that if she is to ride the crest of the new cultural wave, she has to find a new budget and make a new time schedule. Concerts are expensive and hard to fit among PTA meetings, Community Chest drives, Cub Scout Dens and Saturday night bridge games.

There is much impressive factual material: Americans last year spent $3 on musical instruments for every man, woman, and child in the country. There are as many symphony orchestras in the United States as there are TV stations; and there are 35 million Americans actively interested in some form of concert music.

Yet, the sugar-covered cultural doughnut has an outsized hole. In every season for the past 10 years, New York's Carnegie Hall has presented fewer musical evenings, and the opening of Lincoln Center's Philharmonic Hall this fall is hardly calculated to improve the situation. Kansas City's Music Hall is dark more nights than it plays music, drama, or dance performances. Of the 1,200 symphony orchestras in the United States, only 5 have seasons long enough to pay the musicians a living wage. Many of our finest composers and performers are forced to work as salesmen or cab drivers in order to eat.

Where does the young musical artist go after he wins his degree from Juilliard, the University of Kansas, the University of Nebraska, Curtis, Peabody or the Eastman School of Music? Van Cliburn had to compete behind the Iron Curtain in order to become an American hero. Who knows how many other Van Cliburns are forced by simple economics to sit behind the wheel of a taxicab, when they should be in front of a keyboard?

Advocates of the "cultural explosion" theory tell us that halls for the performing arts are mushrooming all over the United States. Lincoln Center is well on the way toward its goal of raising $142 million "in order to bring together a beautiful and spacious setting for America's leading institutions of opera, music, drama, and the dance, and to give our Nation a symbol of cultural maturity." When Philharmonic Hall is completed, who will wash its "three sides of clear glass rising 70 feet from street level to roof?" Who will sweep the "4,600,000 feet," three-quarters of which is devoted to: 'foyers, promenades, dressing-rooms, and offices'? Who will recover its seats in fabrics of harmonizing shades of gold?'

In fact, Philharmonic Hall presents a perfect if discouraging example of the architectural operation which is a success, while the music patient dies. Of what use is a beautiful hospital if the patient cannot pay the bill? Without Government assistance by city, State, or Nation, ticket sales and private philanthropic support are not sufficient. From these must come enough revenue to pay overhead costs, provide maintenance of the building, musicians' salaries, and travel expenses.

The costs of supporting musical creativity have found small place in the elaborate budgets for Lincoln Center in New York, the National Culture Center in Washington, D.C., Music Center in Los Angeles, and the Cultural Center in Detroit. Each of these has provided millions for buildings to please the eye, but very little for music to please the ear.

And where, in all this, do we encourage the developing young artist? New talent is caught squarely between the seats. One seat stands in the new, larger auditoriums. The other rocks with economic demands so high that management dares to rely only on the artist with solid box-office appeal. We have talented performers with no place to perform, and potentially large audiences with tickets priced beyond their means.

Culture has been the subject matter for speeches by American statesmen since George Washington's Inaugural Address; yet, almost two centuries later, Serge Koussevitzky said: "Our world is hungry for spiritual food. But what has been done by the Government to satisfy this hunger? Is there a law preventing Governments from supporting the fine arts? We artists are the living pulse of art; the State is the ground upon which art finds stability and security. It is imperative for the State to realize and acknowledge the signal need of our time. Art needs the support of the State, and demands a department of fine arts."

To the U.S. Department of State, the significance of culture has long been obvious. The Department regularly sends performing groups abroad with the dual mission of playing music and at the same time convincing the emerging nations that we're cultured, too. Less than 2 years ago the Government recognized the importance of this foreign policy aspect of U.S. culture by establishing the post of Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural and Educational Affairs.

But the emerging nations, older allies, and less friendly countries, might be surprised at the disclosure that American symphony orchestras are essentially part-time organizations, playing for less than half of every year. Dismaying as this fact may be to the "cultural explosive proponents, or indeed, to most U.S. citizens, it is hardly a secret to the musicians in these orchestras. They know full well that colleagues of the Los Angeles philharmonic line up regularly for unemployment insurance when their performing season ends; members of the New York philharmonic lay carpets and sell insurance; and musicians of the Chicago symphony appear as door-to-door salesmen.

For any country in Western Europe this would be unthinkable. There, an orchestra stays together and plays together throughout the year. In France $4 million in French francs annually goes to support the opera and the opera comique. In Great Britain, the Arts Council spends $1 million in British pounds, for its grant-in-aid program, for the yearly support of the Royal Opera, Sadler's Wells Ballet, and the Old Vic theater. Nearly every city in Germany has an opera company, financed by government grants. Austria pays off the deficit of the Vienna State Opera. And so it goes. In Denmark, Italy, Sweden, Greece, Portugal, Belgium, Holland, and Turkey, the fine arts have support from government grants. While the U.S. Government has recognized art as part of the foreign policy effort, its acceptance of domestic responsibility for culture puts it in the class of underdeveloped nations.

A few public officials have acted with foresight and effectiveness. In 1935, Senator Robert F. Wagner, Democrat, of New York, sponsored a bill proposing an American National Theater and Academy (ANTA). Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, Republican, of New York, recently created a State Council of the Arts. In commenting on the completion of the council's first year, Brooks Atkinson called it: "A remarkable success." The council, with a budget of $450,000 sent professional opera, ballet, and theater, into more than 50 communities throughout New York.

Senator William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, initiated the farsighted Fulbright program in 1946. It is now one of the largest cooperative programs in the world for the exchange of students, teachers and scholars. The student has the double advantage of studying in the country of his choice while performing in numerous concerts. When the Fulbright scholar returns to the United States after his excellent training, he is faced with the common problem of the American artist. Where will he perform? How will he eat? When he reluctantly accepts a job outside of his profession, he knows he is back home.

The attitude today toward the arts in Washington, D.C., is perplexing. A new Cultural Center in the Capital has been endorsed by the President and supported by the Congress. The legislative "support" takes the form of a gift to the people of an unused, 13-acre swamp, known as "Foggy Bottom." Private efforts are required to raise the funds for the construction and operation of the center, since the legislation was uncontaminated by money. A millionaire-to-millionaire moneyraising campaign is in progress, to be followed in the fall, by a dollar-to-dollar telethon. Because the project is subject to cancellation by the Congress if sufficient funds are not available by September, 1962, the fundraisers have already faced reality by cutting their goal from 70 million to less than half that amount.

On the executive side, Pablo Casals played in the White House, and August Heckscher arrived on the scene as Cultural Coordinator for the United States. Long before this recent appointment, Mr. Heckscher recognized the dimensions of the problem when he wrote in the report of the President's Commission on National Goals: "A people caring about dignity and excellence in its private lives may be expected to care also about the embodiment of these quantities in the public environment. The American scene today is not reassuring in this regard.

Recent congressional testimony would substantiate this point. At a hearing on a bill before the Committee on Rules in the House of Representatives, one Congressman asked, "What are the arts?" It was obviously a rhetorical question, for he immediately proceeded to answer: "I do not know. I suppose fiddleplayers would be in the arts, and the painting of pictures would be in the arts. It was suggested that pokerplaying is an artful occupation. Is this bill going to subsidize the pokerplayers that get into trouble?"

The debate ranged from poker and levity to budget and parsimony. Said another Congressman: "I am sure the spending of $100 thousand a year for culture can very well wait until we have a balanced budget in this country and start retiring the Federal debt. I just do not see any necessity for this kind of business at this time."

"This kind of business" is a description of some half dozen different bills which have been introduced in the Congress this year by a dozen different Congressmen who want aid for the arts. Some politicians say that the only bills which pass Congress, are those that involve large expenditures of funds. If this is true, then the aids to the arts bill, introduced by John V. Lindsay, Republican, of New York, and Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, will remain bottled up in one of the house committees where it has rested for the past 7 years.

The Lindsay-Thompson bill would establish a Federal Advisory Council for the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere in the United States. The council would be authorized to spend up to $100,000 a year. The sum is not munificent—the State of New York has been four times more generous.

Other bills call for: (1) the formation of a U.S. foundation to promote the study and advancement of the performing and visual arts throughout the country; (2) the creation of a department of culture, with its head at Cabinet level; and (3) a program of grants to States for the development of the arts. Many of the dozen sponsors admit privately that chances for a passage at this time are dubious.

Evidently then, a handful of elected officials and a prodigious amount of local activity, though deserving of high acclaim, does not add up to the violence of a cultural explosion. It would seem to take more than supportive words and homemade efforts to "explode" the United States. Culture must have quality; quantity adds up only to computation.

On March 4, 1962, Philharmonic Hall in Lincoln Center announced its first week's program, to begin next September. Harold C. Schonberg commented in the New York Times: "* * * it would seem that commercial considerations have prevailed over artistic ones and that all the ideals that we have been reading about have been set to a singing commercial.

"There are many things that Lincoln Center could have done. If the enterprise is to be looked on as an American cultural dream come true, the American elements could, and should have been played up. The best of our composers should have been commissioned to write music for the occasion and the best of world music appropriate to the occasion also could have played a part * * * but what actually has been announced is a long way from the great vision that Lincoln Center has been talking about. * * * The opening program is an extravaganza, a big patchwork quilt that has neither the virtue of consistency nor taste, a gaudy affair that rings as hollow as a broken drum."

When the piano strikes the tuning "a" for the first time in Lincoln Center next fall, we may well discover that the "culture explosion" makes no more noise than the sound that rings from "a broken drum." More Americans are spending more time listening to good music, yet local orchestral boards continue to set up job placement committees to find off-season work for musicians. New structures are rising to house cultural institutions, yet the quality of the programs which are performed in the buildings will be the true measure of their validity.

Are we witnesses to a "cultural explosion," or is there none to witness?

Strike Losses Increase Under Kennedy Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the big campaign cry of Candidate Kennedy was that we had to get the country moving again. Well, he has succeeded in some areas—we now have a record deficit, a record public debt, some of the biggest Federal spending programs in history and, now we learn, a 60-percent increase in man-hours lost due to strikes over the last year. In spite of the tragic effect upon our economy of such work stoppages as the current strike of flight engineers against Eastern Airlines, and the strikes at defense and missile bases such as the one now tieing up the nuclear ship *Savannah*, we hear no word from the White House. The President has not lost his temper, in fact it appears he is not even aware of the tremendous losses labor disputes under his administration are costing individual workers and the country. There is no evidence that President Kennedy will make any recommendations to curb the unlawful power of certain labor leaders, nor make any effort to hold labor unions responsible for actions which are detrimental to the rest of our society. There is only one way to improve labor relations and that is to make labor unions subject to antitrust law as called for in my bill, H.R. 8407. This legislation would insure that labor organizations played by the same rules that apply to all the rest of us and would protect union members against overambitious and dictatorial labor bosses.

In concluding these remarks I would like to insert two articles from the Washington Evening Star of August 4, 1962. One relates to a 60-percent increase in man-hours lost to strikes and the other to the shameful tieup of the *Savannah*:

STRIKE IDLENESS IN 1962 60 PERCENT ABOVE 1961 PERIOD

Strikes cost U.S. industry and workers 9.8 million man-days during the first half of 1962—a 60-percent jump over last year's January-to-June figure, the Bureau of Labor Statistics said today.

Strike time losses this June hit a 2-year high of 2.88 million man-days, the bureau said.

The Bureau said there were 1,920 work stoppages involving 800,000 workers during the first 6 months of 1962. Both totals were well above the year-ago figures.

Strike idleness during the corresponding 1961 period was estimated at 6.1 million man-days—a postwar low.

This year, the Bureau said, the ratio of time lost to time worked—17 strike-idled hours to every 10,000 hours worked—was below the level for corresponding periods of all but 4 postwar years.

The Bureau said 410 strikes involving 155,000 workers began during June, about two-thirds of them in manufacturing industries. Both those figures were down from the levels reported for May. Another 240 work stoppages that started in May continued into June.

The Bureau blamed about half the working time losses in June on 9 major walkouts, each involving more than 5,000 workers.

Among them, the Bureau said, were strikes at Republic Aviation Corp., Farmingdale, N.Y.; construction strikes along the west coast and in Idaho and Detroit, and walkouts against Eastern Air Lines and the New York Telephone Co.

LABOR DISPUTE FOILS SAILING OF NUCLEAR SHIP "SAVANNAH"

YORKTOWN, VA., August 4.—The nuclear ship *Savannah*, designed to sail for thousands of miles without refueling, remained fast to her pier today, stymied by a labor dispute.

Twice within the week dissident crewmen have refused to man their stations to move the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship to Norfolk for a final fitting before she sets out on her maiden voyage.

How much longer the dispute will hold up the sailing is undetermined. But what is certain is that her maiden voyage—to New York, Savannah, Ga., and then to the World's Fair at Seattle—will be delayed.

When she does get into the shipyard, she will be there for 10 days.

For the men aboard the *Savannah*, the period of idleness is filled by watching television, fishing, and standing about in small groups chatting. Their labor dispute is now under negotiation in New York, and a special Government factfinding panel has been appointed.

The dispute was touched off by pay raises given the nuclear ship's engineering officers. The 70 to 80 deck officers and unlicensed crewmen are demanding similar raises for themselves.

The Government panel named yesterday is to submit its findings within 10 days.

Negotiations between the States-Marine Lines, which operates the *Savannah* for the Maritime Administration, and the unions have been without success in New York. The company has asked that the dispute be sent to arbitration.

The balking crewmen are represented by the Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots, the American Radio Association, and the National Maritime Union, all AFL–CIO unions.

Union officials and crewmen decline to answer most questions at the *Savannah*. One source, however, said the crewmen have been paid off by the company but have not left the ship.

One crewman said they had not been paid off but said the ship's galley has been shut down.

"They're not giving us any food, but then we're not working," he said. "We elected a committee which goes into town and buys food. That's no problem."

Area Needs Fighting Spirit of Oriskany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today is the 185th anniversary of the Battle of Oriskany—the turning point of the Burgoyne campaign and of the American Revolution. This event has been appropriately described as the "Thermopylae of America." In hand-to-hand combat near the frontier village of Oriskany, N.Y., the valiant resistance of American farmers and militia under the command of Gen. Nicholas Herkimer prevented British and Indian forces from subduing the entire Mohawk Valley and reinforcing Burgoyne, who met defeat at Saratoga.

That such an event in our country's history should be refused official national recognition is astonishing—to say the least. But such is the case. This paradox is the subject of the following editorial, written by Mr. William J. Woods, which appeared in the Sunday, July 1, 1962, edition of the Utica, N.Y., Observer-Dispatch. I commend its contents to the House in the hope it will inspire new recruits for the growing ranks of those who are fighting to obtain Federal recognition for the site of the bloodiest battle of the American Revolution—Oriskany. Official commemoration will serve to instill the spirit so needed today as we wage our protracted struggle against the Communist foe.

The editorial follows:

NOTES OFF THE EDITOR'S SPINDLE: AREA NEEDS FIGHTING SPIRIT OF ORISKANY

(By William J. Woods)

It's time for a new Battle of Oriskany.

The shot and shell will be verbal and legal, but almost as hot as any exchanged on the bluffs on that humid August 6, 1777, about 8 miles west of Utica.

The targets will not be Indians skulking behind trees but the so-called experts of the

National Park Service who hid behind anonymity in last Sunday's Washington dispatch giving alleged reasons for downgrading the bloodiest battle of the Revolution.

If you read the story a week ago today you know these specialists of the Park Service had praise enough for the "brave and courageous stand" made by Gen. Nicholas Herkimer and his embattled Palatine German farmers to halt British Gen. Barry St. Leger's march to join General Burgoyne in eastern New York State and cut the colonial Nation in half.

But, say these interpreters of their bosses' decisions, Herkimer was a failure because he didn't do what he set out to do—relieve the siege of Fort Stanwix, where the city of Rome now stands.

That's bureaucracy for you.

Herkimer's orders were to relieve Stanwix and he didn't do it. All he did was give his life, as did many of his compatriots, breaking up a force of British and Indians. Most of the Indians fled into the wilds; the British still able got back to their forces near the fort and soon started northward for Canada; there was no St. Leger army to join Burgoyne.

But, say these nameless specialists, the disruption of the campaign of the British does not count; General Herkimer did not relieve Fort Stanwix. It does not count so much that because of the Mohawk Valley men's dash into the jaws of death at Oriskany St. Leger hesitated, heard General Arnold was coming with reinforcements and ran away to Canada and safety.

Benedict Arnold, the Washington experts say, was really the lad who saved Fort Stanwix. It's probably the only time in history that a general 250 miles away relieved a siege while the 200 killed and 200 wounded American farmers are dismissed as part of an expedition that failed.

If Herkimer's forces hadn't disrupted St. Leger's plan with Joseph Brant, storied Indian chief, to march eastward the whole central part of the State might have been laid waste by the enemy. Defeat of Burgoyne at Saratoga might not have been so easy, if accomplished at all.

Let's see some of the real history of Oriskany.

Says the World Book Encyclopedia: "St. Leger's defeat at the Battle of Oriskany in 1777 and his retreat to Canada were instrumental in upsetting the British campaign plan, and contributed to Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga." No mention there about Benedict Arnold being the real savior of Fort Stanwix and our valley. Contributor of the comment is W. B. Willcox, University of Michigan professor of history.

In the classic Encyclopedia Britannica about a half page is devoted to describing this failure, and it is conceded "the battle, although indecisive, had an important influence in preventing St. Leger from affecting a junction with General Burgoyne."

In a report to this paper last March, A. K. Cunningham, supervisor of historic sites in the office of the State historian, wrote: "The battle greatly crippled the British forces of St. Leger who soon afterward, alarmed at the approach of Gen. Benedict Arnold, gave up his effort to capture Fort Stanwix and retreated into Canada. This, together with the defeat of Burgoyne at Saratoga, thwarted Britain's carefully laid strategy, and the conquest of New York for the purpose of dividing the Colonies was averted."

A glowing tribute was printed in the New York Times in 1925. Stuart M. Emery wrote under the title, "Saving Three Fields of Glory."

"The musket shots of Lexington and Concord have rung around the world; the horrors of Valley Forge are a part of America's fiber; the sword of Cornwallis, yielded at Yorktown, stands as the symbol of liberty achieved through years of wracking struggle," he wrote.

"But how widely is it known that in the smiling stretch of the Mohawk Valley, at Hoosick and on the heights near Saratoga were fought the battles that proved the turning point of the Revolution?

"Without them there would be no 48 States today, reaching from ocean to ocean in a single united country. Without these victories the cause of the Colonies would have gone to ruin. Oriskany, Bennington, Saratoga—the three battles that smashed Burgoyne's crucial drive at the heart of the new America contribution of New York to the land of which it is a part.

"In the dense forests that bordered a certain historic ravine at Oriskany, 8 miles away, the Mohawk Valley settlers, headed by gray-haired, phlegmatic Nicholas Herkimer, inflicted such punishment on the Indians who had ambuscaded them that the power of the red man as a British fighting force never recovered. It was the bloodiest battle of the Revolution, but it saved Fort Stanwix and the valley.

"Oriskany, Bennington and Saratoga turned the tide. Is the Nation to know their real significance?"

Alas, if the National Park Service has its way, the Nation will have to dig out the information for itself.

National officials have made a "big thing" out of Bennington and Saratoga. Why is Oriskany alone of this triumvirate of national shrines denied the accolade of being designated a "national historic site"?

Is it for the same reason the whole Oriskany-central New York area has never received the same attention and political and fiscal nourishment from Washington and Albany that other sections have?

Are we, to put it bluntly, too darned "nice" about demanding things in the Capital to which we sent plenty of tax money? Do officials regard us as in their political pockets or a bunch of quarreling handicaps to whichever party's in power or the kind of people that can be given an easy brushoff?

Right here and now, in the Independence Day Week of 1962, is a good time to start howling for more than lame excuses for delays on arterials, on that promised State office building, on giving Oriskany Battlefield its rightful place in the Federal system. Nicholas Herkimer would never have stood being walked on the way we are.

One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on August 3, titled "One-Way Street":

ONE-WAY STREET

The Soviet Union recently bought two-page advertisements in three large American metropolitan newspapers to publish the text of Premier Khrushchev's 13,000-word speech before the so-called World Peace Congress on July 10.

The thinking behind the move, one suspects, was to try to convince gullible Americans that it was necessary to buy an advertisement to get a peaceful message across; that the Soviet Union is truly the disciple of peace, and that all who oppose the Reds are warmongers.

Unfortunately for Mr. Khrushchev, another American newspaper called the turn. The Washington Post offered to print without charge the text of Mr. Khrushchev's speech provided the Soviet press would do the same with a disarmament speech by President Kennedy.

The Post's offer was turned down.

Why?

Because Mr. Khrushchev, intent on selling the people of Russia on the idea that we are attempting to whip up a war, simply cannot permit them to know that we don't want a war, and will do everything consistent with national honor, to keep out of one. For if they knew the true state of affairs, Mr. K.'s warlike posturing and his demands for more and more sacrifices from the Russian people would come back in his face, and his scare technique would be valueless.

Actions, not words, are what count—a thing it would be well to remember if you ever read any of Mr. Khrushchev's speeches.

Mel Ellis Writes About "Dust or Ducks?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the thoughtful article about our national resources of waterfowl in the August 1962 issue of Field and Stream, by Mel Ellis, the nationally famous outdoor editor of the Milwaukee Journal:

DUST OR DUCKS?

(By Mel Ellis)

Wet lands are oases for all forms of wildlife. Find one, and there will be mink and muskrats, herons and blackbirds, raccoons and deer, fish and frogs. And of primary importance in this era of disappearing waterfowl, there will be ducks.

For half a century Americans have been talking about the preservation of wet lands. But just talking. While dismayed sportsmen protested, farmers were paid Government bonuses to drain marshes and dry up potholes. Now the earth is scarred with ditches, and dust devils dance where water once shimmered in the sun.

In a monumental game of puss-in-the-corner, the Department of Agriculture pays farmers to destroy wetlands, while the Department of the Interior begs Congress for money to preserve them. You foot the bill—and it runs into the billions. Through farm subsidies, you pay to bring more land into production—and create greater surpluses. You pay to buy and store surplus grain. And you pay, though only a pittance, to save these same wet lands from drainage or to reconstruct them as oases for wildlife.

Where will this ruinous nonsense get us? The outlook is bleak. Drainage—and recently drought—have the wild duck population heading for a new low. The recent winter survey showed ducks down as much as 23 percent in some flyways—almost a quarter off the previous low population of 1961.

What is the answer? Certainly Congress hasn't found it. And at this writing there is little hope that it will. It makes gestures. Recently it advanced $105 million against future duck-stamp revenue to speed up wetlands acquisition. But this is merely a loan, not a grant. What will we do when all duck-stamp revenue is being applied against the mortgage? And the grant was insignificant. Wisconsin alone has a cigarette tax which will in 10 years bring in $50 million for wetland purchases and other conservation projects. Even this is inadequate for the State.

What to do? Where to turn? Must we let the wet lands go and see the dust bowls come back? Must many Americans flee from the floods of spring? Shall we write off the ducks as we have the passenger pigeon?

No, says one militant group of sportsmen, which has organized and is acting. It has already made its first contribution toward the purchase of wet lands. Wet lands for Wildlife is the name of this group, which grew from a handful of Milwaukee men into a nationwide organization. It aims to do for the United States what Ducks Unlimited has been doing in Canada—preserving and resurrecting wetlands. Wetlands for Wildlife will concentrate on purchasing wet lands in this country where there is danger of losing them to agriculture or to the promoters and developers.

Frank P. Briggs, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, has said that some 4½ million acres of wet lands must be obtained now in order to maintain present waterfowl populations, not to mention building flocks. This acreage, says Briggs, would cost $150 million. "Using duck-stamp money on a pay-as-you-go basis, it will take from 38 to 45 years to complete this job," he explains. "Time has become our enemy—we cannot wait that long. The entire resource will be depleted."

Wet lands for Wildlife doesn't intend to wait. Its aim is magnificent in scope, but exceedingly simple in principal. It wants to provide this country with such a wealth of oases that wildlife will have no worries. Financing would be simple—and dramatic. Every man, woman, and child who thrills to th sight of wildlife on the wing would be asked to contribute dimes and dollars on a local basis. Then the thousands of organizations that Wetlands for Wildlife envisions would buy wet lands through a central board of directors and turn them over to Government agencies for development and management.

This, the founders emphasize, is not an organization solely for waterfowl hunters; it will embrace bird lovers, botanists, fishermen, trappers, minnow dealers—anyone truly interested in the problem. You and me and the man down the street, doctors, truck drivers, kids in school. In their hands will be the future of water—nature's greatest miracle worker.

Probably nowhere in this country is there a better example of the miracles that water has wrought than Wisconsin's Horicon Marsh. When I was a boy, this was a vast grass desert that was swept by raging fires each fall, their smoke hanging a pall over cities 20 and 30 miles away. It produced some packing hay, but otherwise its thousands of acres were as useless as the Sahara. Then a dam was thrown across the Rock River, and water seeped into even the most remote corners of the dry marsh.

Take a look at Horicon today. It has a big deer herd. It attracts as many as 80,000 Canada geese each fall. Special hunts are held for pheasants. Hound dogs run cottontails on its islands and along its perimeter. Tens of thousands of ducks use it. Tens of thousands of dollars worth of fur are taken from it. Raccoons bring off litters in old heron nests. Coots, gallinules, and a wealth of songbirds live amidst its vegetation. It is a paradise that was once a wasteland.

True, this is what water can do in a big way. But think of the tens of thousands of miniature Horicon Marshes scattered across the country. In Wisconsin alone there are 200,000 acres of wet lands in danger of drainage. Perhaps another 200,000 acres have been drained and then deserted. Their aridity could be transformed into lush, life-giving greenery.

But we can't wait. As Briggs puts it, "Definitely, this is the time for action. What we save now may be all that we will ever save."

Land prices continue to soar. In time, wet lands will be priced out of the wildlife market. There is a limit to what the public will pay to save or reclaim a marsh.

One thing is certain: Subsidies for farm drainage must be stopped. Federal spending for such drainage rose from $7 million in 1954 to $18 million in 1961, and much of the drained land was so inferior it couldn't raise a crop. Now permits are issued for drainage projects after they have been fully explored.

Important are small water areas of from 1 to 10 acres. Usually overlooked, they are in the aggregate the insurance we need against drought and floods. They are the oases that Wetlands for Wildlife can rescue immediately. They are the lifeblood of a stable water table in any State.

In this country there are tens of thousands of sportsmen's clubs. Each can launch a local branch of Wetlands for Wildlife. Lacking a wildlife organization to stimulate interest, community leaders should start the ball rolling. And for the millions who may not get an opportunity to join, there is the privilege of contributing to the future of wildlife in America.

Which brings us down to specifics. Just what is this new organization and what are its objectives? Here are questions answered by Ben Boalt, president of the Milwaukee chapter:

What is the purpose of Wetlands for Wildlife?

"To preserve wet lands by buying land that will be transfered to Federal or State agencies for management and maintenance; to provide breeding, raising, and growing areas for waterfowl, birds, fish, deer, and furbearing animals, flowers, trees, shrubs, and aquatic vegetation."

Why save wet lands?

"Suitable wet lands, acre for acre, are the most productive and beneficial type of habitat for wildlife. They store ground water, provide stabilization of runoff, create natural firebreaks, and provide excellent wildlife refuges."

Is an organization of this type needed?

"Yes. There is no other movement of this type in the United States. Wet lands are being exploited and destroyed at many times the rate they are being acquired for wildlife use."

Can't State and Federal agencies carry out the program alone?

"History has shown that they cannot. The maintenance cost of wet lands is much greater than the cost of acquisition. Most of the funds allocated by Federal and State sources is used in maintenance."

What do State and Federal agencies think of this movement?

"Both have provided staff members as advisers. Frank Briggs personally appeared at the kickoff meeting."

Where do membership moneys go?

"Solely for the acquisition of wet lands."

How does Wetlands for Wildlife get funds for operation and administration?

"Through a separate operating fund supplied by its trustees and through special donations from industry and foundations."

Is the organization nonprofit?

"Yes. It is registered as such."

Are donations tax deductible?

"Yes."

Who owns the land after it has been purchased?

"It becomes public land managed by State or Federal agencies."

Who may become members?

"Corporations, individuals, foundations, and any organization. The minimum membership donation is $3. Wetlands for Wildlife has spread to 17 States. Anyone interested should write to Wetlands for Wildlife, Inc., 3500 North Holton Street, Milwaukee, Wis."

Remember: Now is the time for action. What we save now may be all that we will ever save.

Independence Day of Upper Volta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic of Upper Volta, Maurice Yameogo; and His Excellency the Ambassador of Upper Volta to the United States, Frédéric Fernand Guirma, on the occasion of the second anniversary of Upper Volta's independence.

On August 5, 1960, the former French West African Territory of Upper Volta became the independent Republic of Upper Volta. Like the other now independent states of former French Africa, its Government is based on the principle of popular sovereignty, and legislative power is exercised by an assembly elected by direct universal suffrage. In 1959 Upper Volta joined with three other French West African territories—Ivory Coast, Niger, and Dahomey—to form the Conseil de l'Entente, a loose cooperative association which was continued after independence and which has resulted in the coordination of development plans and of various social, fiscal, and economic policies. The Conseil has set up a customs union providing for free trade among the four members and a solidarity fund for financial assistance. Thus, in political development the Republic of Upper Volta has not only become a modern democratic state but with three of its sister states has formed a unique cooperative association especially adapted to the African scene where economic and social development is of prime importance.

The land itself, which has no outlet to the sea, is a vast plateau rising from a low of 650 to a high of 1,000 feet. It is a land of wooded hills and harsh desert, of cattle-grazing savannahs and lowland rice paddies. Its history before the advent of the European is the tale of the empire-building Mossi, a people believed to have come from East Africa sometime in the 11th century and gradually to have created feudal empires throughout Upper Volta. In the 19th century it became a French protectorate, and later a territory of French West Africa. Now as an independent state and a member of the United Nations it is a respected participant in the world community.

Since the economy of Upper Volta is based on agriculture and animal husbandry, the increase of agricultural and livestock production has been one of the main goals of the country's economic development plans. The new republic has made concentrated efforts to intensify production through the adoption of soil conservation measures, the initiation of agricultural research programs, and the establishment of animal breeding centers. These measures attest to the clear sightedness of Upper Volta's economic planners.

And in the fields of health, education, and welfare Upper Volta has also exerted intensive efforts since independence. A program aimed at expanding primary and secondary education is underway, and it is hoped that full enrollment will be achieved within 15 years. Health conditions are steadily improving, and through the introduction of compulsory innoculations epidemics of infectious diseases such as yellow fever and the plague have been checked. Social welfare programs have been developed in urban areas. A workingman's compensation fund handles accident compensation and allowances to families of incapacitated workmen.

Thus, Upper Volta has quickly assumed the responsibilities of a sovereign state. In foreign relations it is peace loving and trustworthy. In domestic affairs the Government has willingly accepted its obligations toward its citizens and is devoting its every effort toward raising their standard of living as quickly as possible. We congratulate the Government and people of Upper Volta on the second anniversary of their independence.

Walt W. Rostow on How To Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I had occasion to read a fine publication entitled "Special Warfare," prepared by the U.S. Army, which describes in detail the new program in our Defense Department to meet the Communist challenge in guerrilla warfare.

In his message to Congress last year, President Kennedy stated:

> We need a greater ability to deal with guerrilla forces, insurrection, and subversion. We must be ready now to deal with any size of force, including small externally supported bands of men, and we must help train local forces to be equally effective.

During this past year, a tremendous effort has been made by our Government to train specially selected American troops in guerrilla warfare. I believe even our most severe critics must admit that an outstanding job is being done in this field.

This whole American effort is designed to meet Khrushchev's publicly stated objective that his primary tactic is the use of so-called wars of liberation and popular uprisings. By this he actually means wars of subversion and covert aggression. Cuba, Laos, and Vietnam provide examples of Communist or Communist-inspired wars of liberation with the familiar ingredients of insurgency, subversion, guerrilla warfare, and psychological warfare. The threat is not imaginary. It is real and present.

I was very pleased to read in this "Special Warfare" publication, an address by Dr. Walt W. Rostow, now Chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Council, delivered on June 28, 1961, to the graduating class at the U.S. Army Special Warfare Center.

I would like to call Dr. Rostow's excellent address to the attention of those who have been quick to criticize him and who have on occasion even suggested that he might be in some way contributing to a "no win" policy by this Government.

Dr. Rostow demonstrates a deep understanding of the Communist menace, and in this speech which I am including in the RECORD today, he analyzes the extensive changes now underway in the underdeveloped areas of the world. After describing the danger that communism holds for these newly emerging nations, he outlines the actions the United States must take.

In this speech, Dr. Rostow in fact spells out a "do win" policy for meeting the challenge of international communism.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Rostow's speech follows:

COUNTERING GUERRILLA ATTACK

(By Walt W. Rostow)

When the Kennedy administration accepted the responsibility of government, it faced four major crises: Cuba, the Congo, Laos, and Vietnam. Each represented a successful Communist breaching—over the previous years—of the cold war truce lines which had emerged from the Second World War and its aftermath. In different ways each had arisen from the efforts of the international Communist movement to exploit the inherent instabilities of the underdeveloped areas of the non-Communist world; and each had a guerrilla warfare component.

Cuba, of course, differed from the other cases. The Cuban revolution against Batista was a broad-based national insurrection. But that revolution was tragically captured from within by the Communist apparatus; and now Latin America faces the danger of Cuba's being used as the base for training, supply, and direction of guerrilla warfare in the hemisphere.

More than that, Mr. Khrushchev, in his report to the Moscow conference of Communist parties (published January 6, 1961), had explained at great length that the Communists fully support what he called wars of national liberation and would march in the front rank with the peoples waging such struggles. The military arm of Mr. Khrushchev's January 1961 doctrine is clearly guerrilla warfare.

COUNTERING GUERRILLA ATTACK

Faced with these four crises, pressing in on the President from day to day, and faced with the candidly stated position of Mr. Khrushchev, we have indeed begun to take the problem of guerrilla warfare seriously.

To understand this problem, however, one must begin with the great revolutionary process that is going forward in the southern half of the world; for the guerrilla warfare problem in these regions is a product of that revolutionary process and the Communist effort and intent to exploit it.

THE OLD ORDER CHANGES

What is happening throughout Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia is this: Old societies are changing their ways in order to create and maintain a national personality on the world scene and to bring to their peoples the benefits modern technology can offer. This process is truly revolutionary. It touches every aspect of the traditional life: economic, social, and political. The introduction of modern technology brings about not merely new methods of production but a new style of family life, new links between the villages and the cities, the beginnings of national politics, and a new relationship to the world outside.

Like all revolutions, the revolution of modernization is disturbing. Individual men are torn between the commitment to the old and familiar way of life and the attractions of a modern way of life. The power of old social groups—notably the landlord who usually dominates the traditional society—is reduced. Power moves toward those who can command the tools of modern technology including modern weapons. Men and women in the villages and the cities, feeling that the old ways of life are shaken and that new possibilities are open to them, express old resentments and new hopes.

This is the grand arena of revolutionary change which the Communists are exploiting with great energy. They believe that their techniques of organization—based on small disciplined cadres of conspirators—are ideally suited to grasp and to hold power in these turbulent settings. They believe that the weak transitional governments that one is likely to find during this modernization process are highly vulnerable to subversion and to guerrilla warfare. And whatever Communist doctrines of historical inevitability may be, Communists know that their time to seize power in the underdeveloped areas is limited. They know that as momentum takes hold in an underdeveloped area—and the fundamental social problems inherited from the traditional society are solved—their chances to seize power decline. It is on the weakest nations—facing their most difficult transitional moments—that the Communists concentrate their attention. They are the scavengers of the modernization process.

SCAVENGERS OF MODERNIZATION

They believe that the techniques of political centralization under dictatorial control—and the projected image of Soviet and Chinese Communist economic progress—will persuade hesitant men faced by great transitional problems that the Communist model should be adopted for modernization, even at the cost of surrendering human liberty. They believe that they can exploit effectively the resentments built up in many of these areas against colonial rule and that they can associate themselves effectively with the desire of the emerging nations for independence, for status on the world scene, and for material progress.

This is a formidable program, for the history of this century teaches us that Communism is not the longrun wave of the future toward which societies are naturally drawn. On the contrary. But it is one particular form of modern society to which a nation may fall prey during the transitional process. Communism is best understood as a disease of the transition to modernization.

What is our reply to this historical conception and strategy? What is the American purpose and the American strategy? We too recognize that a revolutionary process is underway. We are dedicated to the proposition that this revolutionary process of modernization shall be permitted to go forward in independence with increasing degrees of human freedom.

We seek two results: First, that truly independent nations shall emerge on the world scene; and, second, that each nation will be permitted to fashion out of its own culture and its own ambitions the kind of modern society it wants. The same religious and philosophical beliefs which decree that we respect the uniqueness of each individual make it natural that we respect the uniqueness of each national society. Moreover, we Americans are confident that, if the independence of this process can be maintained over the coming years and decades, these societies will choose their own version of what we would recognize as a democratic, open society.

COMMITMENTS TO FREEDOM

These are our commitments of policy and of faith. The United States has no interest in political satellites. Where we have military pacts, we have them because governments feel directly endangered by outside military action, and we are prepared to help protect their independence against such military action. But, to use Mao Tse-tung's famous phrase, we do not seek nations which shall stand up straight. And we do so for a reason: because we are deeply confident that nations which stand up straight will protect their independence and move in their own time toward human freedom and political democracy.

Thus our central task in the underdeveloped areas, as we see it, is to protect the independence of the revolutionary process now going forward. This is our mission and it is our ultimate strength. For this is not—and cannot be—the mission of communism. And in time, through the fog of propaganda and the honest confusions of men caught up in the business of making new nations, this fundamental difference will become increasingly clear in the southern half of the world. The American interest will be served if our children live in an environment of strong, assertive, independent nations, capable, because they are strong, of assuming collective responsibility for the peace. The diffusion of power is the basis for freedom within our own society, and we have no reason to fear it on the world scene. But this outcome would be a defeat for communism—not for Russia as a national state but for communism. Despite all the Communist talk of aiding the movement of national independence, they are driven in the end by the nature of their system to violate the independence of nations. Despite all the Communist talk of American imperialism, we are committed by the nature of our system to support the cause of national independence. And the truth will out.

THE VITALS OF VICTORY

The victory we seek will see no ticker tape parades down Broadway—no climactic battles nor great American celebrations of victory. It is a victory which will take many years and decades of hard work and dedication—by many peoples—to bring about. This will not be a victory of the United States over the Soviet Union. It will not be a victory of capitalism over socialism. It will be a victory of men and nations which aim to stand up straight over the forces which wish to entrap and to exploit their revolutionary aspirations of modernization. What this victory involves—in the end—is the assertion by nations of their right to independence and by men and women of their right to freedom as they understand it. And we deeply believe this victory will come—on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

If Americans do not seek victory in the usual sense, what do they seek? What is the national interest of the United States? Why do we Americans expend our treasure and assume the risks of modern war in this global struggle? For Americans the reward of victory will be simply this: It will permit American society to continue to develop along the old humane lines which go back to our birth as a Nation—and which reach deeper into history than that—back to the Mediterranean roots of Western life. We are struggling to maintain an environment on the world scene which will permit our open society to survive and to flourish.

THE DIMENSIONS OF INDEPENDENCE

To make this vision come true places a great burden on the United States at this phase of history. The preservation of independence has many dimensions. The United States has the primary responsibility for deterring the use of nuclear weapons in the pursuit of Communist ambitions. The United States has a major responsibility to deter the kind of overt aggression with conventional forces that was launched in June 1950 in Korea. The United States has the primary responsibility for assisting the economies of those hard-pressed states on the periphery of the Communist bloc which are under acute military or quasi-military pressure which they cannot bear from their own resources; for example, South Korea, Vietnam, Taiwan, Pakistan, Iran. The United States has a special responsibility of leadership in bringing not merely its own resources but the resources of all the free world to bear in aiding the longrun development of those nations which are serious about modernizing their economy and their social life. And, as President Kennedy has made clear, he regards no program of his administration as more important than his program for long-term economic development, dramatized, for example, by the Alliance for Progress in Latin America. Independence cannot be maintained by military measures alone. Modern societies must be built, and we are prepared to help build them.

Finally, the United States has a role to play in learning to deter guerrilla warfare if possible, and to deal with it if necessary.

A BATTLE FOR THE MIND AND SPIRIT

I do not need to tell you that the primary responsibility for dealing with guerrilla warfare in the underdeveloped areas cannot be American. There are many ways in which we can help—and we are searching our minds and our imaginations to learn better how to help; but a guerrilla war must be fought primarily by those on the spot. This is so for a quite particular reason. A guerrilla war is an intimate affair, fought not merely with weapons but fought in the minds of the men who live in the villages and in the hills; fought by the spirit and policy of those who run the local government. An outsider cannot by himself win a guerrilla war; he can help create conditions in which it can be won; and he can directly assist those prepared to fight for their independence. We are determined to help destroy this international disease; that is, guerrilla war designed, initiated, supplied, and led from outside an independent nation.

Although as leader of the free world, the United States has special responsibilities which it accepts in this common venture of deterrence, it is important that the whole international community begin to accept its responsibility for dealing with this form of aggression. It is important that the world become clear in mind, for example, that the operation run from Hanoi against Vietnam is as clear a form of aggression as the violation of the 38th parallel by the North Korean armies in June 1950.

In my conversations with representatives of foreign governments, I am sometimes lectured that this or that government within the free world is not popular; they tell me that guerrilla warfare cannot be won unless the peoples are dissatisfied. These are at best half truths. The truth is that guerrilla warfare mounted from external bases—with rights of sanctuary—is a terrible burden to carry for any government in a society making its way toward modernization. As you know, it takes somewhere between 10 and 20 soldiers to control 1 guerrilla in an organized operation. Moreover, the guerrilla force has this advantage: its task is merely to destroy, while the government must build and protect what it is building. A guerrilla war mounted from outside a transitional nation is a crude act of international vandalism. There will be no peace in the world if the international community accepts the outcome of a guerrilla war mounted from outside a nation as tantamount to a free election.

The sending of men and arms across international boundaries and the direction of guerrilla war from outside a sovereign nation is aggression, and this is a fact which the whole international community must confront and whose consequent responsibilities it must accept. Without such international action those against whom aggression is mounted will be driven inevitably to seek out and engage the ultimate source of the aggression they confront.

ALTERNATIVES TO GUERRILLA AGGRESION

I suspect that, in the end, the real meaning of the conference on Laos at Geneva will hinge on this question: It will depend on whether or not the international community is prepared to mount an International Control Commission which has the will and the capacity to control the borders it was designed to control.

In facing the problem of guerrilla war, I have one observation to make as an historian. It is now fashionable—and I daresay for you it was compulsory—to read the learned works of Mao Tse-tung and Che Guevara on guerrilla warfare. This is indeed proper. One should read it with care and without passion into the minds of one's enemies. But it is historically inaccurate and psychologically dangerous to think that these men created the strategy and tactics of guerrilla war to which we are now responding. Guerrilla warfare is not a form of military and psychological magic created by the Communist. There is no rule or parable in the Communist texts which was not known at an earlier time in history. The operation of Marion's men in relation to the Battle of Cowpens in the American Revolution was, for example, governed by rules which Mao merely echoes; Che Guevara knows nothing of this business that T. E. Lawrence did not know or was not practiced, for example, in the Peninsular Campaign during the Napoleonic wars, a century earlier. The orchestration of professional troops, militia, and guerrilla fighters is an old game whose rules can be studied and learned.

My point is that we are up against a form of warfare which is powerful and effective only when we do not put our minds clearly to work on how to deal with it. I, for one, believe that with purposeful efforts most nations which might now be susceptible to guerrilla warfare could handle their border areas in ways which would make them very unattractive to the initiation of this ugly game. We can learn to prevent the emergence of the famous sea in which Mao Tse-tung taught his men to swim. This requires, of course, not merely a proper military program of deterrence, but programs of village development, communications, and indoctrination. The best way to fight a guerrilla war is to prevent it from happening. And this can be done.

Similarly, I am confident that we can deal with the kind of operation now under way in Vietnam. It is an extremely dangerous operation, and it could overwhem Vietnam if the Vietnamese—aided by the free world—do not deal with it. But it is an unsubtle operation, by the book, based more on murder than on political or psychological appeal. When Communists speak of wars of national liberation and of their support for "progressive forces," I think of the systematic program of assassination now going forward in which the principal victims are the health, agriculture, and education officers in the Vietnam villages. The Viet Cong are not trying to persuade the peasants of Vietnam that communism is good: they are trying to persuade them that their lives are insecure unless they cooperate with them. With resolution and confidence on all sides and with the assumption of international responsibility for the frontier problem, I believe we are going to bring this threat to the independence of Vietnam under control.

ASSASSINATION OF A RISING CULTURE

My view is, then, that we confront in guerrilla warfare in the underdeveloped areas a systematic attempt by the Communists to impose a serious disease on those societies attempting the transition to modernization. This attempt is a present danger in southeast Asia. It could quickly become a major danger in Africa and Latin America. I salute in particular those among you whose duty it is—along with others—to prevent that disease if possible and to eliminate it where it is imposed. As I understand the course you are now completing, it is designed to impress on you this truth: You are not merely soldiers in the old sense. Your job is not merely to accept the risks of war and to master its skills. Your job is to work with understanding, with your fellow citizens, in the whole creative process of modernization.

From our perspective in Washington you take your place side by side with those others who are committed to help fashion independent, modern societies out of the revolutionary process now going forward. I salute you as I would a group of doctors, teachers, economic planners, agricultural experts, civil servants, or those who are now leading the way in the whole southern half of the globe in fashioning new nations and societies that will stand up straight and assume in time their rightful place of dignity and responsibility in the world community; for this is our common mission.

Each of us must carry into his day-to-day work an equal understanding of the military and the creative dimensions of the job.

I can tell you that those with whom I have the privilege to work are dedicated to that mission with every resource of mind and spirit at our command.

Metropolitan Water District Urges Defeat of Power Preference Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on August 3 the Los Angeles Enterprise carried the story of the rejection of regional power preference bills by the directors of the Metropolitan Water District of California. The reasons for the board's action were cogently set forth in the Enterprise article as follows:

SHARPLY ADVERSE: METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT URGES CONGRESS TO REJECT REGIONAL POWER PREFERENCES

Directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California have urged Congress to reject the regional power preference bills for the Pacific Northwest.

"We are convinced that this proposed legislation is sharply adverse to the long-range welfare of the people of the metropolitan water district," Joseph Jensen, chairman of the metropolitan water district board, said in letters to U.S. Senators THOMAS H. KUCHEL and CLAIR ENGLE and the southern California Members of the House of Representatives.

"It would, to our mind, set a precedent that could cost our taxpayers and water users very heavily in years ahead," said Jensen.

The preference bills, which would give Pacific Northwest users first call on Federal hydroelectric energy produced in that area, are an outgrowth of plans of the Department of Interior for a 1,000-mile transmission line connecting the Bonneville Power Administration with California.

Pointing out that the Metropolitan Water District is already spending $7 million a year for power to bring water from the Colorado River and will pay the major share of the great cost of pumping Feather River water to southern California, Jensen stated: "At first glance, it might seem, therefore, that we should favor the idea underlying these bills of bringing relatively cheap Federal hydroelectric power from the Pacific Northwest, where it is presently in surplus, to areas such as California and that we should perhaps be willing to take a chance on how long it might remain in surplus.

"To our view, however, this no longer is the pivotal consideration, if it ever was.

"All our information indicates that many, if not all, of the areas of the origin of Federal hydroelectric power will be seeking amendments to this proposed legislation giving regional preference to their utilities, private as well as public, over contractors located outside that region.

"We, therefore, believe that these bills endanger our present supply of power from at least Hoover Dam and jeopardize our hopes for a share of the energy to be produced at Glen Canyon Dam.

* * * * *

"We believe further that their passage could result in restricting or even cutting off entirely Federal hydroelectric power generated in central and northern California and needed to pump water through the State aqueduct to southern California."

Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Walterboro Radiocasting Co. of Walterboro, S.C., which operates station WALD has recently broadcast an excellent editorial which I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate. It is concerned with fiscal responsibility and the importance of supporting rather than tearing down our capitalistic free enterprise system. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Fortunately there seems lately to be quite a bit of interest by the average fellow in such subjects as Government fiscal policy, American capitalism, and the health and well-being of our economy. The interest is being shown by the average fellow like you and me. Such subjects were once the exclusive preserve of the economists, bankers, and Federal officials. There seems to be a genuine concern about which way this country is going. A recent column entitled "New Frontier: Tired Retread of New Deal," by Henry J. Taylor restates some basic truths about our capitalistic system that bear repeating. Taylor's opening premise is "Why don't we just double the spending and double the debt and really get the country going again?" He follows this by stating that a government is only a spender, not an earner. It cannot create prosperity. Before the politicians can give, they must first take. So, to take, they raise taxes and thus drain off capital investment.

Taylor says that capitalism is a condition that requires encouragement. Capitalism is a social condition as well as an economic matter. It takes more than just printing money to create prosperity, paper money being but a receipt in the exchange of goods. It is noted that excessive Government spending encourages a choking off process that slows the inertia of capitalism. Witness the various spending schemes of the New Deal and the New Frontier that usually end up failing to do the job. For instance, unemployment has not been substantially reduced. Taylor then makes this interesting observation concerning a basic economic fact regarding public confidence in our economy: "for every dollar's increase in the annual product of manufacture, disregarding price changes, someone must be willing to invest a dollar in the capital." For 150 years the value of products and the amount of capital employed have seen a parallel rise. Then, in a 7-year period beginning in 1932 private capital actually decreased 31 billion. In other words those with the capital to risk refused to do so because of no confidence in Government. We are now apparently witnessing a rerun of this unhappy state of affairs with the New Frontier calling the shots. The first misfire being the Government's intervention in the steel price rise. United States Steel incidentally, wanted a boost in prices to gain expansion and new machinery capital. At this point they had confidence in Government. Even if they could obtain this needed capital it is doubtful if they would now use it, as steel has no reason for confidence. This reflects right down the line. Few will argue that the ensuing stock market gyrations had nothing to do with a general loss of confidence. In the following weeks various schemes have been advanced to artificially raise confidence, the latest proposal being to cut taxes. This has practical political considerations involved since this is an election year. But how can we cut taxes to increase confidence and not cut spending. I would have more confidence from a spending cut, but we've heard no such proposals as yet. What we need in taxes is a general overhaul, not a minor tax concession, but that is a separate subject that we'll deal with later.

In the past few weeks some foreign countries have been cashing in their dollars for gold, thus showing European concern over our economy. Although most of the world's currency is still tied to the dollar, don't think for a moment that other countries will hesitate replacing the dollar with a more stable currency in which they have confidence. The German mark is a good example of a stable currency. It has become stable because the Germans and the rest of Europe have confidence in it. German Government rejected a policy of high taxation and more controls after World War II and their current prosperity is the happy result. Our Government has sent teams of "experts" to study European prosperity but don't look for any application of their findings right away for, just as a good Communist is one who never deviates from their written dogma, so to a good New Frontiersman is one who cannot deviate far from the preachings of its high priests.

There is no question that America has an obligation to improve itself; to provide a better material life for our citizens. America has a mandate to help countries and peoples less fortunate than we to a better life. We have a costly obligation to maintain a strong and ready military. Few will argue with that. But these things must be accomplished within the framework of our capitalistic economy. We can do only what we can afford.

We cannot afford to continue our gigantic foreign giveaways. Let's scale them down to what we can afford and still remain strong. We cannot afford in this period of history our gigantic giveaways to ourselves such as the $11 billion veterans pension under consideration. It would be nice, but we can't afford it. We cannot even afford the annual $11 billion interest on the national debt. As Henry Taylor says: "It's time for the New Frontier to make peace not with businessmen but with capitalism itself."

We don't pose for a moment as experts in matters economic, but we are certainly willing to listen and learn and these things seem reasonable to us. This is more than we can say for the New Frontier.

America's Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the East Side News, a publication with wide circulation in my congressional district. I commend my good friend, Abraham Schlacht, publisher of the paper, for this editorial dedicated in memory of his late brother, Harry H. Schlacht, in that it recalls to mind yet another East Sider who fought for freedom of expression in this country:

America's Freedom of the Press—Dedicated to the Memory of the Late Honorable Harry H. Schlacht, Noted East Side New York Newspaperman, City Official, and Outstanding Citizen: John Peter Zenger, 1697–1746

(By Abe E. Eisenstein)

July 28 marks the 216th anniversary of the death of John Peter Zenger, famous East Sider and New Yorker, printer and publisher, and America's first defender of the freedom of the press.

"Freedom is not a heritage, but a fresh conquest for each generation and freedom of expression must be vigilantly protected whenever and wherever it is in danger—today as in 1735 when Zenger was the pioneer in this battle.—Arthur Hays Sulzberger, board chairman, New York Times.

John Peter Zenger, a German immigrant, came to this city at the age of 13. His father died on shipboard and his mother, Johanna Zenger, with her three little children moved into a house on Cherry Street.

When he was 14, John was apprenticed to William Bradford, pioneer printer for the Colonies, for 8 years. After his apprenticeship, he was married to Mary White for a short time, and 3 years later, he married (September 11, 1722) Anna Catherina Maulin, of Cherry Street. When he was 23 years old, he was made a freeman of the city.

In 1725, John Peter Zenger formed a partnership with William Bradford, but in the following year he set up shop for himself on Smith Street. Eight years later, he moved to Broad Street. The first arithmetic text in the colony, Peter Venema's "Arithmetica," was brought out by Printer Zenger in 1730.

In 1733, he became editor and publisher of the New York Weekly Journal, set up by him and some prominent New Yorkers. The Weekly Journal, unlike Bradford's Gazette, was highly critical of the then Gov. William Cosby's administration.

One of the articles asserted in general terms that the liberties and properties of the people of New York were in danger. Governor Cosby, on November 17, 1734, had Zenger arrested and imprisoned for 9 months for criminal libel.

The court proceedings were conducted with the greatest unfairness and Zenger's attorneys were expelled from the bar. His ever faithful wife, Anna, ran the Journal during his stay in jail.

Brought to trial on August 4, 1735, John Peter Zenger was ably defended by a famous lawyer, Andrew Hamilton. He demanded: "Shall not the oppressed have the right to complain? Shall the press be silenced that evil government may have their way?" "Not guilty," said the jury.

This was the first successful assertion of the liberty of the press at a time when thought and speech were severely restricted. It led the future Founding Fathers to the free press guarantee in our first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which became effective on December 15, 1791.

In 1737, John Peter Zenger became Public Printer for the Colony of New York and 1 year later of the Colony of New Jersey. He remained the editor of the Weekly Journal until his death in 1746.

"Zenger the Printer—his work is done;
Soft be his slumber. Through storm and stress
Guard we the prize of the fight he won—
Bulwark of Freedom, a fearless press."

This legal case is a landmark in the history of the freedom of the press in this country. Today, this great historic event is depicted with murals, dioramas, historical documents, and exhibits in the Zenger Memorial (started in 1953), on the second floor of the Federal Hall, in the old Subtreasury Building at the corner of Wall and Nassau Streets, on the site of Zenger's jail.

East Siders, New Yorkers, and Americans everywhere salute the memory of that honest and courageous citizen pioneer publisher, John Peter Zenger, and his wife, Anna, who led a crusade for freedom of the press. Their names are permanently emblazoned on the roster of heroes in mankind's struggle against oppression.

Subsidy Will Not Make Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Henry J. Taylor from the News-Herald, Franklin and Oil City, Pa.:

Subsidy Will Not Make Prosperity

(By Henry J. Taylor)

If Government spending and debt can create economic development and make us prosperous, why don't we just double the spending and double the debt and really "get this country going"?

In simple truth, a government is only a spender, not an earner. It cannot create prosperity. It can only supply the conditions; the people must supply the prosperity. For anything politicians say they will give the people, they must first take away from the people. And if they seize so much in taxes that capital investment suffers or is discouraged ("What's the use?"), the jig is up.

Capitalism is a condition. It requires certain encouraging factors that center in human nature and free thought—including thoughts about risks, profits, and the future—for capitalism is a social condition as well as an economic matter.

The mere presence of "money" is not enough; and surely the distribution of mere pieces of paper popped out by a printing press and covered with ink are not enough. Any government can go this route, and all would be prosperous if this were possible.

But prosperity comes harder than that. Actually, paper money is merely a receipt acting as an agent in the exchange of goods and services and, as such, is not even one of the basic structural elements comprising tangible wealth.

That a dole, or subsidy, can be given which benefits certain individuals is undeniable. Some are needed. But as this expands unduly, a choking-off process occurs underneath which slows the flywheel of the whole system. Aside from the dole benefits, why did the enormous New Deal spending and debt program fail to reduce unemployment, and why must the New Frontier fail in the same way?

The answer is that both choke off and discourage individual investment and the capital flow at the root of our system on a much larger scale than the Government can "circulate money" at the top. This is the terrible leak in the discredited idea.

The politicians face a basic phenomenon of economic life, little understood but beyond dispute. For every dollar's increase in the annual product of manufacture, disregarding price changes, someone must be willing to invest a dollar in the capital.

In fact, the annual adjusted value of all manufactured products and the amount of capital employed in American industry have risen together in absolute parallel throughout 150 years, as the late Carl Snyder, famous statistician for the Federal Reserve, documented year by year in his monumental book, "Capitalism, the Creator."

Until 1930 earlier interruptions had little effect on our long-term rate of growth. But after our 1930 depression the New Deal took steps—some needed, some not; some wise, some unwise—which had an incredibly profound influence on the fundamentals of capitalism itself. An enforced redistribution of wealth took the place of an expansion of capital investment. The Government diverted the capital flow.

One result was no increase in capital investment by our citizens or the rest of the world. Accordingly, there was no increase in output in the United States in these 7 years before World War II saved—in an economic sense—the New Deal. In fact, these 7 years, 1932–39, reversed the pattern of the past 150 years and private capital investment actually decreased $31 billion.

Those who had nest eggs laid aside and other capitalists remained, but capitalism stagnated. For the stimulus for the capital flow has always been, of course, that it is worthwhile to risk one's savings and that if all turns out well, the proceeds will be protected. Capital contracts and prosperity does not expand when jobmakers see any government display unbridled power and a disregard for thrift, risk and the profit incentive.

The New Deal displayed much such disregard, and even the patient New York Times recently described the New Frontier as "a tired retread of F.D.R.'s New Deal measures." This is why President Kennedy's TV treatment of the complex steel issue confirmed earlier anxieties and was immediately reflected by the stock market. What was shown at once by this sensitive barometer must likewise affect the capital flow. And neither Mr. Kennedy nor our Nation can afford that.

It's time for the New Frontier to make peace not with businessmen but with capitalism itself.

Appendix

Greek-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the good relations which have existed for the past several years between the United States and Greece is indeed a bright spot in today's troubled world. The following editorial is an excellent summary of our relations with Greece.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Greek-American Relations" which appeared in the Hellenic Chronicle of Boston, Mass., on July 12, 1962:

GREEK-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Relations between the American and Greek Governments were never better than they are at present and the same may be said of the friendship between the two peoples. This friendship is the most sincere conceivable between nations today.

If we tried to analyze the reasons for this friendship we would find that in the first place common interests, common ideals, and common dangers are the chief factors that unite our countries. Both Americans and Greeks are true democrats and cannot conceive of existence without liberty and equality.

America needs allies in this part of the world. She knows that Greece, though a small country may be fully relied upon as a loyal and trusted ally.

During World Wars I and II the Greeks fought on the side of the Western nations. The Americans no doubt remember that during World War II when Greece was attacked simultaneously and without any provocation by two mighty armies, the Greeks did not stop to think of the consequences but immediately put up a stiff resistance and fought to the end, almost singlehanded. America, therefore, knows very well that we would do it again if and when the hour of crisis arises again.

For the Greeks, if that hour ever comes, we need the support of a powerful ally to be able to withstand an aggressive attack from our western and northern borders.

Besides common interests, however, there is another quite strong reason why we should be unhesitatingly supporting the objectives of America. We Greeks are not an ungrateful nation and we will never forget that, if we are today an orderly nation, with government and financial stability, communication networks, airports, harbors, busy factories, we are indebted for all this to the generosity and devotion of our great ally.

World War II and the subsequent guerrilla war had laid our country prostrate in complete ruins, and only a miracle could have restored it to its present condition. This miracle came from America in the form of UNRRA, Truman plan and Marshall plan and later the Public Power Corporation. Were it not for these aids, we should now certainly be on the other side of the Iron Curtain struggling for economic survival and longing for our beloved freedom and liberty.

America should not be influenced in any way by a very small minority of Greeks who criticize American policy. These form only quite a negligible minority belonging to the Leftist party and receiving orders from Moscow. They no longer can be considered as Greeks, because they often act against the interests of their own country and have repeatedly taken arms against their brothers, seeking to impose upon them a minority government similar to that of the Kremlin. Unfortunately these minorities are found in all countries throughout the world.

One thing is certain, that if the Kremlin authorities ever become foolish as to launch an unprovoked attack upon the Western Nations, Greece will again perform its righteous duty in the cause of justice and freedom, without hesitation and without any fear, as she did so in ancient times against the Persian hordes and during the War of Independence against the Turkish Empire and in recent times against the Italians and Germans.

We know that owing to our geographic position, we have to be the shock troop of the Western Nations. May that hour never come, but whatever is our destiny, we shall know that the ideals of democracy will always prevail against tyranny and brute force and "peace on earth" will become a reality.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The above was written by a pupil of Ernest Coulouras, of Lowell, who recently completed a year's teaching at Volos High School in Greece as a Fulbright exchange teacher. The youth is Byron Altintop, 17, arriving in this country this month as a Fulbright grant student to study at Bowdoin College for 1 year. Bowdoin is offering tuition free and Beta Theta Pi fraternity is providing room and board.

Thank You, NEA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a high honor was bestowed upon the Asbury Park Evening Press recently. They were selected by the National Editorial Association as the recipient of its annual award for community service. In being so chosen they won out over a large field of contestants including the winners of the Pulitzer Prize.

The Press has accepted the award with humility and on June 22 wrote an editorial "Thank You, NEA," for their great honor. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that another accolade can be added to this fine newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANK YOU, NEA

It is unnecessary to say that the Press is delighted to have been selected by the National Editorial Association as the recipient of its annual award for community service. The NEA is an old and honored journalistic association and any newspaper would be proud to receive its accolade. The Press won out over a large field of contestants including this year's winners of the Pulitzer Prize.

The newspaper service which won the NEA award involved the reapportionment of the New Jersey House of Assembly. This newspaper had long contended that reapportionment of the lower house of the legislature was overdue and that it was unfair for counties with a declining population to retain their old representation at the expense of the more rapidly growing areas. The Press contended in a suit that the legislature had no right to ignore the constitutional prescription for decennial reapportionment. The newspaper further argued that it was the duty of the supreme court to order legislative action to protect the citizen's constitutional rights. In a precedent-setting decision the court took jurisdiction in the case and announced it would act if the legislature failed to do so. A few hours before the deadline set by the court the legislature passed a bill reapportioning the seats in the assembly.

In its more than 80 years of life the Press has waged a continuing battle for what it deemed to be the public good. It regards such crusading as a vital element in the operation of a progressive newspaper. A newspaper that is loyally supported by its readers, as is the Press, owes something to those readers. It owes them an impartial news report, honest editorial comment, and a willingness to act as their spokesman in matters requiring a collective voice. The Press deems this to be its obligation to its readers and the public and it pledges itself to discharge this responsibility, in sincerity, to the best of its ability.

The Irish Brigade of Civil War Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact recognized by historians that men and women of Irish origin, in proportion to the relatively small population of the Irish among the peoples of this world, have fought and sacrificed more for freedom, than any other group. During the Civil War, they ranked after the Yankees and the Germans, in the number of men who served the Union cause.

Believing in the right of self-determination, many other Irishmen fought for the Confederacy and their beloved leader, Gen. Robert E. Lee.

In that conflict no unit distinguished itself more than the Irish Brigade of New York, commanded by Gen. Thomas Francis Meagher. On June 2, 1962, the Irish Brigade Memorial Committee of New York City conducted patriotic exercises at the scene of the Battle of Gettysburg.

Mr. Patrick J. Hogan, national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America and Canada, delivered the oration. I bring you his inspiring message, originally published in the July–August edition of the National Hibernian Digest:

ORATION DELIVERED BY NATIONAL PRESIDENT PATRICK J. HOGAN AT GETTYSBURG

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I want to thank the Irish Brigade Memorial Committee of New York City for giving me the privilege of representing the Ancient Order of Hibernians at these patriotic exercises.

This beautiful Celtic Cross, whose base is moistened by the tears of relatives and friends, was erected through the generosity of admiring sympathizers, to honor the men of the Irish Brigade, Gen. Thomas Francis Meagher their undaunted leader, and through them to perpetuate the memory of all those gallant Irishmen who fought and died in the American Civil War.

We, the Irish, of a later generation remember them with pride, and while we believe they have long ago passed to their eternal reward, we nevertheless offer a prayer, not only for them, but for all those who gave their lives for their conception of liberty and justice.

Paradoxical as it may seem, those of our race who fought for the Confederacy as well as for the Union, were inspired by the same lofty motives, and sustained by the same ideals and principles, and to their everlasting glory, all gave their last full measure of devotion to the cause which they served and in which they implicitly believed. That is our answer to the cynics and the critics who taunt us by saying that they were either unscrupulous adventurers or cold calculating soldiers of fortune. We are far removed from the tragic events of those times, but in view of the fact that some historians have found elements of justification in the southern cause, we reiterate with emphasis and in bones of finality, that they willingly and cheerfully gave their loyalty and their allegiance to that section of America which they called home.

We especially recognize that in their own way and in their own time, they were motivated by the doctrine of self-determination, but without bitterness, hatred, or animosity toward each other. Had it been otherwise, they could never have been brothers, and comrades in arms in the Fenian movement, whether here or in Ireland. With a little luck and even with a little help from the North and the South which they perhaps unconsciously helped to unite and solidify, they could also have been successful in securing the complete freedom of the land of their birth and the home of their forefathers.

Those brave men whose mortal remains hallow this historic battlefield, were lovers of liberty and they shed their blood to prove it, and in an inverted sense, they were crusaders for democracy and they gave their lives in vindication of their beliefs, their hopes, and their patriotic instincts.

Left here to sleep in oblivion and obscurity, those ideals and ambitions would in all probability have perished with them. But while the Irish of the present time treasure their memory and cherish the spirit which animated and sustained them in the pursuit of their lofty principles, there is still hope that a grateful Nation will at last and at least, give its moral and diplomatic support to bring to fruition in their island home the hopes and aspirations of the Irish people.

While Thomas Francis Meagher from Waterford, perhaps more than any other Irish hero, personifies and typifies the spirit and is representative of all the Irish soldiers whose deeds we celebrate and whose memories we honor here today, it is indeed tragic that his mortal remains are not commingled with theirs. If the Missouri River showed him neither mercy nor gratitude, it is our hope that his ardent soul is in peaceful communion with all his patriotic associates.

Far beyond the eloquence of words, their deeds, their sufferings, their supreme sacrifice should ennoble our lives and strengthen our determination to proclaim aloud for all to hear, "While our hearts are with our country, we love old Ireland still."

May their souls and all the souls of the faithful departed rest in peace.

Tribute to Ellsworth Bunker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the Brattleboro Daily Reformer of August 3, 1962, there was published an editorial written by the editor, John S. Hooper, paying tribute to an esteemed citizen of my county, Ellsworth Bunker. Mr. Bunker is a near neighbor of mine. He might perhaps be claimed by the county, and he is connected with three towns, in that his residence is in the town of Dummerston, his telephone line comes out of Brattleboro, and his mail goes to Putney, Vt.

We are all proud of the work of Mr. Bunker as Ambassador to Argentina, to Italy, and to India, and we are also proud of his more recent achievement—what appears to be a settlement of the Indonesian-Dutch controversy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER "BUNKER" HILL

(By John S. Hooper)

Ellsworth Bunker, of Dummerston, former Ambassador in Argentina, Italy, and India, has again successfully come out on top of what appeared to be an insurmountable mountain of international dissensions. Early this week in the quiet surroundings of a Virginia estate, this mild but firm negotiator brought Holland and Indonesia together in an agreement that restores peace where an ugly little war seemed about to erupt. He had been asked by President Kennedy to represent the United States in the negotiations, after Holland and Indonesia had accepted the U.S. role as intermediary.

It was the first time the United States can take the credit for terminating a war since President Theodore Roosevelt was the intermediary in ending the Russo-Japanese war of 1905.

Ellsworth Bunker's victory in obtaining peace where war threatened between Holland and Indonesia over West New Guinea rises high as one of the major achievements in the use of negotiation and diplomacy, rather than force, in effecting peaceful settlement of an international dispute. Had it not been successful, the possible extension of the conflict into Russia and United States spheres is all to apparent.

Now, again, this southeast corner of Vermont makes its contribution to international relations. Those of us who live here have reason to be proud of the link for good between us and the rest of the world that has been forged by our fellow citizens and neighboring institutions engaged in the great work of creating better international understanding. It can be especially happy about Ellsworth Bunker's latest achievement. This mild man with nerves of steel—a Democrat who has served both Republican and Democratic administrations in the field of foreign service—will doubtless now return to his Dummerston farm to tend his flowers and get some needed relaxation.

Where he will go next to serve his country we do not know. But wherever and whatever it is, he will do it with the quiet determination of a man who believes in mankind's capacity for thinking through its problems—and who so often has proved this point.

A High School Student Asks for Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter received from a high school student in California. I feel that the letter indicates a deep concern on the part of many students in America who have a desire to see their beloved country remain strong and independent. They are appalled at the lack of understanding of the international Communist conspiracy by many citizens who should know better. Young people in primary and secondary schools are in the most formative period of their life, and if their minds can be captured and directed to socialistic thinking, America will be faced with a generation of collectivists. This student asks for help. What are we, as Congressmen, doing to give them the assistance and guidance which they need? I have deleted the writer's name for fear that recognition would bring retribution.

The letter follows:

DEAR SIR: I am scared—scared to death. At least, I am if the people of my area are any indication of the feelings of the rest of the people in the United States of America. It seems that in this region, it is "quite fashionable to be a 'little pink,'" to quote a liberal. I am only a high school student, and by popular definition should be liberal, and then get more conservative as I grow older. I am anything but liberal, and support the conservative theories quite strongly. It seems there are not too many "older people" in this area, as most are quite liberal.

Perhaps you are wondering why I am so frightened. These are but a few of the reasons that have been said to me by liberals and have cause this fear:

"You know, the Communists have done so much for the people of Russia, and of course, China. I really don't think that they want a democratic form of government or

any other Western kind. The Communists have done so much for them."

"Why give the people of China a democratic government? After all, they have always looked up to some strong leader, and any democratic government would fail miserably. Why, it couldn't have accomplished any of the things that the Communist government has done."

"You are taking an awfully American viewpoint. After all, you should look at it from a neutral point of view. That is not going to accomplish anything. The Communists will consider the matter from a Communist viewpoint, and if you (as an American) consider it from an American viewpoint, well, we won't get anything accomplished."

"It's ridiculous to stand up and defend your country to that extent. That's being too American."

"I'm for peace—total peace. And since peace cannot coexist between Russia and the United States, well, I'm for total peace."

"No, I wouldn't mind giving up the United States if it meant peace. After all, a Communist peace is better than none at all."

"Sure, we basically believe in the same thing—fight communism. But we believe in fighting it by different methods. You can't fight Communists by denying them the rights of this country. Let them alone—they will destroy themselves."

"Are you going to join the Junior Statesmen of America?" That'll be the day. Look, we are all liberals and leftists in that club. It's open to all, but the conservatives—you know, Dr. Schwarz and Barry Goldwater followers—joined at first, but we ridiculed them so that they finally had to resign out of sheer humiliation."

"The Junior Statesman of America. Don't join that. Your ideas are too American. You can't get anything done in there unless you are completely left and radical."

"Conservatives, radicals, John Birchers, all the same thing."

"You want to start a pro-American or anticommunism organization here at high school? No, I don't recommend it, that organization could turn into a Fascist one.

"Yes, I believe in the United States, but if there is ever a real threat of war, I say 'let's surrender.' After all, 'Better Red than dead.'"

"Who me? Of course I'll stand up for what the United States is based on—after all, I'm an American citizen."

With citizens like this for Americans, who needs Communists for enemies?

A great number of these were said by high school students—the future leaders. They had to be influenced somewhere, at home, at schools? Or have they fallen to Communist propaganda. Do they say this out of fear, when in a group? I know from experience that when you stand up and defend your country—the United States of America—and criticize the Soviet Union and communism, you are immediately tagged as a "John Bircher" or "radical." A few may say, "I completely agree with you," but are scared to come out in public or in a classroom and defend you or their country.

Do you have any information or anything that could help me to try to show others the evils of communism and try to reconvert these ignorant Americans to good American citizens? It is in the high schools, especially, where the future leaders form their pro-Communist opinions.

Please, sir, what can be done to stop this?

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Independence Day of the Ivory Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic of the Ivory Coast, Felix Houphouet-Boigny; and His Excellency, the Ambassador of the Ivory Coast to the United States, Konan Bédié, on the occasion of the second anniversary of the Ivory Coast's independence.

The Ivory Coast, which first became known to Europeans as a result of exploratory voyages by the Portuguese in the 14th and 15th centuries, was administered by France from the end of the 19th century until 1958. At that time its people voted in favor of the constitution of the Fifth French Republic, thus making the Ivory Coast an autonomous state in the French Community. On August 7, 1960, the Ivory Coast became an independent republic, while remaining in the French Community. Today its 3 million citizens, many descendants of ancient kingdoms, are striving to consolidate their young nation.

We are recently privileged to welcome the President of the Ivory Coast, M. Felix Houphouet-Boigny, who came on a state visit. President Houphouet-Boigny, formerly a physician, has become known to the world for his efforts to achieve freedom for the Ivory Coast and for his faith in cooperation with other nations. After the Second World War he was a founder and leader of the African Democratic Rally—R.D.A.—an interterritorial political party which assumed the lead in the movement for independence of the French-African territories. For many years he represented the Ivory Coast in the French National Assembly. President Kennedy has praised his extraordinary efforts in promoting African unity and cooperation within the Council of the Entente, the Union of African and Malagasy States, and through a conference of 20 African nations held recently at Lagos, Nigeria. We trust that President Houphouet-Boigny's visit to the United States and the conversations between the two Presidents have strengthened the friendly relations between our two countries. President Houphouet-Boigny's visit followed a trip by Attorney General Robert Kennedy to the Ivory Coast, where he represented the United States at the first anniversary of that nation's independence last August.

The Ivory Coast has cooperated closely with France in its economic and social development. Attractive housing is being vastly expanded. The proportion of children receiving elementary education has increased ninefold during the last few years. Until 1958, higher education was available only in the universities of France or nearby Senegal; now a university is being established in Abidjan, the capital city of the Ivory Coast. Public health services are being strengthened both at Abidjan and in the interior administrative subdivisions. Meanwhile, an economic boom is in progress, and President Houphouet-Boigny, who successfully led the struggle for African emancipation, is now embarked on a bold experiment of cooperating with foreign governments and investors. We salute the Ivory Coast on the second anniversary of its independence.

Philadelphia: Policing the Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the July 19, 1962, issue of the Reporter magazine contains an article by free-lance writers Ruth Marossi and Gerald Krefetz entitled "Philadelphia: Policing the Police."

The article points out that in 1958, Mayor Richardson Dilworth established a police advisory board composed of prominent Philadelphians to hear complaints of alleged police mistreatment of citizens.

The Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 report on the administration of justice noted the Philadelphia policy advisory board "is apparently the first such agency created in this country." The Commission commented that—

> The general consensus is that the Philadelphia board has met with some success. Demands are now being made in other cities that similar boards be established.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article published in the Reporter on this subject, which tells how well the board has been working.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA: POLICING THE POLICE

(By Ruth Marossi and Gerald Krefetz)

"Police brutality in the United States today is a serious and continuing problem in many parts of the country." This was the finding of a recent report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, a body created by Congress. Though most police departments work in a decent and lawful manner, the Commission was "concerned about the number of unconstitutional and criminal acts committed by agents of American justice who are sworn to uphold the law and apply it impartially."

If the third degree is the most flagrant violation, it is by no means the only one. Harassment, illegal search and seizure, refusal of permission for an arrested person to telephone his family or lawyer, discrimination based on race, religion, or national origin, shakedowns, destruction of property—all these, the report indicates, are common.

The United States has a rapidly growing crime rate. In the decade ending in 1960 the number of serious crimes rose four times as fast as the population. The last 2 years witnessed an increase of 16 percent, though lately this precipitous rise has shown signs of abating. Under these circumstances it is hardly surprising that both official and public pressure are brought to bear on police departments to solve and if possible prevent criminal acts. Unfortunately, the result is sometimes overzealous law enforcement.

Many cities have internal police boards presided over by police officials who are primarily concerned with breaches of regulations within the force. Their makeup, viewpoint, and normal obligation all tend to favor the police. Even if the board should find in the complainant's favor, there is little it can do for him. The offending officer may be disciplined, but the victim receives little more than psychological compensation, for only in rare and extraordinary circumstances is a police record destroyed by the authorities. Consequently, after a run-in with the law, one must forever admit to an arrest record on applications for employment, naturalization, passports, and on other legal forms. Qualifying the answer with lengthy explanations often merely serves to arouse and increase suspicion.

Philadelphia has been making a noteworthy effort to find a solution to this state of affairs. An experiment has been carried on there that guarantees an impartial hearing to victims of police mistreatment. In 1958, Mayor Richardson Dilworth established a police advisory board composed of civilians to hear complaints. In cases of false arrest the citizen is guaranteed not only a written apology by the police but also the privilege of having his arrest record destroyed before his eyes.

For a number of years several Philadelphia civil organizations—the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission, the Civil Rights Committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association, the American Civil Liberties Union, the NAACP, the American Friends Service Committee, and the National Conference of Christians and Jews—had discussed the need for such a board. The incident that finally shocked Philadelphia into action concerned a patrolman who assaulted a superior and who on two separate occasions committed brutal attacks on private citizens. The police department board charged him only with insubordination. This led councilman Henry W. Sawyer, III to observe that such departmental inquiries were "a farce when it comes to hearing civilian cases."

On September 30, 1958, the mayor appointed five prominent Philadelphians who were willing to serve the city in a unique experiment, among them Clarence Pickett, a Nobel Peace Prize winner and executive secretary emeritus of the American Friends Service Committee. Because of increased caseloads, the board has recently been enlarged, and two panels of four members each will hear cases alternately.

The procedures are simple and direct: anyone with a complaint against the police who files a statement within 90 days can have his case reviewed. If in the opinion of a member of the board the complaint warrants investigation, it will be thoroughly examined by a special police investigator. A public hearing is scheduled after complainants, police, and respective counsel have been given sufficient notice. Strict rules of evidence are not followed; the board attempts to keep the proceedings as informal as possible. The civilian board in no way conflicts or interferes with the jurisdiction of the police disciplinary body. It is purely advisory and its recommendations are not binding.

Here is how the board operated in one difficult case. Shortly after 3 o'clock on a Monday morning, a car was stopped by the police. A white clergyman was on his way home after lecturing at a university some distance away. The other occupant of the car was a Negro student, a girl. When the clergyman asked why he had been stopped, the officer first replied that it was a "routine check," but then hinted at prostitution. At the station house, the officer in charge said that seeing a racially mixed couple was reason enough to suspect prostitution. The clergyman requested a hearing by the civilian board "because of the embarrassment caused us * * * the arbitrary and unwarranted detention * * * and perhaps illegal arrest." After investigating, the board found that the car had been stopped and its occupants taken to the station house merely because the couple were of different races. It recommended that the officer involved be suspended for 2 days and given a departmental reprimand; he was also asked to write a letter of apology. Moreover, the board requested that a departmental directive clarify policy and prevent such incidents in the future. Here, as in other cases, police officials cooperated fully with the board and acted on its suggestions.

Within the last year, increasing publicity has doubled the number of cases brought before the board. More than half are settled amicably without hearings, and the board has found in favor of the police as often as against them. Indeed, in some cases the board has praised the "self-control and restraint as exemplary and befitting a professional police officer" in the face of civilian abuse and insults.

As one might expect, many cases presented to the board involve Negroes, who now make up nearly a fourth of Philadelphia's population. As James Barker, former head of the Philadelphia branch of the NAACP, has said, "Police violence has always been the lot of the Negro. It seldom receives much notice, nor have the maltreated complained very loudly." At least the new arrangement makes it more possible for those who feel they have been mistreated to rgister their complaints. But actually, complaints from Negroes, while numerous, have not been disproportionate. And the board's records indicate that cases come from all racial groups and classes, white as well as colored, businessmen as well as laborers.

The Philadelphia experiment has been in operation for only about 4 years—still rather a short time as municipal institutions go. Nevertheless, it has already made its mark despite meager funds and a small staff. There has, of course, been opposition to the board. It has been accused of existing merely to protect the rights of a small part of the population. "Minority groups are handled with kid gloves, given every advantage far beyond what is due. You call them 'minority groups,' I call them high-pressure groups," remarked Bernard Lemisch, a leading attorney for Philadelphia's Fraternal Order of Police. "The board is a kangaroo court. No outsider should sit in judgment on the police. Civilians don't understand police procedures."

The main criticism from the police association, however, really lies elsewhere: it complains that the police cannot do an effective job if someone is looking over their shoulder. The 1960 meeting of the National Conference of Police Associations declared that police review boards were subverting and undermining law enforcement. Since then, patrolmen's benevolent associations have taken strong stands against the establishment of review boards in a number of other cities where Philadelphia's example is being studied or is already being followed. It must be noted, however, that Philadelphia's crime index, as reported to the FBI, has decreased although the national average has risen in recent years. This would not seem to indicate that Philadelphia's police force has been either demoralized or undermined by the board's efforts to protect citizens against police brutality.

The Failure of the Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ramona, Calif., Sentinal:

THE FAILURE OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

President Kennedy's 49-plus-percent popular vote in 1960 did not constitute a mandate of the people. The new President was inclined to disregard the fact that not even one-half of the country was with him, and launched into vigorous radical programs of welfare-statism and power grabbing. He has run into the proverbial stone wall. The present situation, although clear to some, is an enigma to the political scientists.

Former Presidents can point with irritation and place the blame on a Congress dominated by another political party—Mr. Eisenhower to a Democratic Congress and Harry Truman to a GOP Congress. Not so, Mr. Kennedy. His programs have suffered defeat at the hands of a Democratic Congress—some of the opposing Congressmen having been seated by the Kennedy machine. It can be truthfully stated that the Democratic Congress has stubbornly resisted the Kennedy programs. This resistance has been blamed on the southern Democratic bloc. The facts belie the allegations. It must be difficult for the administration to reconcile this argument with the present filibuster (at Sunday's writing) by a stubborn element of the Democratic Party, NEUBERGER, GORE, KEFAUVER and others, against the Kennedy plan to place the authority of the Telstar satellite in the hands of A.T. & T.

The Kennedy record of legislation is a dismal one this year. Of his must legislation, civil defense, literacy tests, foreign aid, job retraining, urban affairs, farm controls, aid to education, foreign trade, medicare, and tax revision; only job retraining, foreign aid, and foreign trade are to his credit, while he lost the big ones, medicare, urban affairs, aid to education, literacy tests. His tax revision and farm controls are being watered down.

Despite the administration's talk of better times, many economists now believe the Nation will enter another recession. Other economists are now publicly scoring his almost total failure of domestic welfare and reform programs. As it appears today, the President's promise of a half-billion-dollar surplus in 1963, will in reality exceed $7 billion deficit, possibly extending to a $10 or $12 billion deficit. If tax cuts are adopted, or emergency spending programs are necessary, the largest peacetime deficit in history may result. Labor officials are of the opinion that a 6-percent unemployment rate may result this fall, and even that will be difficult to maintain.

Much of the lack of confidence in the country today can be traced to the mailed fist attack of Kennedy upon the steel industry, and his chronic antibusiness thinking.

The records of the steel industry are in Government hands at present, and there is little wonder that there is a reluctance to invest money in corporations who can be subject to administration manipulation.

More lack of confidence in investment is developing by the national pressures of unions on the administration for a shorter workweek, which to an investor means less production and plummeting profits. Until the attitudes toward business change, Mr. Kennedy cannot expect a return of confidence.

Some lack of confidence is developing among thinking people who will not accept the strange economy policies of an administration which raises the debt ceiling, promotes immense welfare programs and still talks of reducing taxes at the same time. Who invites industrialists to the Capital as his guests, while his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, conducts massive antitrust and monopoly probes simultaneously. Thinking people can easily see through the ruse of the administration withholding results of tax reduction studies until fall, just before the November elections. And San Diego people, for example, are awaiting and are aware of the inevitable fact that San Diego will receive some defense contracts in time for elections in the fall, to prove that the President holds the economy of this and other areas in his hands. His party stalwarts are shaken by his angry denunciation of his own party congressional members, and his demagogic appeal to the public to replace them with men more amenable to his programs.

The President has been severely rebuffed this year, not because he is not personally popular, but because his programs are not. He would do well, as the American citizen's chief representative, not to stage a lone battle against the people he represents. And not to abuse the stand of the sectional representatives of the citizenry, the State's elected representatives to Congress.

"They do abuse the King that flatter him,
For flattery is the bellows that blows up sin;
The thing which is flatter'd, but a spark
To which that blast gives heat and stronger glowing;
Whereas reproof, obedient and in order,
Fits kings, as they are men, for they may err."
—Shakespeare's "Pericles."

Custer Battlefield, Little Big Horn River, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the August 6, 1962, edition of the New York Herald Tribune includes a column by John K. Hutchens describing the Montana literary scene as exhilarating. Hutchens traveled to the Custer Battlefield near the Little Big Horn River in Montana to write "Literary Montana," in his daily book review column.

In describing Montana as the State with the highest per capita book-use rate among all Western and Midwestern States, Hutchens writes, "Wherever you look out here, or so it seems, someone is writing a book, or is planning to, or has just finished one."

I remember when Hutchens' father, Martin Hutchens, was editor of the Daily Missoulian and Missoula Sentinel when I was growing up in western Montana. The elder Hutchens edited the two Missoula dailies from 1917 to 1926, and was himself a literary Montanan, who wrote a lively column that his readers avidly followed. Martin Hutchens was a Montana pioneer, having arrived in the territory in November 1889 on the day before statehood. He worked there for the old Helena Independent until 1893 when he moved to New York. When he came back to Montana in 1917, he had a wife and two children, one of whom was John Hutchens, aged 12 at the time.

John Hutchens returned to Montana this June for the first time in 30 years, and was so impressed by the cultural climate of the State that he ended his "Literary Montana" column with the declaration, "any other place containing only 600,000-odd citizens should be so lucky."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hutchens' column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAILY BOOK REVIEW—LITERARY MONTANA: "CUSTER BATTLEFIELD, LITTLE BIG HORN RIVER, MONT."

(By John K. Hutchens)

As every American Indian schoolboy knows, reversals suffered by Gen. George Armstrong Custer at this place on Sunday afternoon, June 25, 1876, left only two survivors on the non-Indian side, (1) the U.S. Army horse Comanche, now to be seen in a Kansas museum, finely stuffed and very lifelike but incontestably dead, and (2) your correspondent, who, stuffed finely with Montana steak, for a reasonable fee will disclose to any student of General Custer's misadventure the definitive story thereof.

No takers? Your correspondent had feared as much, and accordingly has occupied his holiday time hereabouts with a once-overlightly survey of the literary scene in this State that he last observed too many years ago.

THINGS HAPPEN

The Montana literary scene, strikes him as exhilarating. Oddly, there are Montanans who would reject that salute. Montana, this faction declares, has retreated into a cultural as well as political isolationism; at the very least, a kind of stultifying indifference.

Here it is, the Republic's fourth largest State, about 3½ times the size of Pennsylvania, but with a population only a bit larger than Pittsburgh's. That is to say, about 675,000 souls, thanks to huge stretches of Rocky Mountains and far-reaching plains which those souls justly cherish but do not find exactly habitable.

THEY WRITE

This enormous, thinly populated area, even when a territory on the way to statehood, had its writers and readers. Its first published book, Thomas J. Dimsdale's "The Vigilantes of Montana" (1865), was hailed by no less a one than Mark Twain as the "bloodthirstily interesting" classic it turned out to be.

Wherever you look out here, or so it seems, someone is writing a book, or is planning to, or has just finished one. Up in Great Falls is A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Pulitzer Prize-winning author of "The Big Sky," "The Way West," "These Thousand Hills." The same town harbors Dan Cushman, of "Stay Away, Joe!" renown. Over in Missoula are the greatly talented Dorothy M. Johnson, who wrote "Indian Country" and "The Hanging Tree"; that professorial firecracker, Montana State University's Leslie A. Fiedler ("Pull Down Vanity"); Marion T. Place, a topflight writer for teenagers ("Wild Horse Trap," "The Copper Kings of Montana"); and a newcomer to the bookstalls, Virginia Weisel Johnson, granddaughter of a noted Montana pioneer, John R. Toole, who will make her debut soon with the first full-fledged biography of Gen. Nelson A. Miles, "The Unregimented General."

Bozeman has its Naomi Lane Babson, who wrote the fine frontier novel, "I Am Lidian" (1951), Cut Bank its wise, salty Dan Whetstone ("Frontier Editor," 1956), Kalispell its mystery-writing Margaret Scherf, the Bitter Root Valley its ageless poet and tireless newspaper woman, Bessie K. Monroe.

THEY READ

But there shouldn't really be anything astonishing about all this. Statistics say that the printed word is esteemed out here. The State's total public library book stock (not including the State Historical Library) was 1,231,561 as of 1961, and these books were borrowed 3,087,457 times, giving Montana the highest per capita book use rate among all Western and Midwestern States. Three bookmobiles traveling 55,026 miles circulated 1,200,508 books to 150,756 readers in rural areas.

And what do Montanans like to read? About what Americans anywhere like to read, except that Montanans have a special liking for books about their own State history, says Susan Eaker, whose sparkling bookstore in Helena, the capital city, would adorn Fifth Avenue. Mrs. Ruth O. Longworth, librarian of the State library commission, agrees. High prices of hardcover novels, and the wealth of good paperbacks, have diminished the interest in new fiction, Miss Eaker adds, though she doesn't take much nonsense from customers who complain about those prices.

"Be quiet, Charlie," she said to one such patron in your correspondent's hearing. "I know what you pay for scotch."

But there is more to the local cultural life than this. There is the Montana Institute of the Arts, founded in 1948 by Harold G. Merriam, professor of English emeritus at Montana State University, who from 1920 to 1939 made American literary history as publisher of "The Frontier," later "Frontier and Midland," finest of western "little magazines." (Excerpts from the historical documents it carried will appear this fall as "Frontier Omnibus," to be presented by the Montana State University Press.)

NO IVORY TOWER, THANKS

In 14 cities and towns throughout the State the Montana Institute of the Arts brings together more than 700 people interested, as creators or audience, in the fine arts, music, drama, history, writing. It holds an annual festival, conducts story and poetry contests, sends exhibits of the arts on the road, publishes a lively quarterly. The mountains are tall here, but there are no ivory towers.

To many a Montanan and out-of-stater Montana's chief literary glory is the library of the State Historical Society, a superb collection of some 50,000 items—rare books, documents, manuscripts, newspapers, and other published and microfilmed material—available to any serious student under the auspices of the knowledgeable, gracious Miss Mary K. Dempsey, chief librarian. How many writers have used this treasurehouse there is no telling, but it's quite certain at least 50 books have been written that would not have existed without this source that their authors drew on, together with the historical society's 11-year-old Montana:

The Magazine of Western History, which under Michael S. Kennedy's editorship has few peers as a regional periodical.

Pittsburgh, or any other place containing only 600,000-odd citizens, should be so lucky.

Harmful Effects of Smoking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on smoking which calls attention to the harmful effects of tobacco. The article was first published in the New Republic, and subsequently has been reprinted in many, many newspapers. Recently the Wallowa County Chieftan has reprinted the article, for the purpose of giving this information to its many, many readers in northeastern Oregon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wallowa (Oreg.) County Chieftan, July 8, 1962]

IN OUR OPINION

Last year tobacco companies spent $114.5 million on television advertising for a product which disinterested scientific observers regard as a proven carcinogenic agent. Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, widow of her cancer-stricken predecessor and herself a recent sufferer from the disease, has been asking how such advertising affects the public interest which TV is required by law to serve. An associate director of the National Cancer Institute has called for Federal control of tobacco products on the ground that they are a hazard to health. Britain's Royal College of Physicians has recommended Government action toward cutting the consumption of tobacco.

The average American over 14 years of age smokes 4,000 cigarettes a year, and this produces a Federal and State tax yield (exclusive of purchase taxes) of more than $3 billion. Though the processing industry is dominated by a handful of giant corporations, tobacco farming is incredibly fragmented. Most growers of burley, the distinctive American cigarette tobacco, are licensed to grow less than 1 acre of it, and allotments of a tenth of an acre are common. Another branch of the Federal Government protects raw tobacco prices so rigidly that gross returns to these farmers, in relation to their costs, are maintained at a level over 40 percent higher than for a common crop such as corn. 1962 tobacco acreage is 4 percent ahead of last year, and yields have been rising, too.

No farm organization has said a word about the astronomically higher incidence of lung cancer among smokers over nonsmokers. It is left to the corporations to deny they have any interest in attracting younger adolescents by advertising which insistently suggests that cigarette smoking is a prerequisite for sexual prowess and professional success. And it is the industry which has set up a board of hired scientists to point out that the only cancer which cigarette tar has ever been observed to produce was on the nonhuman tissues of a laboratory animal's skin. On evidence less conclusive than this, however, the Government ordered the destruction of a chemically sprayed crop of cranberries a few years ago.

The Neglected Area of Management Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to find one of our outstanding corporation officials taking a position that it is the responsibility of management to take leadership in politics.

An address by William C. Stolk, chairman, American Can Co., at the general management course, American Management Association, on May 23, 1962, and a summary of discussion follow:

THE NEGLECTED AREA OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY—REMARKS BY WILLIAM C. STOLK, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN CAN CO., AND SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION AT THE GENERAL MANAGEMENT COURSE, AMERICAN MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, HOTEL SHERATON-ASTOR, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 23, 1962

It is a pleasure to be here today, as any meeting or discussion pertaining to management is one in which I am tremendously interested. I hope that the few remarks I make will stimulate your thinking about this important subject and that during the question and answer period we may pursue it further.

Recently I read the synopsis of a newly published book entitled "What Makes a Good Manager?" (I have not read the book—the synopsis says it is 937 pages long.) It outlined 12 requisites of good management—from "the art of delegation" to "knowing how to budget."

But missing from the summary of 937 pages on how to be a good manager was any reference at all to what I have chosen to call "The Neglected Area of Management Responsibility."

What I am really troubled about is that too many managers are limiting the application of the basic and sound principles of leadership to their own business operations.

For the past 30 years American business has been on the defensive and business management, particularly top management, has ben almost apologetic about its performance and leadership in helping to build the greatest industrial Nation in the world. I think one of the reasons for this defensive attitude has been the aggressive tactics of the Government. The results indicate very clearly that while we have been "sticking to our knitting" and thinking only of our own business, the politicians have been wooing and winning the loyalty of the man on the street—the voters—many of whom, unfortunately, still look on business with suspicion and distrust.

We have been too willing to believe that politics is for the politician, which is almost as naive and unrealistic as saying that our country is protected from enemy attack by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Let's face it; the politicians and the union bosses have done a better selling job, and what makes it worse is that we are losing the sale by default.

A problem still unsolved

I do not want to get involved in the steel issue, but for the sake of emphasis, I want to call your attention to the first paragraph of an editorial entitled "Steel: A Problem That Is Still Unsolved," which appeared in the April 21 issue of Business Week:

"When the chairman of United States Steel Corp. told his press conference last week, 'I do not know anything about politics,' he made one of the classic understatements of all time. But he was only reflecting an attitude that has been voiced, often with pride, by a great many American businessmen."

In my opinion, this attitude has to change because industry's only hope is to educate the voter to the true nature of our free market economy, the system of competitive enterprise. We can't win him by printing high sounding phrases on economics, which even some economists don't understand.

Nor do we make the right impression by having the voter believe that management is selfish, is only interested in personal gain, is out to destroy unionism, and lives in an ivory tower which is very exclusive and expensive. We can win him by encouraging management at all levels to become interested in and take an active part in public affairs at the community, county, and State levels.

In the past several years hundreds of companies have instituted programs in public affairs; our company is one of those. We have clearly stated the responsibility for public affairs as part of the job of managers at all levels. More than 3,000 of our people have taken courses, which we and others have made available, in the art of practical politics and many of them are now working actively in the parties of their own choice.

Needed: Creative leadership

These things are necessary and good, but the job cannot stop there. In discharging his public affairs responsibility, a manager must initiate constructive change, just as he must in managing his own business operations. The failure has been, in too many cases, reacting to events instead of exercising creative leadership in the improvement of our way of life. By reacting instead of leading, too many business managers have been creating a negative image of business as being against everything except the status quo.

I would not want to give you the impression that we think we have completely solved this problem in our own company. We have not, and we know we still have a long way to go in both learning how to do it and then motivating all managers to want to do it. But two specific examples will help demonstrate the opportunity to do the job better.

A community success story

We are proud of the success story recently demonstrated by the managers and employees of our large papermill in Alabama. In order to have access to the essential raw materials—trees and water—it was necessary to locate this mill in an area where there were not any large modern schools. To operate the mill, it was necessary to transfer skilled technicians and managers to the Alabama woodlands from other parts of the country. The educational opportunity for their children was severely limited. So on their own initiative they joined with local people in a political campaign which won the election necessary to increase their own taxes to pay for better school facilities and teachers. Result: All local people benefited.

To get such problems solved requires willingness to devote time and leadership in areas outside the manager's direct business responsibility both at the local and national level.

An industry success story

The story of "Keep America Beautiful" is, I believe, an example of how businessmen can take constructive action in these areas when it is required.

All of us agree that litter along the highways of America is a serious problem brought about, of course, by the millions of cars carrying Americans on wheels in all sections of the country. The solution in our opinion is education of the public. To this end, industry established the Keep America Beautiful organization, financed by industry and dedicated to the proposition that the public must be educated not to throw litter and deface our beautiful countryside.

When the service clubs of America realized that industry was serious about their willingness to finance this venture, they undertook the job of educating the communities and were instrumental in having every State in the Union pass laws against litter and fine people who get caught carelessly distributing it. The momentum and interest of the public has been a tribute to America. Walt Disney has recently prepared a film called "The Litterbug," which will be shown in theaters throughout the United States and, beginning with the fall semester, will be shown, I hope, in all the schools in America. Industry will finance such distribution.

On most of the political issues on which Americans are divided today, the difference of opinion concerns not the goals, but the best means of achieving them.

Business and industrial managers should be qualified by their knowledge and experience to help make the right choice.

Leapfrog into the future

The technologies developed in business and industry have made it possible for us to leapfrog into the future. We have the opportunity to solve our own domestic problems and to assist in the less developed areas of the world in all of the essentials of modern living.

What took decades to accomplish by the pioneers of America can now be done in a matter of years. In place of covered wagons and railways carved through the wilderness, we have airplanes and soon may have rockets. The occasional little red schoolhouse has been replaced by radio and television. Instead of having to string power cables over hundreds of miles to remote areas, we can now place atomic reactors for electric power in the midst of jungles and deserts. Instead of the letter and newspaper by packet ship, we will soon have round-the-world instantaneous communications by space satellites.

Advances in agriculture, food processing, and packaging have made it possible to insure not only adequate nutrition but a high standard of living all over the world.

These are opportunities on a national and global scale. But the same leadership qualities are requisite in every community in which we live and work. Don't you agree this is a golden opportunity for management? I hope that you will seriously consider the application of the basic principles of management to this so far "neglected area of management responsibility."

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Question. Mr. Stolk, you stated that participation in public affairs should be a part of management responsibility at all levels. How much time can your executives take away from their direct responsibilities to spend in this political area?

Answer. Well, our plan is to have the individual make that decision himself. Our experience has been that the time an individual spends on this work is not at corporate expense or sacrifice. Usually the time they put in on this is after hours, or weekends, or at lunch time. I doubt very much if many would take time off their jobs. Their good judgment is the best insurance that the interest of the company will not suffer.

Question. Mine is a followup question on that. Would you give a leave of absence if a man were elected to Congress?

Answer. I sure would. We couldn't pay him, but he would not lose any of his service years if he did. I wouldn't be at all surprised if one of our enthusiastic young men would be running for Congress one of these days and we would welcome the fact. I think it would be proof positive that our program is sound.

Question. I understand that you are associated with the Committee for Economic Development. Could you tell me what kind of acceptance you have had on the CED's school education program and what are your plans for the future with respect to economic education?

Answer. Well, the acceptance has been, in my opinion, very favorable. For example, there are only five newspapers across the United States who came out against the program. I believe that we have got to have better economic education. And I think we will have to start in the high school. We cannot wait and start in college. This, of course, means that we have a tremendous need to educate teachers because there are not enough teachers in the United States to do the kind of job that needs to be done. It is surprising to me how many schools do not have any semblance of economic education in their curriculum. Incidentally, I heard a president of a college talk on this subject last week and he said that trying to change the curriculum in a school or college was about as practical and emotional as moving a cemetery.

Question. I understand the point that you are making that management has this responsibility to the community. You are saying community participation is in reality part of their job and you encourage them in that direction. Do you provide them any recognition if they do that portion of their job well?

Answer. Yes, sir. We do consider it part of their job. If they do that portion of their job well, it is recognized. In one case I am thinking of, it gave an individual an opportunity to show how good he was outside of the plant. He moved from a plant managership to an assistant general manager of his particular division. Nobody in the company knew that he had the talent for creating enthusiasm in people. He had never before had the opportunity. This fellow had been doing an excellent job of running a plant. Nobody ever dreamed that he had the talent of going outside of the plant and organizing people to become interested in political campaigns.

It is an educational job. I know some people are still reluctant. They don't understand how we in the general office can be quite as enthusiastic as we appear to be. But we are not asking them to follow any set pattern. We just ask that they take an interest in the community and do what they think is right for the community. We will be satisfied with that. It is people in the field who have demonstrated how effective this can be.

Question. Would you add that in employing people for executive positions you would consider an aptitude for activities political and otherwise as a prerequisite?

Answer. I am going to have to answer your question in two ways. First of all so far we have not, as a company, gone outside for executive talent. We have been very fortunate in building from within so that that question has not been asked yet. I for one would be in favor of asking such a person—especially if he were going to be a top executive of the company—how he felt about this. I think it is very important that the American Can Co. continue this policy.

Question. Should not there be more effort in each of our respective companies to educate the employees, to point out the mutual interests that management and labor have in their particular own bailiwick? The profit motive—in other words—when the stockholders of a corporation earn a profit on their investment, this also is an advantage to the individual employees. Isn't it a case of starting the job at home?

Answer. You have to start it a home. Of course, I am assuming that the job is underway. We have in our company, for example, a very serious problem, in that most of the can factories have contracts with the Steelworkers' Union which is the same union the steel industry and the aluminum industry have. We have been trying for the last 3 years to educate all employees through our supervisors, and in group meetings, that you can't compare the steel industry with the can industry. That's like comparing pineapples with bananas. The problems of the industries are different. The competitive conditions are different. We have been conducting educational programs so that all employees can understand the competitive problems that we are facing. But that's a job that has to be going on at all times.

Question. In line with your policy of encouraging management to take leadership in community and political affairs, do you also advocate that individual companies take a position on issues as a company?

Answer. We do. Of course, we point out why a position we take is good for the country. And, if it is good for the country, it is good for the company. If we stick to the areas of public welfare, we don't think we can be wrong. If we get people to believe the facts that are in the public interest, the American Can Co.'s interests will be taken care of.

Question. Can you give us an example of what you consider a noncontroversial problem?

Answer. Well, the cost of government. We think that the cost of government is entirely too high. We think that the tax structure is too high as a result of the high cost of government. We think the expansion of business is retarded by the high cost of government and the high taxes. We also think that depreciation policies should be changed because this too would be in the public interest.

Question. Do you care to comment on the present method of reporting profits? What can we do so that the unions cannot misconstrue and point out the millions of dollars you have made?

Answer. I think the area that needs lots of explaining is the amount of investment that is needed to produce a profit. Now we have been talking for the last few years about the tremendous amount of money that we have been putting into our business to enable us to stay in business. I don't think the problem is so much explaining the profits but explaining what it takes in the way of investment to make the profits.

Ready Reference Guide to Senate Press Aids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the National Editorial Association, publisher of the National Publisher, has compiled for the first time a ready reference guide to Senate press aids. This guide appeared in the July 1962 National Publisher, which is distributed to newspapers nationwide.

I believe that publication of this list in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be helpful to the many fine reporters who work in the Senate and House press, radio-TV, and periodical galleries, as well as to the many newspaper editors around the country who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by mail.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the "Ready Reference Guide to Senate Press Aids."

There being no objection, the guide was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

READY REFERENCE GUIDE TO SENATE PRESS AIDS

(Revised through July 20, 1962)

President of the Senate, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; press secretary, George Reedy

State	Senator	Press contact
Alabama	Lister Hill, Democrat	Bob Smith.
	John Sparkman, Democrat	Grover C. Smith.
Alaska	E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, Democrat	Miss Mary Lee Council.
	Ernest Gruening, Democrat	George Sundborg.
Arizona	Carl Hayden, Democrat	Fritz Kessinger.
	Barry M. Goldwater, Republican	Tony S. Smith.
Arkansas	John L. McClellan, Democrat	Ralph Matthews.
	J. W. Fulbright, Democrat	Pat Fleming.
California	Thomas H. Kuchel, Republican	Warren Francis.
	Clair Engle, Democrat	Charles Bosley.
Colorado	Gordon L. Allott, Republican	Jack Ware.
	John A. Carroll, Democrat	Harmon Kallman.
Connecticut	Prescott Bush, Republican	David S. Clarke.
	Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat	James P. Boyd.
Delaware	John J. Williams, Republican	Miss Eleanor R. Lenhart.
	J. Caleb Boggs, Republican	William Hildenbrand.
Florida	Spessard L. Holland, Democrat	Oscar Elder.
	George A. Smathers, Democrat	William McHale.
Georgia	Richard B. Russell, Democrat	Earl Leonard.
	Herman Talmadge, Democrat	William H. Burson.
Hawaii	Hiram L. Fong, Republican	Miss Leila Villada.
	Oren E. Long, Democrat	Paul Southwick.
Idaho	Henry C. Dworshak, Republican	Edward Woozley.
	Frank Church, Democrat	Porter Ward.
Illinois	Paul H. Douglas, Democrat	Howard E. Shuman.
	Everett Dirkson, Republican	Harold E. Rainville.
Indiana	Homer E. Capehart, Republican	Gene Dawson.
	Vance Hartke, Democrat	John Munger.
Iowa	B. B. Hickenlooper, Republican	Dan O'Brien.
	Jack Miller, Republican	Loyal Meek.
Kansas	Frank Carlson, Republican	Miss Betty Rosness.
	James B. Pearson, Republican	John Conard.
Kentucky	John S. Cooper, Republican	Bailey Guard.
	Thruston B. Morton, Republican	Albert B. Brooke, Jr.
Louisiana	Allen J. Ellender, Democrat	C. B. Morrison.
	Russell B. Long, Democrat	William E. Leonard.
Maine	Margaret C. Smith, Republican	Bill Lewis.
	Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat	Donald Nicoll.
Maryland	J. Marshall Butler, Republican	Lee Edwards.
	J. Glenn Beall, Republican	Ben Whitehurst.
Massachusetts	Leverett Saltonstall, Republican	Charles Clapp.
	Benj. A. Smith II, Democrat	Robin L. Pell.
Michigan	Pat McNamara, Democrat	Edwin N. Winge.
	Philip A. Hart, Democrat	William B. Welch.
Minnesota	Hubert Humphrey, Democrat	Winthrop G. Griffith.
	Eugene J. McCarthy, Democrat	Clinton Boo.
Mississippi	James O. Eastland, Democrat	Courtney Pace.
	John Stennis, Democrat	Phil Stroupe.
Missouri	Stuart Symington, Democrat	Fred McGhee.
	Edward V. Long, Democrat	S. William Brown, Jr.
Montana	Mike Mansfield, Democrat	Raymond Dockstadter.
	Lee Metcalf, Democrat	Merrill Englund.
Nebraska	Roman L. Hruska, Republican	Dean Pohlenz.
	Carl T. Curtis, Republican	Lynn Mote.
Nevada	Alan Bible, Democrat	Alan Jarlson.
	Howard W. Cannon, Democrat	Chester B. Sobsey.
New Hampshire	Norris Cotton, Republican	Kenneth Roberts.
	Maurice Murphy, Jr., Republican	Norman E. Bailey.
New Jersey	Clifford P. Case, Republican	Sam Zagoria.
	H. A. Williams, Jr., Democrat	William E. Oriol.
New Mexico	Dennis Chavez, Democrat	Henry R. Smith.
	Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat	Howard Bray.
New York	Jacob K. Javits, Republican	Richard Aurelio.
	Kenneth B. Keating, Republican	Mrs. Vera R. Glaser.
North Carolina	Sam J. Ervin, Jr., Democrat	W. Hall Smith, Jr.
	B. Everett Jordan, Democrat	William B. Whitley.
North Dakota	Milton R. Young, Republican	Bill Wright.
	Quentin N. Burdick, Democrat	William O. Scouton.
Ohio	Frank J. Lausche, Democrat	Ray M. White.
	Stephen M. Young, Democrat	Herbert Jolovitz.
Oklahoma	Robert S. Kerr, Democrat	John Meek.
	A. S. Monroney, Democrat	Mrs. Beth Short.
Oregon	Wayne Morse, Democrat	Miss Phyllis Rock.
	M. B. Neuberger, Democrat	Lloyd Tupling.
Pennsylvania	Joseph S. Clark, Democrat	Bernard E. Norwitch.
	Hugh Scott, Republican	Eugene S. Cowen.
Rhode Island	John O. Pastore, Democrat	C. J. Maisano.
	Claiborne Pell, Democrat	Raymond N. Nelson.
South Carolina	Olin D. Johnston, Democrat	Thomas W. Chadwick.
	Strom Thurmond, Democrat	Harry S. Dent.
South Dakota	Karl E. Mundt, Republican	Walter Conahan.
	Joseph H. Bottum, Jr., Republican	John S. Arnold.
Tennessee	Estes Kefauver, Democrat	Charles Caldwell.
	Albert Gore, Democrat	Jack W. Robinson.
Texas	R. W. Yarborough, Democrat	Louie E. Mathis.
	John G. Tower, Republican	C. Herschel Schooley.
Utah	Wallace F. Bennett, Republican	Edwin C. Bliss.
	Frank E. Moss, Democrat	Grant W. Midgley.
Vermont	George D. Aiken, Republican	Charles Weaver.
	Winston L. Prouty, Republican	Robert Donihi.
Virginia	Harry Flood Byrd, Democrat	J. Heywood Bell.
	A. Willis Robertson, Democrat	William Foster.
Washington	W. G. Magnuson, Democrat	Carl Downing.
	Henry M. Jackson, Democrat	Brian Corcoran.
West Virginia	Jennings Randolph, Democrat	James W. Harris.
	Robert C. Byrd, Democrat	Louis I. Freed.
Wisconsin	Alexander Wiley, Republican	Herbert Kirstein.
	William Proxmire, Democrat	Jerry P. Clark.
Wyoming	Gale W. McGee, Democrat	Richard Cook.
	J. J. Hickey, Democrat	Miss Louise Love.

Assignment for the Sixties: To Strengthen the Arm of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, at its recent national convention the General Federation of Women's Clubs installed Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, of Concord, N.H., as president. The people of New Hampshire are particularly proud of Mrs. Arnold, who is an exceedingly brilliant woman with outstanding qualities of leadership.

In assuming the presidency of the general federation, Mrs. Arnold gave a challenging address entitled, "Assignment for the Sixties: To Strengthen the Arm of Liberty."

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSIGNMENT FOR THE SIXTIES: TO STRENGTHEN THE ARM OF LIBERTY

(By Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, of New Hampshire, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs)

With deep humility and great appreciation I accept the heavy responsibilities and the great honor of this assignment. This is the second greatest honor that has come to me. The first, I am certain you suspect, since you know of the Arnold partnership, was to be invited and to have been Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold.

At this moment you may expect me to say something earth shaking and electrifying, but the greatness if there may be any on this occasion, and I believe there will be, will not be in me or in what I say. The distinction lies instead in you, in your being here and in what you will do in your communities in the days that are ahead. From the bottom of my grateful heart, I appreciate your standing to honor not me but the General Federation of Women's Clubs and those who have served in this office. This is as it should be, for this is the largest, most vital force of organized womanhood in the world with a long history of dedication to the highest of purposes, the improvement of mankind.

Seventy-five years ago last October 28 New York City was filled with 70 bands, and flags with 38 stars flew high. The big event of the day took place on Bedloe's Island. As the enormous veil was pulled away, a tremendous roar echoed across the harbor. Everyone agreed that the Statue of Liberty was magnificent. The lady had come to the United States as a gift from the people of France. She was placed at the entrance to the harbor to welcome the millions who would follow her to the new world. How fitting that liberty should be represented by a proud woman for women are sensitively concerned for husband, children, friends, home, and community. The Statue of Liberty's torch is held high by a strong arm. She represents the dream of freedom nurtured in the human mind almost since time began. She serves as a symbol of freedom for men and women to worship as they choose—freedom from tyranny and oppression, and freedom to say or write what is on our minds and in our hearts. Our purpose, then in this organization for the next 2 years will be "to strengthen the arm of liberty" to reinforce the spirit of freedom so that this torch may never flicker but glow with greater brightness in an atmosphere of faith, not fear, in a new dedication to moral courage and humanitarian ideals and with a new concern for spiritual values and the sanctities of life that our godless adversaries can never destroy.

How do we plan to do this? It's a matter of our motto, Unity in Diversity, and of making our club collect a vital and fulfilled promise. Nor will one department be more important than another. The age old classic "the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of you," aptly applies here. The importance of all departments, all divisions should be clear as they supplement each other and are important to each other. For example, safety is a matter of public affairs, of the home, of education, of fine arts, of conservation and of international affairs. Citizenship works with the new citizen, the young citizen, the mentally disturbed or ill citizen, the vacationing citizen, the voting citizen. All departments will be separate packages yet interlocking units working toward a common goal without sharp definition where one department's work begins and the other ends. This is a dynamic concept that the greatness of our age lies not only in the choosing of important work to do but lies in the care and perfection of all work that is done. It discourages trivia and self-importance. No chairman will be exalted above another. To broaden our scope, our programs will be translated into the native languages of our clubs in the Council of International Clubs.

Questionnaires were sent to more than 100 business, civic, and government leaders including the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, asking them to indicate their thinking as to the greatest need and challenge to the women of this organization during the next 2 years. In their opinion the greatest challenge to the General Federation of Women's Clubs is, first, to be completely and thoroughly informed on current affairs; secondly, to spend more time in studying the tax system and our economic structure; thirdly, to recognize a need for a better literacy program, both at home and abroad; and fourthly, a complete understanding of the problems of education and its financing, as well as the dangers of the present dropout crisis. Quite naturally the businessman was interested in business problems and the conservationist in conservation problems, but what is important is that in our diversified program for this administration we meet all these challenges and recognize the needs with our program "to strengthen the arm of liberty."

Our collect begins: "Keep us, Oh God, from pettiness, let us be large in thought, in word, in deed."

To me this is our international affairs development with study programs in every division. Believing that history has imposed on the United States the task of helping to shape a world order in new dimensions—that is spiritually, socially, politically and economically—the international affairs department will emphasize that collective security is a concept of the free world and the most important factor in the defense of free nations against the menace of communism. NATO, OAS, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS will get special attention in relation to the area which is being studied. The divisions of this department will be Europe, the Americas, Africa, Near East, Asia, Far East and the United Nations. A workshop at the United Nations for the Board of the General Federation of Women's Clubs has been planned under the direction of the U.S. mission to the United Nations and with the personal interest of the U.S. representative to the United Nations.

Study engenders action. The realization that millions of people abroad are unable to take advantage of the fundamental freedoms because they cannot read the words which civilization has taken 20 centuries to transcribe is frustrating and tragic. To establish a literacy program abroad requires not only materials and equipment, but also trained teachers and technicians. Several private and government agencies were contacted concerning this problem. Everyone said it was the greatest need abroad but the "how to do it" loomed too large for any one organization. Assurance was essential that publications and materials would be suitable and that teachers and technicians were well educated and loyal to the free world and our democratic society. Over a 10-year period we have had a happy relationship with CARE. We presented our proposals to them and with them we venture forth in the first literacy program of its kind in eight countries: Costa Rica, Guatemala, Hong Kong, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, and Turkey. No organization has ever attempted a project of this variety and magnitude. The preliminary work has been an enormous task. I contacted teachers and technicians. Workers in the field checked and rechecked the practicality of proposals. The State Department encouraged and complimented us on this effort. No stone has been left unturned to make certain of the most forceful use of our resources. The limitation of eight countries was heartbreaking, for the need is so great in so many corners of the globe. Other possibilities and areas were considered but, feeling a great sense of the need for concentrating for perfection, we limited our efforts to these countries. We believe this will be a giant step in eliminating illiteracy from the face of this earth. My recommendation for at least a part-time secretary for the Council of International Clubs is to provide a focal point of exchange. In connection with the program to encourage travelers to our country from abroad, our hostesses in the Council of International Clubs will serve as special ambassadors for the General Federation of Women's Clubs for women from other countries. Many of our State federations will be active in the international scholarship program which has special emphasis on Latin America.

The club collect says "let us be done with fault-finding and leave off self-seeking."

Before we start fault-finding we need to do some fact-finding. Each State president will be asked to find the greatest challenge in her State and work in that single area and to encourage club presidents to follow the same pattern in their communities. The community achievement program and contest should be a part of every community—urban and rural—with all women's clubs uniting toward one single goal and purpose, since the axis of the world breaks through at the community level. Six leadership mobilization seminars will be held in October in connection with the community achievement program. As the military needs more guided missiles, the community needs more guided leaders. Leadership mobilization should be incorporated in department work to assure coordination and to direct specific attention to this need. Community improvement might well include more adult education sponsored by our clubs and we will vitalize the ESC reading for credit program. Two prizes of $500 each will be given to the two clubs in each State which prove themselves most outstanding in promoting a scholarship program. A three-dimensional study of the problems of school finance at the local, State and national level will be prepared, and there must be increased determination to assist education in meeting its tremendous challenges. School dropouts are potential losses. In these days of specialization and automation, the unskilled person is a waste of manpower and young people who ought to be our greatest resource become our greatest liability.

Have you thought of the 1 out of 10 adults in the United States who has not completed more than 4 years of education, and of the 3½ million who are condemned to a life of anonymity because they cannot write their names, and of the 3 million who cannot read and are easy victims of the unscrupulous? The statistics concerning the illiterate in your State will startle you. My pride has been boundless in the realization of the desire of the members of this organization to "strengthen the arm of liberty" by taking the lead in providing literacy workshops where volunteers will learn how to teach the fundamentals. Also, in this connection, we will work to "strengthen the arm of liberty" by extending a helping hand to the foreign born, the newcomers to our shores. We will help them to understand life in America with an organized program of orientation in the community—visiting the library, the supermarket, the bus station and inviting them to our homes. We should remember that no small part of America's vitality and strength is rooted in the blood and sinew of those who had vigor and courage to reject oppression by an act of individual faith in the free world to leave their own soil. They, too, must be given an opportunity to "strengthen the arm of liberty." Our clubwomen must provide a helping hand.

Our club collect says: "May we put away all pretense and meet each other face to face, without self-pity and without prejudice."

Our convention in Milwaukee, June 10–14, 1963, will be followed by an international conference in Munich. A large group of carefully selected representative women from the NATO countries will have arrived in this country 2 weeks before and traveled by way of Washington to Milwaukee with daily meetings with our clubwomen en route. They will attend our convention in Milwaukee for 3 days and return to New York. The women from our country en route to Munich will fly to New York from Milwaukee to meet them. Paired according to interests, a doctor's wife with a doctor's wife, a teacher with a teacher, the women from America will have personal understanding as well as friendship by close personal contact even before we arrive in Europe. We will visit eight NATO countries in 25 days with an international conference and with meetings with clubwomen in every country. Such a tour will accommodate the busy clubwomen with limited time and money but with a desire to understand the world on the powerful basis of woman to woman and neighbor to neighbor.

A 3-day American heritage pilgrimage to Washington during the Easter weekend will, of course, feature an open house at the General Federation of Women's Clubs headquarters. This will provide an incentive to see the functional and practical conveniences of our home on N Street. It will serve as a get-acquainted meeting for those who want to visit for only a 7- or 9-day period the Caribbean and to see our clubs in action there and participate in an exchange of understanding of problems and friendships in the Western Hemisphere.

The next words of the collect are: "May we never be hasty in judgment and always generous."

The fine arts will serve as our bonus in beauty with the activities geared toward renewing pride in and love of country, through a knowledge of its culture; inspiring art work in the very young, as well as in those who desire to use this knowledge for serious purpose or for relaxing recreation; and inspiring art for those who may find in it therapy for these turbulent times. Above all, the people in my town and your town must be made aware of the important role in interpreting the meaning of democracy as living creatively by encouraging the best in the performing arts.

In the past the General Federation of Women's Clubs has been a leader in the attack on obscene literature. It's time we hit the sawdust trail again. This time let us inform the consumer and the merchant of the excellence of paperbacks that are available and replace the revolting with the splendid. Let's blow the whistle on dramas that make us blush and let's commend the television station that presents a never-to-be-forgotten documentary. Let's encourage the newspapers and magazines which present the names of decent people who are performing worthwhile activities and let's not spend that dime for the newspaper with the cesspool pictures and headlines.

The collect says, "Let us take time for all things. Make us grow calm, serene, and gentle."

The child's first experience with democracy comes in the home where he learns the meaning of teamwork by agreement and of individual responsibility. With exceptional program material, we have streamlined the home program with the hope that it may have special appeal for the young homemaker. With divisions involving family living and child development, family economics and home management, house improvement, and modern food trends we are certain that America's upright homes will keep this Nation from falling. Religion and spiritual values penetrating into all departments with an attitude of brotherly love will give proof that democracy has its firm foundation in truth and its lofty roof the will of the people for freedom and justice in accordance with the will of God. The spiritual ideal is not a luxury but an absolute necessity, for to us human life is sacred and inviolate.

The collect says, "Teach us to put into action our better impulses straight-forward and unafraid."

That is exactly what we will do in public affairs. Freedom is something that has been won in a few places by a few people through ingenuity, self-discipline and effort. The desire for freedom of choice grows with education, economic growth and political responsibility. Because of the Communist challenge, America has found itself both guardian and protagonist of free civilization. We need to look at America. We need to determine what to expect of America. Every clubwoman in America will be a participant in a study course based either on the Rockefeller panel report, "Prospect for America," or on the report of President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals, "Goals for Americans." With America placed in a position of leadership, we need to know our values, our goals, our mistakes, our faults. A leader, however, be it individual or nation, is always a target for criticism. Our democracy was founded by those with conflicting points of view, but needling criticism can become a dangerous habit and an undermining force. The seeds of doubt—doubt of ourselves—can become too strong whether they come from extremists on the right or extremists on the left. American women must feel sincere, sophisticated pride in our country in exactly the same way we admire women with similar pride in their country. We are proud of what we will do to coordinate health work. We will ask our women to wear medical identification tags for their own protection. To study and act in the field of gerontology is to bring hope and comfort and intelligent understanding in an area where misunderstanding flourishes. New campaigns to make certain that voters use their privilege to the greatest advantage will be initiated as we encourage our members to participate actively in government at the local, State, and national levels. There will be special concern for youth in crime prevention, in juvenile court, in proper street lighting and in community center facilities. Safety will emphasize driver training clinics, use of seat belts, and for the first time in this country will conduct a workshop for leaders and editors of many nationality groups to assist in familiarizing visitors and newcomers to our land with American traffic regulations. Concerns of home safey will include poisons and fire hazards. A publicity workshop will be available for every State. A complete kit for study of the tax system and our economic structure has also been prepared and will help to meet the challenge of being informed.

And the collect states: "Grant that we may realize it is the little things that create differences. That in the big things of life we are at one."

A drop of water, a small clod of earth, our oil, gas, iron, fissionable fuels, animals, mountains, forests, lakes—unity in diversity—the glories of America under the name of conservation with the need for deep realization of our veritable survival in that work, conservation. Based on the premise that conservation is the wise use of renewable and nonrenewable natural resources, conservation becomes not just a term, but a way of life. We will strive for multiple use in resource development with private enterprise and government assistance in an effort for the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest possible time. Because of the tremendous difference in conservation problems and needs in this country and after careful study with officials of the Department of Agriculture and Department of Interior as well as private interests, States will be grouped according to similar conservation needs and problems with five regional conservation chairmen. Our natural resources are interdependent and interrelated and they need to be considered and understood in this perspective. By studying the area conservation problems, experiencing special conservation days in every State and becoming acquainted with a telescoped conservation program, an interest in comparative concerns may be more fully developed and better understood for a more forceful and effective program. Conservation concerns our economy, our nutrition, our recreation, and our very way of life.

The collect concludes: "And may we strive to touch and to know the great common human heart of us all. And, oh, Lord God, let us forget not to be kind."

We have only sketched our program. There are several conferences in the planning stage that will be announced at an appropriate time. This will not be a one-woman administration, nor will any effort be spared to give credit to the States, to the districts, to the clubs, to their leaders, and to the members. Organization should serve as laboratories for democracy. Our program will be prepared entirely by our own club members. There must be free and open discussion and friendly agreement and disagreement. We hope to develop within our program constructive, consistent compelling values around which the very life of any community—urban or rural—may revolve. We will call for a week in February when we will ask each club to have some cherry pie and to think of the Founding Fathers and of their challenge to us. We will ask our members to think of the challenges of America today. We will ask them to evaluate and count the ways in which their club, and they as individual members have strengthened the arm of liberty during the year.

Since liberty frees man from outside authority and places the obligation on his own mind and conscience, there are the weak and fearful who shy away from responsibility. When we are free, we can choose. To the uneducated and the dull the power of choice appears like a tremendous responsibility. Yet those who let others do their thinking for them cease to be free. To think effectively is to think carefully, intelligently and honestly. We believe this program will encourage clear thinking, provide something in which to believe, and will turn ideas into reality. Freedom is a basic human right, but it is a right to be gained only by working for it—by making sacrifices to keep it. Freedom has a soul that must be defended. Freedom is an idea that must be made secure. Our worst security risks may not be subversive groups but those who would corrupt our free institutions for personal gain; those who have lost their faith in democracy and would by panic or fear blindly undermine; those who think themselves so clever that they can shackle and exploit our way of life and the people in it.

Freedom does not foster easy solutions. What irony that the way toward arms control is by an arms race. And yet our attitude cannot be one of softness but of sanity. The struggle is for the minds and souls of men. We are not going to convince the Communists and they are not going to convert us. The struggle will be determined by what goes on in the heart of each of the two societies. The cold war becomes more agonizing with time. Women must represent the thoughtful in complete opposition to those who would allow self-indulgence in emotionalism.

Plato once said, "Those having torches will pass them on to others." The founders and leaders of this organization have had torches which have been passed through each administration and now to us. Tonight I can see torches of enthusiasm that will be passed on to State federation and to clubs.

Ours is a world that talks quits casually of interplanetary missiles and the launching of men into space. Ours is a globle where Peiping and New Delhi are almost as close as the corner store. Ours is a world in which a cold war directed toward reaching and capturing men's minds and emotions is raging. Ours is a torch of commitment and action as women "to strengthen the arms of liberty" in my neighborhood and your neighborhood, in my city or town and your city or town, in my State and your State, and above all, in our country.

Here are the women—
In them you see sincerity
Of purpose, action, mind, and heart,
Willing to work, to play their part.
No questions do they ask concerning credit,
Where help is needed, they are there to give it.
No task too large, no task too small
The burdens of mankind to shoulder—
They, in a diminishing world, stand tall.

Here are the clubs—
Diverse in size and interest,
Yet bound by fellowship as is a team,
They do not simply eat, and chat and dream
Of a better world—but in Home, Education,
Public Affairs, seek areas to improve,
In International Affairs, Fine Arts, Conservation
Consider better ways to move
Theirs is the community outlook, point of view,
The very axis of the world in our communities breaks through
"To Strengthen the Arm of Liberty," we so often say
Determining the privileges and responsibilities of our democratic way.

Here is the General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Its motto round the world is known
Unity in Diversity encircles, challenges, sets the tone,
No test for religion, political party, creed,
Yet knowing man cannot survive where there is greed
They only ask that freedom and God be ever in our minds,
Seeking the truth and better paths toward peace to find
Realizing that the talents and joys of active living
Are vitalized through unselfish unified giving.

The women, the clubs, the General Federation of Women's Clubs
To these we look with faith that knows no fear,
Who daily work to make the world aware
Of the opportunities, the challenges, the need,
The dangers of blithe apathy to heed,
To extend, to strengthen the arm that holds the torch of freedom now.
Our task, our organization, our clubs, our women,
Dedicate themselves and make a solemn vow.

The Worthy "Know America" Project of the Gerald V. Carroll Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to bring to the attention of the U.S. Congress the meritorious work being done by the Gerald V. Carroll Post of the American Legion in Passaic, N.J., and its commander, Sam Martinique. The article which follows was printed in the August 3, 1962, edition of the Passaic Herald-News and points up the worthwhile and important work that can be accomplished by a group of dedicated citizens.

The article follows:

LEGION POST TO LAUNCH "KNOW AMERICA" PROJECT

PASSAIC.—The Gerald V. Carroll Post, American Legion, headed by Commander Sam Martinique, has selected V–J Day, August 14, for the start of a campaign to broaden the knowledge of students, aliens, and citizens of the subject of "America."

"It is a fact," Martinique said today, "that most native-born Americans today would be unable to pass the examination required of every alien applicant for U.S. citizenship. It is the objective of Carroll Post to set in the minds of everyone what every alien must know to become a citizen and what every citizen should know to become a better American."

The method to be used is a two-record album entitled "This Is America." The set has been approved by the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service for use over its stations and by the Los Angeles Board of Education for use in its adult education program for classes in citizenship, government, and history.

The album explains in simple, understandable terms, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the flag, American history and the setup of Federal, State, county, and city governments. A "talking book" without any propaganda, it is ideal for children in grammar and high school, adults studying for citizenship, and is especially appropriate for use by the blind.

Of this album, Nikita Khrushchev has written: "Our hopes lie with the youth of America, through the apathy of their parents. We hope that your program to have this album reach every home is a complete failure."

The album sells for $5.98 and may be obtained only by ordering through Carroll Post, American Legion, 127 Prospect Street, Passaic. Interested in obtaining the widest possible circulation of this important documentary, the Legion is seeking the assistance of Scout troops, organizations of aliens studying for citizenship, boys' clubs, and other groups.

The "Know America" committee includes Marvin Martinique, chairman; former Representative Gordon Canfield, Assemblyman Joseph M. Keegan, Dr. Joseph Rubinstein, Kenneth Peterson, Nathan Hugo, William Bryne, Thomas E. Duffy, Aaron Troast, George Coronato, Max Marquardt, Robert Hartfiel, Raymond Pickett, Matthew Super, Clarence Frederickson, Paul DeVries, John Karl, Richard Henneberry, August Hovorka, Frank Auerbach, Alphonse Vasile, Stanley Baily, Stan Briggs, Henry Welling, Joe Gluck, and Gerald Butterworth.

Supreme Court Decision on Prayer in New York Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at the request of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh, I ask unanimous consent that the council's thoughtful statement on the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the New York school regents' case be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL OF GREATER PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 26, 1962.

Re Statement on Supreme Court decision on regents' prayer.

We are gratified that the decision of the Supreme Court on school prayer is clear and unequivocal. Although we recognize that American democracy is founded in large part upon ethical and moral concepts derived from the great religions of mankind, we believe that religious liberty is an indispensable aspect of democratic freedom. We believe that the growth of democracy in the United States is in large measure a product of that unique principle in our basic law that puts religion outside the jurisdiction of the state. Any impairment of that principle threatens religious liberty and brings other basic freedoms into jeopardy. The maintenance and furtherance of religion are the responsibility of synagogue, church and home, and not of the public school system. The utilization, in any manner, of time, facilities, personnel or funds of the public schools system for purposes of religious instruction should not be permitted.

The Supreme Court decision will oblige those who desire to promote religious understanding and practice to do so within the framework of their homes and churches. At the same time, it will relieve school administrators of the responsibility for carrying out practices which are unconstitutional and which do not contribute to better intergroup relations among the pupils of varied faiths in the schools.

The fact that the Supreme Court opinion is based on a case involving the regents' prayer confirms our belief that the attempt to neutralize religious differences by attaining a so-called common core religion or nonsectarian prayer is futile and cannot be depended upon for the solution of this problem without violating the American principle of separation of church and state.

SYLVAN LIBSON,
Chairman, Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh.

Unique Jewish Farm Colony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very excellent article by Mr. Gary Shenfeld in the Atlantic City Press about a unique farm colony founded by Jewish refugees in south Jersey 80 years ago. One hundred refugee families from Russia settled a few miles west of Vineland and founded the first colony of Jewish farmers in this country. The area later developed into the three towns of Alliance, Norma, and Brotmanville.

These people persevered over almost indescribable hardships. Originally they lived in a large barracks under the worst of conditions when they arrived at Alliance, which is on the Maurice River in the southeast corner of Salem County, about 5 miles northwest of Vineland. The area was covered with woodland over its thousands of acres. The owners, the Leach brothers, cut off timber, sawed it into lumber and sold the land to the Alliance Land Trust for $15 an acre.

From the lumber the people erected shanties 14 feet square and 14 feet high, lined with one thin board and plastered inside. In the winter the settlers suffered from cold and in the summer they sweltered in the heat. Each shanty sold at $150.

The refugees chose the Alliance area because it was located on the Jersey Central Railroad, about 100 miles from New York and about 40 miles from Philadelphia. In the early days, in addition to farming, the settlers opened a cigar factory which operated only briefly, and also went into the tailoring of cheap summer coats and vests which proved profitable. Then berries and grapes came into bearing.

In the meanwhile, A. Brotman, of New York, took over the Gartman farm and built a large shop, eventually building up Brotmanville. While the farms were being cleared of stumps, the settlers were learning the rudiments of farming with the help of books and the advice of neighbors. Mostly they learned through experience. A major problem was education of the children. To get their children into Vineland High School, the immigrants had to pay the tuition personally. The youngsters usually rode their bicycles to school and when that was impossible a wagon had to be hired.

Originally there were four synagogues, and a Sabbath school was inaugurated. Later there were Friday night gatherings at the hall of the big synagogue where also was conducted a public library. There was a night school for adults.

Brushland was still being cleared as late as 1900. The farmers had no running water or electric lights. The "richer" homes might have a kitchen pump, but the water usually came from an outside well. Homes were heated with a wood range. Bathing was done in a homely washtub. Kolman Krassenstein ran a general store and post office, but the bulk of the shopping was done on the weekly horse-and-buggy trip to Vineland every Saturday.

Herman Eisenberg, raised in Norma and graduated from Rutgers and the University of Pennsylvania Law School, is now a Philadelphia lawyer. He recalls his early education in "the little red schoolhouse of Union Grove which consisted of two rooms housing all eight grades." There were four classes in each of the two rooms.

Jacob D. Spiegel, better known as "Jake," was the organizer of the Norma Athletic Association in 1904. In later years, according to Mr. Eisenberg, Jake was to be the guiding spirit of almost everything that took place in Norma. The NAA included residents of Norma, Alliance, and Brotmanville, with its main activity the baseball team.

Only two of the original settlers are left, William H. Levin, about 88, who lives across from the Alliance Cemetery, and Isaac Helig, about 86, who lives on Garden Road.

Mr. Spiegel said:

> Normally, the Jewish people are industrialists, businessmen, and tradesmen. Here, the only thing they had was a piece of land and a home. They worked in neighboring towns to supplement their incomes; in Vineland, Deerfield, and Sharptown's canneries to support themselves.

Elizabeth Rudnick Levin, daughter of one of the original settlers, married Dr. Samuel F. Levin. She was born in Alliance and graduated from Vineland High School. On the 50th anniversary of the immigrants' coming, Mrs. Levin wrote about the prematurely old women who plodded along, day after day through the hot summer, doing the work of man and beast. During the strawberry season, children trudged along with their mothers going from farm to farm under the blazing sun to pick the perishable berries for an insatiable market.

The only recreation of these women was the Saturday morning service at the synagogues and they made yearly contributions toward beautifying the interiors of the "schule."

Sam Berkowitz, who runs the Berkowitz Feed Mill in Norma, says that in the three little villages poultry and general farming are still the biggest industry although the poultry industry is going sour. There are three poultry dressing plants in the area, a pearl button factory and two feed mills.

Mrs. Herman Spector, a Norma resident, says that conditions have changed in the area but the land remains fertile. Many of the old farms have disappeared, replaced by poultry farms now threatened with extinction. New scientific methods of farming have proved that the sweet potato is not profitable enough for the farmer so the basic crops have changed to more garden vegetables.

The spirit of these settlers was summed up on their 50th anniversary when they wrote:

> Our farms are all paid for; we have a good name and credit in the bank, befitting industrious and thrifty people. We feel prosperous and can keep our heads up; we are employed steadily; we are our own bosses.
>
> We are well and fairly comfortable and happy. Even the crisis which played such havoc in the cities with our brethren who were gambling in real estate and in stocks and bonds didn't hurt us very much.
>
> We lost neither our heads nor our homes. Indeed, we have less temptations, albeit less luxuries. We lead a natural life.

Sermons could be written on that last sentence, "We lead a natural life." If every human being could say that, I am sure most of the worlds' ills would disappear and we could all enjoy "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

World Government: United States Outnumbered, Outgunned, and Outvoted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, many citizens are disturbed by the policies of the Kennedy administration. A constituent sent me Jack Moffitt's column "The Cracker Barrel." It outlines very clearly many of the most important administration mistakes. The newly announced policy of interdependence for example. Jack Moffitt reflects the growing disgust of our people when he concludes the column by saying, "you-know-who would pay for lifting 'the weight from the shoulders of all'."

I submit it for the information of the House:

THE CRACKER BARREL

(By Jack Moffitt)

EAGLE ROCK, July 21.—Unless Congress puts a halter on him, President John F. Kennedy will commit the lives, the fortunes, and the sacred honor of the citizens of the United States to formation of a world government in which we will be outnumbered, outgunned, and outvoted. Mr. Kennedy made his intentions clear in his July 4 speech when he made crystal clear his willingness to trade American independence for what he called interdependence. He suggested an alliance with the presently forming European Economic Community, made up of six European nations. The new United States-European alliance would "look outward to cooperation with all nations in meeting their common concerns," he said.

For 17 years, Americans have given billions of dollars to help the rest of the world. Our gold supplies have been sucked away. Our national wealth has been scattered across jungles and deserts and down international ratholes. Our national economy, depressed by debt and unbalanced budgets and confiscatory taxes, could slide any time into an abyss that would make the depression of the thirties look like a Sunday-school picnic. And yet our President, who never met a payroll or turned a lathe or depended for his livelihood upon a weekly paycheck, talks glibly about surrendering our country to a regional and eventually to a world government where you-know-who would pay for lifting "the weight from the shoulders of all."

The Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Alliance for Progress" which appeared recently in the quarterly publication of the Chase Manhattan Bank, Latin American Business Highlights.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

A little over a year ago, on March 13, 1961, President Kennedy announced the Alliance for Progress, a program designed to speed economic growth in the Latin Americann nations, more firmly establish democratic institutions in this hemisphere, and enhance the unity and security of the Americas.

There is little new in the large outline of the program, for it had all been said at various times in the past. For instance, large parts of the Treaty of Bogotá, signed a year and a half earlier, reappeared in it. Thus the Alliance was a continuation of policies that had been taking shape for several years.

But the program was announced with a new urgency, against a backdrop of increasing political ferment in Latin America. Thus, the U.S. commitment was made firmer than ever before, and the goals of a development program were made more concrete.

Although the program was announced by the President of the United States, it quickly acquired inter-American backing. The basic program was endorsed and amplified by 20 member countries at a meeting of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este, in Uruguay, in August 1961. At that meeting the U.S. representative committed this country to make large financial outlays in the coming decade to support the program, while the Latin American representatives committed their countries to sweeping changes, where needed, in such fields as taxation, land reform, education, and housing.

With only little over a year in which to judge the results, it is still too early to say whether the program will achieve its original aims. To be sure, during the first full year of operations under the Alliance, the United States has committed even more funds than promised at Punta del Este, enabling numerous important projects scattered throughout the area to get underway. Furthermore, Latin American legislators have stepped up the tempo of reform efforts in the areas set out in the charter of Punta del Este. In addition, the U.S. foreign aid machinery has been overhauled in a way that should make it more sensitive to the needs of the Latin American nations.

PROGRAM UNDER ATTACK

But the program has been under heavy attack by responsible people in the United

States and in Latin America. On this side, critics point to influential segments in Latin America who resist reforms the critics regard as an essential counterpart to U.S. financial assistance. Others claims that much of the U.S. aid has been administered recklessly, without proper regard for how productive the use of the funds will be, simply in order to meet the dollar commitment made at Punta del Este. Perhaps the most telling criticism—and the one stressed in this report—is that the Alliance effort is too heavily biased toward social reforms, and gives inadequate weight to the role of private capital.

On the other side, many Latin Americans have criticized U.S. Alliance administrators for moving too slowly to help finance projects and offset balance-of-payments deficits they say should have high priority. Also, a substantial number of Latin Americans—particularly among the wealthier—believe the U.S. attitude toward reforms in such delicate areas as land tenure and taxation is meddlesome, at best, and possibly a danger to political stability.

What can one say about these complaints? It is clear that to a large extent they result from frustrations that are almost bound to exist during the early stage of any ambitious and complex project. In order to get public support for a program that is costly and involves important social and political changes it has been thought necessary to stress the bright vision of the future. In the language of President Kennedy: "And if we are successful—if our effort is bold enough and determined enough—then the close of this decade will mark the beginning of a new era in the American experience. The living standards of every American family will be on the rise, basic education will be available to all, hunger will be a forgotten experience, the need for massive outside help will have passed, most nations will have entered a period of self-sustaining growth."

Such words, though surrounded by cautious phrases, are generally read out of context and tend to raise unrealistic hopes among those who have come to desire swift improvement in their living standards.

Frustration is also due in no small part to the relatively slow economic advance that most Latin American countries have experienced in recent years. While under the best circumstances the Alliance could not have produced a large economic boost in so short a time, it provides a convenient scapegoat for other economic ills.

Even after making full allowance for these frustrations, we have no arithmetic by which to weigh the criticisms mentioned above. However, a start can be made by first looking at the overall foreign aid picture, in which the Alliance plays a new and important role. We can then look more closely at what has been accomplished during the past year and attempt to evaluate the program in terms of its stated goals.

THE BROADER PROGRAM

The Alliance for Progress is not merely a U.S. foreign aid program. It is a joint inter-American effort involving major commitments by the nations of Latin America. This is what gives meaning to the name and substance to the program.

Nevertheless a large dollar expenditure by the U.S. Government is involved, so it is useful to look at the Alliance in terms of the broader program of which it is part.

In the whole postwar period the United States has made loans and grants totaling over $86 billion, of which $30 billion was in the form of military supplies and services and about $56 billion in the form of economic and technical aid. Nearly 85 percent of this aid has been as grants, though the ratio of loans to grants has been rising in recent years. This massive program, averaging more than $5 billion a year, has played a key role in U.S. foreign policy.

The goal of this policy has been to achieve a peaceful world order in which the rights and obligations of each nation are understood and respected. However, as world conditions have changed, U.S. policies to achieve this overall purpose have changed—sometimes belatedly—to meet them. In very broad terms, the postwar period can be divided into two major phases we have experienced, and a third phase we now appear to be entering. The first of these, from 1946 to about 1952, was the reconstruction phase, in which the United States spent nearly $40 billion for economic and military goods and services—most of it in Europe—to help rebuild war-damaged economies that stood in danger of being absorbed in the postwar Soviet expansion. This program, which encompassed the Marshall plan, was most successful and was largely finished—except for continued military support—by the early 1950's.

The second major phase, which overlapped the reconstruction period and is still important, is the defense phase. This phase coincides with the rising Communist military threat in the 1950's, highlighted by Soviet nuclear and rocket technology and by the aggressive moves of Communist China. About two-fifths of all postwar aid has been military, and during the 1950's this military aid, coupled with the so-called defense support, constitutd the most important element in the aid program. Thus, countries on the periphery of the Communist world—Taiwan, Korea, Vietnam, Laos, India, Pakistan, tended to receive the bulk of U.S. aid. This kind of assistance from the United States is likely to continue to be important for quite a while. But it may give way in time to aid that is more directly aimed at economic developmnt itself.

Throughout the past 15 years the United States has provided assistance to promote economic growth in less developed nations. The point 4 program was of this type. Moreover, the Export-Import Bank made numerous economic development loans—especially before 1953—and several of these went to Latin America. The Development Loan Fund, established in 1957, has been making loans to help meet the longrun development needs of many nations. All these efforts may well appear, some years hence, as forerunners of a new type of aid program—a program to attack underdevelopment on a large scale, and on a broad economic, social and political front. The Alliance for Progress, if carried through, will be the first effort of this kind.

THE ALLIANCE AIMS

In reviewing the main elements of the Alliance it is useful to remember that many of them were reflected in the Act of Bogotá signed by 19 representatives of the OAS in 1960 during the Eisenhower administration (see LABH, vol. 11, No. 2).

After the Act of Bogotá considerable progress was made in defining the development goals of the Latin American countries. Thus, when the ministerial meeting of the OAS took place in August 1961, the delegates were prepared to put into the charter of Punta del Este a rather concrete set of proposals and development targets. Because these targets are quite explicit it may be well to enumerate some of the more important of them:

A minimum average rate of growth in income of 2½ percent per person in each country.

Elimination of illiteracy, and 6 years of primary education for each school age child, by 1970.

An increas of life expectancy through specific health measures and improved water supply and drainage for at least 70 percent of the urban population and 50 percent of the rural population.

Agrarian reform—where required—to improve systems of land tenure and agriculture techniques.

Tax reform to reduce evasion and bring the principle of ability to pay more in operation.

Construction of low-cost housing for low-income families.

Elimination of inflation where it exists and the maintenance of price stability.

Strengthening existing agreements on economic integration such as the Latin American Free Trade Area and the Central American Common Market.

To implement these aims the United States agreed to provide a major share of the minimum of $20 billion over a 10-year period indicated as needed from sources outside Latin America and to contribute $1 billion for Latin American development during the 12 months beginning March 13, 1961.

THE U.S. SHARE

The crucial question about the Alliance targets is whether the minimum growth in per capita income of 2½ percent a year is likely to be met, if current trends persist. But before examing this question, it may be well to indicate how well the United States has met its commitment to the Alliance, and how the Latin American nations have fared in making institutional changes set out in the charter.

From March 13, 1961, through February 28, 1962, the U.S. Government made commitments under the alliance program for a total of $1.03 billion—not including $305 million of Export-Import Bank refinancing for Brazil. Some 87 percent of the total was in the form of long term development loans, with only 13 percent in the form of grants. The Export-Import Bank supplied $361 million; the AID, $402 million; the Social Progress Trust Fund administered by the IADB, $130 million; the food for peace program, $136 million.

This represent a considerable stepup in our foreign aid program in Latin America despite the fact that several of the loans, particularly the $100 million Chile loan and the social progress trust fund, had been authorized by Congress before the alliance was announced.

However, the task of finding worthy and well planned projects is a very large one, and it is unlikely that more funds could have been committed without damage to the credit standards of the lending agencies and a resultant waste of resources. As it was, about $400 million of the total U.S. commitments were in the form of export refinancing or outright balance of payments loans. Since one of the major problems in Latin America is to use capital resources as efficiently as possible, and since balance of payments loans tend not to do this, such loans will hopefully play a smaller role in the future.

All in all, the United States, by providing financial, technical, and material assistance on an expanded scale, has fulfilled its part of the bargain struck at Punta del Este. At the same time, it should be recognized that the role of the United States, though crucial—even central—to the success of the Alliance, is not the most difficult. In effect, the United States is contributing a small fraction of its annual production, in return for which it hopes to achieve a more satisfactory world order. The Latin American nations, on the other hand, have a more difficult task. They must mobilize their resources on a far larger scale and have promised to undertake major economic and social reforms.

AMBITIOUS REFORMS

The undertaking on the part of the Latin American countries to modify land tenure and tax systems where these appear necessary is certainly one of the most difficult, contentious and ambiguous aspects of the Alliance for Progress. No reasonable observer would deny that in many areas of Latin America a more broadly based land tenure system and improved tax system, if they can be achieved without undue social and political stress, would strengthen the foundations of democratic government and reduce social tensions.

Regarding land reforms, however, there has been a tendency in this country to overestimate the amount of good land that could thus be redistributed, to overestimate the improvement in farm technology and production that would result, to underestimate the amount of political unrest that would be created by large land-reform efforts, and to gloss over the immense differences that exist between countries and regions within countries, where the problem of farm productivity requires different solutions

Because the amount of good land to be redistributed is small, the number of individuals that could become members of the class of independent farmers is quite small from a political point of view. Yet land reform on a substantial scale invariably raises hopes too high. This, plus the conflicting interests of those now holding land, make such reforms potentially explosive. Nevertheless, in a number of countries, particularly in Colombia and Venezuela, moderate and well-conceived land reform programs have been under way or under serious study for some years. Probably reform measures will eventually be enacted in Chile and Peru, though the net social and economic benefit in these countries will be severely limited by the availability of arable land.

The point is that for some time land reform has been taking place or is being prepared for in a number of countries. While the Alliance may usefully speed the process somewhat, great care should be taken not to press it too hard, for the social costs could far outweigh the meager social and economic gains.

Tax reform is also a difficult matter in any country. Here the problem of evasion is perhaps more important than that of tax structure. Improvement in the tax field is needed in most nations—and is increasingly accepted as necessary by responsible Latin Americans. Hopefully, the pressure of the Alliance can be used to streamline tax collections. But it would be a mistake to assume that a substantial increase in tax rates on the higher incomes would greatly improve matters, even if easily implemented. Although it would provide more resources for government investment programs, it would also reduce business incentives needed to draw out private savings and investments.

NEW KIND OF REFORM

Latin America clearly stands in need of reforms that promote economic growth. But such reforms are not necessarily the same as those which redistribute and reduce discrepancies in income. Indeed, if Latin America is not to become wedded to doctrines which give central governments authority over most of the nation's resources—and this involves loss of freedom and great coercive power of the government—then incentives must play an important role in a free market economy. In many Latin American countries, due to a web of government controls, unpredictable shifts in government policies, inflation and low standards of civic rectitude, incentives exist only in distorted form. Thus, so-called free economies are often very far from free. The reforms that are needed are those that make them freer and more stable.

This is the crux of a fundamental criticism that might be levelled at the Alliance for Progress. The Alliance seeks to follow what appear to be two basically contrary lines of approach. On the one hand, a minimum target of fairly rapid economic growth is set, with the hope that growth can be even more rapid. Moreover, in the overall planning for the Alliance, private investments—both foreign and domestic—play the dominant role. At least a third of the capital from outside the region, and two-thirds of the capital generated domestically, are expected to be private.

Yet the Alliance is negotiated and worked out by people close to the levers of government control and their programs deal with government action. But in concentrating on the government sector, and dealing with elements of the economy which can most directly be affected by it, they have tended to emphasize reform movements which cannot be implemented rapidly without great social unrest and political uncertainty—the conditions least likely to provide a healthy climate for savings and investments.

The U.S. Government has taken a number of steps to help encourage the flow of U.S. private investments—improvement in the investment guarantee program, better economic intelligence services through the Department of Commerce, the setting up of the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP), a committee of U.S. businessmen to work out ways for private funds to be channeled into Alliance projects.

But important as these moves are, they do not strike at the heart of the problem, which is to improve the investment climate in Latin America for private investments, both foreign and domestic. This is not an easy thing to do. It may even be impossible. What is certain is that we—the U.S. Government and the U.S. business community—have not done all we can to persuade the people and governments of Latin America of either the importance or the requirements for such an investment climate. This is an area urgently requiring study.

THE PIE

The Alliance is struggling with the old problem of the pie. It is desired to have both a bigger pie, and to cut the slices more evenly. But the very process of evening out the slices may preclude making the pie much larger. In deciding where the emphasis should lie it seems clear that in the long run the smaller slices will grow more rapidly if the major effort is devoted to enlarging the whole pie, even though substantial differences continue to exist between the largest and the smallest slices.

ENDS AND MEANS

The problem of the Alliance is not that it seeks too much. The task of raising the general standard of living in Latin America is as immense as it is vital. It requires great vision, and the courage to state the need and the goal clearly. The problem, rather, concerns the means for achieving these goals that are either spelled out or implied in the Alliance program—tax and land reform, better housing, education, health programs. These are partly means to economic growth. But mainly they are the social ends, the fruits enjoyed by nations advancing rapidly. The real means—and the overriding need in Latin America—is an increased flow of capital from domestic and foreign sources, and improvement in the efficiency with which all resources—particularly the human resources—are used. To develop these means does involve large expenditures on such social projects as schools, hospitals, roads, and farm extension services, all of which generally require the direct attention of governments.

But the services of such projects cannot be fully productive unless there is a friendly attitude on the part of the government and the public toward private business. In the face of the barrage of propaganda against free enterprise such attitudes are unlikely to emerge by themselves. And if public spokesmen for the United States—the country where it has paid off most handsomely—do not defend and endorse a free-enterprise system, then policies which weaken it are likely to predominate, and the ultimate goal of the Alliance will be put off further into the future.

Student Summer Corps Assists New Jersey Migrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently I read of a summer corps project which has been set up in New Jersey to aid migratory farmworkers and their families. Students from Douglass College in New Brunswick are working with migrants, operating day-care centers for migratory children, arranging for visits of mobile health units to labor camps, and organizing civic groups to help these deprived Americans.

I would like to call attention to this project for two reasons. The first is that it demonstrates that our American youth are living up to a very high standard indeed; in an age in which we hear almost daily of the threat of communism and of the threat of juvenile delinquency, it is reassuring to find this proof that our American youngsters are second to none in high-minded public spirit. I commend these girls from Douglass College.

The second reason is that this article calls our attention to the fine work being done to aid our migratory farmworkers by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I know that Senator WILLIAMS was very interested in this project; indeed, I even understand that he was instrumental in getting it started. I would like, therefore, to take this occasion to commend the Senator for the wonderful efforts he is making to bring to our migratory workers the same standards of deceny, the same standard of living that are enjoyed by all other citizens of our rich and prosperous country.

I therefore insert under unanimous consent, the article from the July 24 New York Times entitled "Students Assist Jersey Migrants" at this point in the RECORD:

STUDENTS ASSIST JERSEY MIGRANTS: DOUGLASS COLLEGE GIRLS SET UP CHILD DAY CARE CENTERS

(By George Cable Wright)

WHITESBOG, N.J., July 23.—Susan Jo Shill bent over six little children squatting on the splintery floor of the brown-shingled saltbox structure this morning. She was trying to teach the somewhat bewildered youngsters, from 1 to 4 years old, to model with clay.

Outside, Elizabeth Ferrar was coaching a baseball game.

The scene was a clearing on the J. J. White blueberry and cranberry farm in the heart of Burlington County's pine belt. The occasion was the opening of a day-care center for the children of migrant farm workers.

Miss Shill, 22, and Miss Ferrar, 20 are 2 of the 16 present and former Douglas College students primarily responsible for the creation of day-care centers being set up in Burlington, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, and Cumberland Counties.

Under the direction of two Douglass faculty members, the girls are organizing local officials and other residents to take over the centers and run them permanently.

Their project, 4 weeks old, is being sponsored and financed by State and Federal agencies.

Miss Shill, a June graduate of Rutgers, will attend the University of London this fall as a Fulbright scholar.

"We want to take a census of Spanish-speaking migrants and set up a system by which a Spanish interpreter is available when needed," she said. "We want to get lawyers to provide legal aid to migrants, organize groups for paint-up, clean-up tasks and explore the feasibility of an adult education program."

Miss Ferrar, a junior, stressed that "no farmers have turned us away yet. They have cooperated wonderfully. The migrants seem as enthusiastic as we are."

Today, the girls, led by the head of the Sociology Department at Douglass College, and Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, led reporters and cameramen on a tour of the centers.

Raymond H. Male, New Jersey Commissioner of Labor and Industry, and other State and county officials joined in the tour.

Private organizations have contributed $1,500 to the project.

The Basic Flaw in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I ask permission to include a speech made by one of my constituents, Mr. Sydney Houston, of Dade City, Fla., to the Kiwanis Club of Dade City, entitled "The Basic Flaw in Socialism." I commend this to the Members for their consideration:

THE BASIC FLAW IN SOCIALISM

Socialism, like all forms of collectivism, is full of flaws and inconsistencies, but the basic flaw is its deluded acceptance of the vicious doctrine that the end justifies the means.

This is just as true of the so-called Fabian socialism, presently popular in English-speaking countries, which advocates a gradual and allegedly legal approach to collectivism, as it is true of the starkly brutal and revolutionary Marxian socialism, or communism, as it is more often called by others, although the Reds usually refer to themselves as Socialists.

The end does not justify the means. All religions, and all systems of ethics worthy of the name, teach that it does not. But that it does is taught by all forms of socialism and that is where they first go astray.

Law is force, resting upon policemen, judges, jails, and gallows. Therefore, law is justified only where force is justified. Force is justified only defensively, to protect person and property, and for no other purpose. Therefore, law is justified only defensively, to protect person and property, and for no other purpose.

Force is not justified to compel one man to turn over his pocketbook, or any part of it, to another (that is highway robbery) or to compel one man to contribute to the causes favored by another, however apparently stupid the one or sophisticated the other. Therefore, law is not justified for any such purpose.

You will note our President calls for "sophisticated" solutions to current problems. My dictionary defines "sophisticate" as "to deprive of genuineness." It has been my experience that only the immature are concerned with sophistication; the mature and balanced adult attaches no importance to it, preferring genuineness.

If the chairman of your local Red Cross Drive should place a pistol at your head and forcibly extort a contribution, he would be guilty of a crime, despite the fact that nearly all would agree the cause a most worthy one and deserving of generous support. But, the end does not justify the means.

By the same token it is equally criminal for a majority (large or small) to place a tax pistol at the head of the minority and forcibly extort contributions to projects the minority does not believe in.

That which is criminal in man individually can not be right for man collectively. All the sophisticated sophistry of all the sophomoric Socialists in the world can not make it right. All the tears of the sobsisters and all the blood of the bleeding hearts can not erase the truth of that statement.

Man has the right to defend his person, property and liberties; that is obvious. Therefore, he can delegate that right to government with the powers necessary to enforcement.

He can not delegate to government rights he does not have himself, and he does not have the right to open his neighbor's pocketbook at will, however desirable it may seem to him.

Thus, the basic issue is a moral one. Shall we obey or defy the strict injunctions in the Ten Commandments, viz: "Thou shalt not steal" and "thou shalt not covet."

Those prohibitions very effectively dispose of any moral pretensions of socialism and expose it for what it is; unchristian and unethical legalized larceny.

Yet there are some so benighted and misguided as to prate of Christian socialism. To me that makes no more sense than Christian cancer. It is a contradiction in terms.

Christianity is a free-will religion. It is offered but it is not forced. Socialism is force; the force of perverted law by which a misguided majority violates the natural rights of the minority, the Ten Commandments and the Constitution of the United States.

There is nothing sacred about the momentary will of the majority. It was a majority that crucified Christ, permitted the reign of terror in the French Revolution, and voted Hitler into power in Germany. Majorities will at times do wicked and shameful things; therefore, there are some actions that the constitution of a free government must forbid to a majority, just as the Ten Commandments forbid certain acts to individuals.

It was implicit recognition of this fact that impelled our Founding Fathers to draw and ratify a Constitution that stressed the rights of the individual and restricted the power of the majority to coerce the individual, to the end that we might be truly free.

Love, compassion, and charity are invoked to justify the practice of socialism. They are wonderful virtues.

But they are only a smokescreen to cover the real sales pitch of socialism which is something for nothing. Any sane and honest man knows you can't get that—at least not for long.

Man's duty is to practice those virtues himself. It is wrong for him to compel others at pistol point to a forced compliance with his ideas of what is proper in that respect.

The end does not justify the means. If the means are evil, so is the end, no matter how seductively disguised by hypocritically pious words.

The Constitution of the United States, which is the political corollary of the great moral prohibitions handled to Moses on Sinai, guarantees no one any security except that which he can obtain by his own efforts. That is just, moral, and practical.

Under the principles established by that document, we became the wonder, envy, and hope of the world. Who could be so criminal or so stupid as to replace those noble precepts and sound practices with socialistic folly, thoroughly discredited by all previous experience?

To ask that question is to answer it: Our last four national administrations and the Supreme Court of the United States, among others.

Patriotic and well-meaning friends, including members of this club, tell me that no man can be elected to office who does not compromise his principles and offer at least enough government bounty to swing a majority of the voters in his district.

If that is true we are hopelessly lost, and your children and grandchildren will be grovelling slaves of totalitarian communism (the ultimate end of Fabian socialism) in the most hideous and galling bondage yet seen.

But I do not believe that for a moment. I am constitutionally incapable of such defeatism, and the pages of history are full of apparently hopeless causes that were carried to eventual victory by the courage, honesty and persistence of a handful of resolute men. Our American Revolution is a case in point.

I also pay the American people the compliment of not believing them as stupid and unprincipled as this defeatist belief would imply.

It is true they have been bemused and seduced for 30 years, but I believe when they are offered a clear-cut choice between the freedom of constitutionalism and free enterprise and the slavery of socialism that they will make the right choice. Bear in mind that they have had little real choice for a long time; only the lesser of two evils.

Recall that Landon offered a cheap New Deal, Willkie an efficient one, and generous Mr. Dewey one that was both cheap and efficient but it was still a new deal if, indeed, retrogression to practices thoroughly discredited by all previous history may be called new.

If only someone had had the sense and courage to get up on his hind legs and say "this demagog is selling (and collecting for) a bill of goods he can't deliver, and here is why," there might have been a very different situation today. The fault has been in our leadership, as well as in ourselves.

Two other points must be forcefully driven home, besides the fact that the end does not justify the means.

1. The politician who will steal for you, will also steal from you. This is pointed up by a minimum income tax rate of 20 percent which is double the contribution asked, but not compelled, by a wise and just God. What a commentary that is on our government.

2. When government does something for you, it takes something from you. And when government does everything for you, it takes everything from you, and you have become a robot slave groveling in hopeless despair, with the temporary security of a pig in his sty, but without mind, soul or hope.

Gentlemen, if you, and others like you, will stop lolling complacently on your expanding posteriors, and galvanize into action, this country can be saved from the gathering darkness of Socialist night. If you get busy soon enough.

Surely, your own self-respect, and the love you bear your children, will impel you to do so.

Let's refute the basic flaw of socialism. Let's establish that "the end does not justify the means." Let's preach it so consistently and forcefully that it will penetrate the thick skulls of the politicians.

The Cardinal Principles of the Conservative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER H. DOMINICK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Colorado Daily, which is published by the students at the University of Colorado, Mr. Charles Adams, who appears as city editor for the Daily, and also signs himself as editor, the New Conservative, sets forth the cardinal principles of the conservative as sharply and as understandably as I have ever seen them stated. Mr. Adams is to be highly commended for having captured both the spirit and the essence of the basic philosophy of serious-minded Americans who are concerned about the future course of this Nation.

I include Mr. Adams' analysis as part of my remarks, and recommend its study by my colleagues:

Your editorial "To the Rescue" is by far the most humorous column to have appeared recently in the Daily, an honor you have preempted from Max Lerner. However, you have revealed that you have done a great deal less research on the basic tenets of conservatism than on the intricacies of digital dialing.

The new conservative does indeed have certain cardinal principles which are not at all unknowable as you infer, even to the liberal mind.

The new conservative holds:

That the individual has and should exercise full freedom of thought, speech, enterprise, and association, limited only to the extent that he endangers the freedom of others.

That the right of private property is a basic human right.

That objective standards of truth, right, and justice do exist.

That all human beings are equal in dignity and in rights, but not in character or in ability, in personality or in achievement; that the constructive achievements and successes of the individual are contributions to society rather than threats to it; and that all measures must be opposed which compel an artificial equality, enforce mediocrity, penalize our best for the benefit of our worst, or deprive any individual of his rightful earnings through any theory of a ceiling on permissible individual success.

That our foreign policy as a nation should be characterized by courage rather than fear, daring rather than compromise, decision rather than negotiations, initiative rather than reaction, advance rather than retreat.

That our destiny as individuals and as a nation is in our own hands; that neither our enemy nor any uncommitted areas will determine our future unless we permit them to do so; that America, as a nation, and every American citizen can and should attain more freedom in the future rather than less; that we intend to do all in our power to attain such greater freedom for ourselves and for our country.

The new conservative seeks to check his own philosophical premises, identify his convictions, integrate his ideas into coherency and consistency, take the initiative and the responsibility, and to offer the country a view of existence to which the wise and honest can subscribe. He knows that ideas divorced from consequent action are fraudulent, and that action divorced from ideas is disastrous.

Should you, Editor Danish, with a mind either to spread this philosophy or oppose it, care to spearhead the movement to tap liberal reservoirs of wealth ("dirty old men," "Bakuninists," and "White House Squirrels" notwithstanding), your every effort will be appreciated.

Charles Adams,
Editor, the New Conservative.

What Kind of Electoral College Reform?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the question of electoral college reform does not revolve around whether or not reforms should be made, but rather the nature and extent of reform. The following editorial emphasizes some of the most important points which must be kept in the forefront of any discussion of this crucial problem. It also points out a source of information for those of our people who are interested in finding additional information on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial entitled "Electoral College Reform," which appeared in the Union Leader of Manchester, N.H., on June 23, 1962:

Electoral College Reform

In any discussion of the electoral college system there is one point on which there seems to be nearly universal agreement: the need for reform in our current method of choosing presidential electors.

But the proposals range from those that would make the current system even more unfair to those that would bring about its outright abolition. We might be inclined to go along with the latter if it were not for the almost inevitable results: the loss of State control of presidential elections, a violation of the principle of a Federal union of States and the Federal principle of representation. The office of elector keeps presidential elections free from congressional control.

Senate liberals, such as Senators McGee, Case, of New Jersey, and Kefauver, have advanced proposals which would guarantee that the unfairness of the present system will continue. The constitutional amendments they propose would simply abolish the office and person of the presidential elector but leave the present system otherwise unchanged.

The unfairness of the present system was underscored by the Kennedy-Nixon presidential election results in 1960 when, by extremely narrow margins, entire States went—as a bloc—for Kennedy or Nixon. Thus, although the popular vote was extremely close, Kennedy's vote in the electoral college was 303 and Nixon's only 219. (Even though each State's delegation in the electoral college is equal in number to its congressional delegation, the "winner take all" theory prevails in our presidential elections.)

As a result of this system of en bloc voting for the electoral college, organized pressure groups in the Nation's largest cities are permitted to wield political influence far in excess of their limited membership. As in the case of New York, they can determine the outcome of the election in the entire State and swing a large number of electoral votes (in New York, 45 in 1960; 43 in 1964) to one of the candidates. Thus, in 1960, although the GOP tallied 3,446,419 votes for Nixon to the Democrats' 3,423,909 votes for Kennedy, the Liberal Party electoral slate polled 406,176 votes and swung the entire State to Kennedy. And 70 percent of the Liberal Party's votes were cast in New York City alone.

Of the several proposals currently before the Senate, this newspaper favors the State-district plan sponsored by Senator Karl Mundt, of South Dakota, and five other Senators representing both political parties. Senate Joint Resolution 12 is the only proposal that would retain the office of presidential elector. It would require, however, that the electors who correspond to Representatives be elected in individual, nongerrymandered districts, while the electors who correspond to the U.S. Senators are elected statewide.

But this newspaper will be the first to admit that a good case can be made for other of the proportional plans, under which each State's electoral votes simply would be divided among the candidates according to popular vote. (We favor S.J. Res. 12 because it retains the office of elector and guarantees State control).

As one source of reliable information on the various proposals now before the Senate we recommend that readers write to the Committee on Electoral College Reform of the American Good Government Society, 810 Dupont Circle Building, Washington 6, D.C., whose distinguished board of trustees is headed by Dr. John S. Mills, of Western Reserve University.

The National Charity Lottery of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in this country, it is all too often true that gambling is a pillar of organized crime. I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the example of Panama in order to show that gambling does not have to serve such evil ends. The national charity lottery of Panama functions, as its name would indicate, to provide funds for the support of hospitals, welfare institutions and orphanages.

The national charity lottery plays quite an important role in the everyday life of Panama, and although that nation has a population of only 1 million, gross receipts from the national charity lottery were over $34 million in 1961. In that year, the profit to the Government was close to $6 million.

In Panama, the gambling urge is centralized and channeled so as to achieve beneficial ends. Gambling dollars in

Panama are not used to shore up racketeers as in the United States. Instead, they are used to promote the public welfare. When we realize the merits of a national lottery, we too will be able to siphon funds from the pockets of gangsters into the pockets of hard-pressed taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer must the American taxpayer continue to be the victim of hypocrisy?

Uncle Sap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune:

UNCLE SAP

State Department testimony in support of Mr. Kennedy's appeal for authority to buy $100 million in United Nations bonds to tide the organization over a financial crisis arising from its military intervention in the Congo discloses this:

1. Without waiting for any authorization to buy bonds, the U.S. Government has voluntarily given U.N. $215 million from foreign aid appropriations to keep it out of bankruptcy.

2. Upon pocketing these American funds, the U.N. then voted remission of a major share of assessments against a large number of member nations for support of the Congo operation.

3. The effect of this was to use the American handout to subsidize numerous U.N. members which are either hostile to the United States or indifferent to its foreign policy goals.

4. The total kicked back to these nations at the expense of the American taxpayer was $11,400,800. Thus Castro's Communist Cuba was provided with a gift of $140,800 at American expense; Poland, a Soviet satellite, with $512,000; Communist Yugoslavia with $243,000, and neutralist India with $140,800.

5. Some of the beneficiaries were deadbeats which had failed to pay their assessments for maintaining the U.N. peacekeeping forces in the Congo and the Gaza strip. Among them were Poland and India. Thus, in effect, they were rewarded for dodging their share of the burden.

This all but unbelievable story was confirmed in testimony before a panel of the House Foreign Affairs Committee by Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs, who appeared in support of Mr. Kennedy's bond-buying scheme. Cleveland did not volunteer the information. It was dragged out of him.

Even Democratic supporters of the Kennedy proposal were stunned. "That's enough to kill the bill right now," said Representative HAYS, of Ohio. "How can we vote for this bill now?" asked Representative ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin. A Republican, Representative ADAIR, of Indiana, observed that the State Department seemed content that the United States should pick up the check for all comers.

Practices of this kind, which are on their face the height of irresponsibility, certainly should put Congress on guard not only against the bond buying device but against the whole reckless dissipation of tax money in foreign aid, for it is from this source that the money paid out by U.N. in gratuities to its delinquents came.

Cleveland's bland admission that the Government cheerfully allows itself to be played for a patsy puts in a stranger light than ever the charade enacted last week before the World Court. The United States had pressed this tribunal for an advisory opinion whether U.N. special assessments for the Congo were as binding upon the membership as the contributions for ordinary expenses of U.N. The Court decreed that they were.

This ruling was sought by the Kennedy administration as evidence that, with all members required to pay, the investment in bonds would be safe. But now we know that the U.N. has rewarded its deadbeats for not paying, so that the Court's opinion is reduced to mere window dressing. In addition, Cleveland kept referring to the bonds as "stopgap aid." What that means is that the State Department regards the bond purchase as the first drop in the bucket in a never-ending process to keep U.N. going, which will require, not buckets, but barrels of American cash.

Key Targets of the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, no Members of this House regret more deeply than do his colleagues on the Committee on Un-American Activities the decision of Hon. GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio, to retire from office at the end of his present term.

As an extremely valuable addition to his uniformly useful service on this committee for the past 10 years, Congressman SCHERER has authored an informative article on current Communist activities in the United States which was published in the August 1962 issue of the American Legion magazine.

Because of the value of this article to Members of Congress and the American people, I include it in full under permission to extend and revise my remarks.

The article follows:

KEY TARGETS OF THE COMMUNISTS

(By Hon. GORDON H. SCHERER, Member of Congress)

A short time ago a professor in one of our midwestern universities was lecturing to his class in political science. After a few sarcastic references to the Committee on Un-American Activities, J. Edgar Hoover, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, he smirkingly said: "This fellow Hoover talks out of both sides of his mouth. One day he admits that the membership of the Communist Party has reached an alltime low in this country. The next day, when he is before the Appropriations Committee of Congress asking for more money for the FBI, Hoover charges that the threat from internal communism in this country is greater than ever."

The professor then continued to parrot the Communist line. He said: "Since there are so few Communists in this country, why should we become so excited over them? What possible harm can 10,000 Communists do in a Nation of 180 million people?"

This professor was not a Communist although he belonged to some Communist-front organizations. Of course, his students did not know that. But here we have a man who, because of his position of influence—and there are thousands more like him in the United States—is doing more harm to this country than many in that group of 10,000 Communists.

In evaluating the extent of the danger of the threat from within, we must multiply this 10,000 many times because of synthetic Americans like the professor. We must be ever cognizant of the fact that most Communists operate from key and strategic positions where their subversive activities have the maximum effect on the greatest number.

Let me cite just a few of hundreds of examples from hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in order to prove the point which the professor either did not understand or did not want to understand.

Edward Yellin, a rather brilliant young man, while in college and most likely under the influence of a man like our professor, became a dedicated, fanatical Communist. Let's see how the Communist Party used him in its colonization program. First, we must understand what colonization is. It is a highly developed, succesful technique of the Communist conspiracy. As an example, a well-educated young Communist with one or more university degrees makes application to a basic industry for a menial job in an industrial plant. In his application for employment he misrepresents his educational attainments by downgrading them. His job application shows only 1 year's attendance at high school whereas he has a master's degree. A person operating as a colonizer obtains a job on the assembly line where his Communist connections are unknown. He is then in a position to indoctrinate fellow workers and stir up strife and dissension in the plant, at the direction of the Communist apparatus.

It does not take much imagination to see that one red colonizer might be the cause of a slowdown, a strike, and even espionage and sabotage in a vital defense plant. Again, who can say that a single professor such as I have mentioned did not start a chain reaction like this in many directions over the years?

Getting back to Edward Yellin. When he was called before the Committee on Un-American Activities in Gary, Ind., in 1958, he defied the committee and refused to answer questions about his activities as a Communist colonizer in the Chicago area. He was subsequently convicted in the Federal court for contempt of Congress. (Mr. Yellin's appeal from same will be reargued in the Supreme Court in the new term beginning next October 1.) During the litigation; he went back to college as a graduate student at the University of Illinois on a Ford Foundation scholarship. The following year—believe it or not—the National Science Foundation which was set up by the Congress in the interest of national defense gave Yellin a fellowship from taxpayers' money to continue his research.

This however was revoked after the Committee on Un-American Activities investigated the National Science Foundation's policies in granting fellowships.

During this investigation it was disclosed that one of the great universities in this country—some people refer to it as one of the more liberal—received from the Federal Treasury, through the National Science Foundation, over a 3-year period, $235,500 for scientific research projects. These projects were requested by and were under the supervision and direction of a professor who, when before our committee not too long ago, invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions concerning his membership in the Communist Party.

In another case, one Lee Lorch, a brilliant mathematician—but also an identified, hardcore Communist, who was fired from three universities, subsequently received a grant from the National Science Foundation.

Now the National Science Foundation has been set up by your Government primarily in the interests of national defense—and note I say in the interests of national defense—to advance scientific study and research in this country. Its action in granting a fellowship to Yellin seemed incomprehensible.

Professors in the university who knew about Yellin's conviction and Communist Party activities and who recommended him to the National Science Foundation for the fellowship, failed to disclose his conviction in their recommendations. Their excuse was that they were only interested in his proficiency as a scientist.

This same attitude was expressed by people with whom I discussed the award in the National Science Foundation. They said in substance that they were concerned only about Yellin's ability and suitability as a scientist; that some scientists were a different breed of cats than the rest of us, and that they would not give the Government the benefit of their scientific knowledge and research if we inquired too closely into their backgrounds and political beliefs.

To those who continue to peddle the Communist line that 10,000 Communists in this country are of little or no consequence, may I remind them that at the time Russia was taken over, less than one-seventh of 1 percent of the people in that unhappy country were Communists. Poland had only 4 percent. When Castro seized Cuba and took it behind the Iron Curtain, there were only a handful of Communists pulling the strings. Even today in Czechoslovakia, which has the largest percentage of Communists in any country in the world, we find it with only 11 percent.

It should be obvious to the least informed that, if the Communists had attempted to take Cuba by outward or military aggression, they would have failed miserably because we would have moved in with everything we had. Yet today, Havana is as Communist-dominated and controlled as are Peiping and Moscow. Why? Because a corporal's guard of Communists in key positions were able to enlist the help of thousands of Cubans and many Americans by concealing their identity and their real objective. Cuba was taken by internal subversion. Its people and their possessions were taken intact and put to use by international communism. It is now the base of operations for more takeovers in Central and South America.

There are other instances where a relatively few Communists in strategic positions in government were able to flip a country from the Western into the Communist orbit after just a few murders and assassinations. This is what happened in Iraq.

I'm sure that if one of the leftwing crowd accidentally got hold of this American Legion magazine and read this article in the dark of night where none of his ADA friends would catch him, he would say: "Well, none of these things can happen in these United States."

The leftwing crowd in England said the same thing. We all know that England has just completed a penetrating and extensive investigation of Communist infiltration into its Government agencies (called in England, the civil service). The results rocked the British Isles and shocked them out of their complacency. Even Prime Minister Macmillan who, like many people in this country, had heretofore not been too concerned about the Communist internal threat, did a rightabout-face.

Since the United States is the prime target in the current struggle with international communism, is anyone so naive as to believe that only the British are the targets of internal subversion?

In order to prove the tremendous danger of only a few Communists in Government, I am not going to beat an old bag of bones by dragging out the Hiss, Remington, Judith Coplon, Rosenberg, and Abel cases, etc. Instead, let's take a look at the dire results of one of the most recent penetrations of the Government service by just two security risks.

Not too many months ago Bernon Mitchell and William Martin, two brilliant young mathematicians, from good American homes, educated in our best universities, obtained highly sensitive jobs in the top-secret, hush-hush National Security Agency. They defected to the Soviet Union and revealed to the Kremlin that we had broken the Russians' secret code and that of other satellite nations. Of course, these countries immediately changed their codes. This meant months and perhaps years when the United States would be deprived of valuable intelligence information, since it might take that long to decipher their new codes.

In addition to their traitorous act, Mitchell and Martin went on radio and television in the Soviet Union and bitterly attacked and condemned the United States. Yes, they were only two men, but they did incalculable harm to the security of the United States and furnished volumes of effective, insidious propaganda to the Communists in the cold war.

Because the matter is still under investigation, I cannot name names at this time, but I do know that a disreputable character who for many years was, to say the least, closely associated with Communist causes, occupies a position today where he has high-level influence in agencies of this Government.

I am convinced in my own mind that not all of the failures in our missile launchings are due to oversights, by our scientists and technicians. Recently, I listened to witnesses under oath who charged that defects found in a highly complex weapon resulted from sabotage in a plant where Communist activity is under investigation. The actual saboteur has not been found.

J. Edgar Hoover, who is perhaps the outstanding authority in this country on Communist objectives and techniques, said:

"Soviet espionage activities in this country expose the fallacy of so-called peaceful coexistence. In recent years, pseudoappeals for peace by Communists have been more than matched by intensified Communist espionage efforts in the United States. Using blackmail, bribery, and similar techniques, Communist agents, many with diplomatic immunity, are stepping up their efforts to obtain our military, scientific, and industrial secrets for use against us. * * * Foremost in the present battle plans of the Communist Party, U.S.A., are well-calculated efforts to embarrass the American economic system; to infiltrate and gain control in our labor organizations; and to secure footholds in basic American industries, such as transportation, manufacturing, communications, and chemicals. Success of these Red objectives will be destruction for our way of life."

The Defense Department, in requesting legislation to help it combat espionage and possible sabotage in defense plants, told the Committee on Un-American Activities:

"U.S. industry is a prime target of the Communist movement in the United States. It is a primary concern to the Communist movement that it obtain from American industry information concerning the defense structure of the United States, particularly with reference to modern weapons of war. To this extent, the Communist Party has been consistently interested in penetrating defense industries where classified work is being performed and also basic industries which, while not engaged in classified work, may be in support of industries performing modern weapons' manufacture.

"The potential for bringing defense production to a halt by sabotage of power facilities is enormous and the repercussions would be, I think, disastrous because, if the power itself is cut off, defense plants cannot produce, and we would thus be denying ourselves the weapons which are so essential to our national defense effort."

Here the Defense Department among other things makes the point that it is possible for one Communist in a key position in an electric powerplant in time of crisis to put out of commission not only defense plants but an entire city.

In connection with the Defense Department's request to give it legislative tools to enable it to deal with security risks in defense plants, the Committee on Un-American Activities conducted extensive hearings. I was told by representatives of the Defense Department that there are 2,000 potential espionage agents and potential saboteurs working in defense plants today.

The committee found that in the Pittsburgh area alone there were five plants which had vital defense contracts and in which the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, known as UE, had bargaining rights for employees. UE was expelled from the CIO because it was Communist dominated and controlled. Numerous officials of this organization were identified as members of the Communist apparatus.

Then again, let us look at Michael Mignon who at one time was an official of the American Communications Association. At the same time he was a functionary of the Community Party. The American Communications Association has also been expelled from the CIO, because it was Communist dominated and controlled. Michael Mignon, who later broke with the Communists, testified that the Communist apparatus wanted Communists working on our communications system so that in time of internal or external conflict with the Soviet Union, tielines and cables could be sabotaged in a matter of minutes.

Today this American Communications Association has bargaining rights for some of the employees of Western Union and Radio Corp. of America and of course this is because under provisions of the Labor Relations Act the companies have no alternative but to employ such people. These are the companies that operate and maintain the tielines coming out of the Pentagon and the nine transatlantic cables to Europe. Persons have been identified as Communists who are members of the American Communications Association, who are employed by Radio Corp. of America and Western Union, and whose job it is to maintain and operate these vital lines of communications.

Recently, the committee developed evidence to show that there are Communists who have radio operators' licenses from the Federal Communications Commission. These operators—whether working on ship or shore installations—are in a position to disrupt our whole Conelrad warning system should this country be attacked.

The Communists want the American people to believe that their party in this country is fading and dying. That is part of their current strategy.

To those who consider themselves loyal Americans yet continue to parrot this line—to those who argue that there are so few Communists left that we should abolish the committee on Un-American Activities and weaken the Federal Bureau of Investigation—let me continue to present some additional cogent evidence.

The overwhelming majority of the men who serve in the merchant marine are hard-working, dedicated, loyal Americans, but the evidence is clear that a few are not. The question arises: How dangerous to our security are these very few?

When the courts held (due to a deficiency in the law) that the Coast Guard lacked authority to screen security risks off merchant vessels, hundreds who had been denied seamen's papers were again permitted on our ships. When the Committee on Un-American Activities started to correct or plug this loophole in the law the Communists and the leftwing sobsisters cried loudly. They charged the committee with trying to prevent men from earning a living because of their political beliefs.

It developed at the hearings just how dangerous a Communist could be aboard a merchant vessel. It was shown that we are building extremely costly and highly complex mechanisms and weapons to protect this Nation from potential Soviet aggression. Some of these are being shipped to various parts of the world. In a crisis one saboteur, with or without modern electronic devices, could sabotage these weapons on board a ship. In fact, he could sink the ship in the Panama Canal, the St. Lawrence Seaway, or one of our harbors, putting them out of commission for many, many months. There are still those, I repeat, who want to equate danger with numbers.

I can hear some diehards charge that very few of these 10,000 Communists in the United States hold key positions. Let me just give you one example of how effective a so-called "average Joe" Communist can be. Some 20 million pieces of vicious Communist propaganda are coming into this country each year through the U.S. mail.

One of the many techniques used in connection with Communist propaganda is to get nationality groups in this country to take a position on a current political issue involving the Soviet Union.

This nationality group is then flooded with propaganda directed to this issue. It is printed in the language of that group. It is addressed and mailed from Iron Curtain countries directly to individuals in this country.

"Average Joe" Communist is given the job of getting the names and current addresses of individuals belonging to their specific group. When he transmits such a list to his superiors, "average Joe" Communist completes one of his assignments and then eagerly waits for another.

Another key target of the Communists is the field of entertainment. It is a means by which they can reach millions of people with propaganda that subtly and cleverly presents the Communist program. The Communist Party line may be found in a lengthy soliloquy on social injustice. It may be presented in a movie which will be shown around the world, or it may be only a snide crack about patriotism delivered by a "sick" comedian in a popular night club. No detail or opportunity is missed by the Communists to use the play or movie for their purposes.

The script for a scene in a satire called for Stalin and Hitler to dance together, each holding a knife in the back of the other. The director of the play was a Communist. He removed the knife from the Communist leader's hand.

Of course, the Communists over the years also had a practical reason for snaring show people into the Communist apparatus. Show people made unusually good dupes for Communist-front activities within the entertainment field. Their talents were used to bring large sums of money into the coffers of the Communist Party. Many of them with sizable incomes contributed substantially to the Communist treasury. Robert Rossen, a prominent Hollywood director, for a time was a member of the Communist movie set. Eventually he became disenchanted and disillusioned with the Communist offensive. He testified that out of his salary he contributed $40,000 to Communist causes.

Again, we can see that, while only a comparatively few people in the entertainment field served Communist causes, yet the total effect of such service was tremendous.

Let me give you just one more example of the point I have been trying to make in this article before I close.

Two years ago the Committee on Un-American Activities was holding hearings in San Francisco. A substantial number of students, although a handful compared to the student body in the San Francisco Bay area, picketed the hearings. Most of them honestly felt hostile to the committee, largely as the result of some clever brainwashing by some leftwing professors and a few clergymen. The student picketing and demonstrations were turned into riots and mob violence by a handful of hardcore, trained Communist agents. These are the facts, in spite of what some of the "soft-on communism" clique contend. These demonstrations, like the ones against Eisenhower in Tokyo and against Nixon in Caracas were used by the Communist propaganda machine around the world in an effort to show that all students were opposed to the American Government and its activities. They were used to create hatred and ill will toward the United States. These demonstrations were effective propaganda battles in the cold war.

They were instigated and directed by an unbelievably few trained Communists who cleverly used others to do the job. The victory for international communism's propaganda assault throughout the world was tremendous.

We must never forget that big oaks from little acorns grow.

Don't plant or nurture any of those acorns unwittingly. Don't permit yourself to be used by the Communists in any way to advance Communist-inspired projects. To avoid being so used, you should be very careful about the organizations you join, the meetings you attend, the petitions you sign, contributions you make, and the use of your name.

More than one person has been embarrassed to learn, too late, that his name, his prestige, or his money was used to help push a cause that had its origin in top Communist circles. Before you become involved, check carefully the organization that wants your help and the people who are tied up with it. And if you have any doubts whatsoever, stay clear of it.

Many Red-inspired projects look innocent on the surface, some of them with expressed goals that are highly commendable. The party line in some cases will be so skillfully camouflaged that it hardly shows. However, some manifestations will always be apparent to the vigilant, and you have a responsibility to be vigilant about such things.

So that you can exercise intelligent vigilance, learn everything you can about communism, and get your education from qualified sources, not from people who are ill informed or who may be exploiting legitimate fears of communism for ulterior purposes. The more you know about communism, its history, and the way it operates, the easier it will be for you to spot organizations and individuals who do the bidding of the Communist Party.

To avoid giving any sort of help to Communist promotions, a negative approach is necessary. If the 10,000 Reds in this country want to call for things desired by the Kremlin, let it be clear that they speak for themselves. Since most Americans are by now aware that these people are determined to bury us, why should we assist in our own interment?

However, more than a negative approach is necessary if we are to turn the Red tide and win out in this struggle. There is one area in which we have to give due credit to the Communists, and that is their utter dedication to the cause represented by the Red conspiracy. Obviously it is a wrong cause and an evil one, but we cannot deny that Commuinsts work at promoting it in a way that, to most of us, is absolutely incredible.

The time has come when Americans are going to have to show some of the same kind of dedication. We have a nation and a way of life that should inspire such dedication.

We must understand that we are engaged in a life-or-death struggle for survival with the international Communist apparatus; that we cannot hope to prevail in this struggle unless all Americans in every field of endeavor are absolutely convinced beyond any doubt that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system; that we are not faced merely with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government; but that we are now in a death grip with an enemy the like of which, for debasement and inhumanity, the world has not seen since the time of the Dark Ages. We can ignore, appease, and negotiate with this enemy only at the cost of our survival.

This is the challenge of our day to all patriots of this Republic. We must accept this challenge. We shall either dedicate ourselves to it or, like the countries already behind the Iron Curtain, face slavery and eventual destruction.

Release of Virginia High-Grade Tobacco Import and Its Effects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Philippine war damage bill the other day, reference was made to the restriction on the importation of American tobacco into the Philippines. Recently, the Philippine Supreme Court, interpreting the Philippine tobacco law, has ruled that high-grade Virginia leaf tobacco may be legally imported into the Philippines to maintain the level of production of locally manufactured cigarettes.

An article by Dr. Urbano A. Zafra, formerly Minister Counselor in the Philippine Embassy and Consul General in New York, analyzed the ruling of the supreme court of the Philippines and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The article follows:

[From the Manila (Philippines) Herald, May 12, 1962]

RELEASE OF VIRGINIA HIGH-GRADE TOBACCO IMPORT AND ITS EFFECTS

(By Urbano A. Zafra)

The hotly debated controversial tobacco question was finally clarified and settled by the supreme court in its decision of April 18, 1962, upholding the mandatory injunction issued by Judge Higinio B. Macadaeg of the Court of First Instance of Manila for the release of the Virginia tobacco imported by the Agro-Industrial Products, Inc. The case was brought about by the Presidential authority granted to the Agro-Industrial

Products, Inc., in July 1961 to import 4.5 million kilos of foreign Virginia tobacco for blending purposes against the purchase of ACCFA stock of low-grade Virginia tobacco amounting to four times the quantity of imported tobacco (ratio of 4 to 1) and of sun-dried or filler tobacco from the FACOMAS equal to twice the quantity of imported tobacco (ratio of 2 to 1).

FOUR BASIC ISSUES DECIDED

In its decision the supreme court reviewed and considered the pertinent facts and circumstances surrounding the proposal for the importation of Virginia tobacco and the disposal of the ACCFA stock of low-grade tobacco and concluded on four basic issues as follows:

1. That the Presidential directive of July 1961 is in pursuance of the intents and purposes and in accordance with the objectives of Republic Act 698, as amended by Republic Act 1194;
2. That there is no provision in the law giving the cigarette manufacturers the right to import the Virginia tobacco; hence, inferentially, such importation may be made by anyone authorized by the President;
3. That the test upon which importation of Virginia tobacco may legally be allowed is the maintenance of the level of production of manufactured cigarettes and not the level of the annual production of tobacco; and
4. That the courts may not interfere with the President in the exercise of his discretionary power and authority provided by law.

Referring to the aims and objectives of Republic Act 698, as amended by Republic Act 1194, the Supreme Court declared:

"As we see it, the above laws were enacted for three principal reasons; namely (1) to prevent a drain on the dollar resources of the country or its money, occasioned by the importation of big quantities of Virginia type cigarettes; (2) to provide means of livelihood to farmers in the Ilocos provinces, as Virginia leaf tobacco is planted on higher land from which rice has already been harvested; and (3) to provide a continuous source of revenue, taxes on high-grade cigarettes being much higher than others. There are also two concommitant objectives resulting from the adoption of the law; namely, to develop the cigarette industry and provide work for women labor and to minimize smuggling of cigarettes."

On the claim that only the manufacturers of cigarettes have the right to import, the Court said, "We have found no such provision in the law. What we have found is that imported tobacco shall be allocated among the manufacturers of tobacco products."

With respect to the basic requirement for importation of Virginia tobacco, the Supreme Court declared:

"It should also be noted that the test, upon which an importation may legally be allowed, is the possibility of maintaining the level of production of manufactured tobacco (cigarettes), not the level of the yearly harvest of tobacco. That is the immediate and important requirement that the law demands before the President may authorize importation of high-grade Virginia leaf tobacco. Said requirement was complied with when the Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued the certificate stating that there were only a stock of Virginia leaf tobacco for the purpose of cigarette manufacture enough to last 4 months."

Regarding the President's discretionary directive, the Court stated that "following the well-established principle of separation of powers and the rule that courts may not interfere with the executive, especially the President, in the exercise of the discretion expresly vested in him by the law, we are forced to declare that there are no justifiable reasons or grounds for declaring the Presidential directive invalid."

BENEFICIAL EFFECTS ON THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY

Notwithstanding the prophecies of doom and ruin for the tobacco industry by opponents of the entry of high-grade Virginia tobacco for blending purposes, the Supreme Court decision may well usher in a new era of progress and prosperity for not only the Virginia tobacco industry but also for the native tobacco growers of northern Luzon. For one thing 18 million kilos of the 47 million kilos of ACCFA low grade Virginia tobacco stock will be disposed of and some million kilos of sun-dried Virginia low-grade tobacco will be purchased from the FACOMAS to be exported as cigar filler. A total of 27 million kilos of low-grade tobacco will thus be taken out of the total supply of Virginia tobacco, thereby improving the tobacco supply situation. Under the Presidential directive 5 to 10 percent of the net profit from the imported tobacco would be channeled to research work toward the improvement of the industry. This should afford the industry the use of scientific means of utilizing the byproducts of tobacco that are wasted today. For instance, the tobacco stems could be processed as materials for the manufacture of fertilizers and chemicals for pest control. Finally, with the availability of high-grade imported Virginia tobacco the manufacturers could increase their production of aromatic cigarettes and thereby decrease the smuggling of "blue seal" cigarettes.

The native tobacco industry will also stand to benefit from the Agro proposal, through increased market for filler tobacco, particularly in the United States, where the demand for such tobacco is increasing in view of the ban against Cuban tobacco from entry into the United States. With the favorable atmosphere created in the United States as a result of the entry of U.S. Virginia tobacco into the Philippines, the chances are greater for the establishment of a quid pro quo between Philippine tobacco and U.S. Virginia tobacco. Since under the Agro proposal some 10 million pounds of U.S. Virginia tobacco are allowed entry into the Philippines, the Philippine quota of filler tobacco, which at present amounts to only 5,200,000 pounds, should be increased by 10 million pounds. This can be effected by a unilateral action by the United States through legislation without the necessity of amending the Laurel-Langley agreement.

PHILIPPINE ECONOMY STRENGTHENED

The disposal of the ACCFA stock of low grade Virginia tobacco will enable that agency to liquidate its outstanding indebtedness to the Central Bank and to the planters, amounting to 155 million pesos. The customs duties and compensating taxes collected on the imported tobacco alone will enhance the government revenue by over 100 million pesos. Moreover, the increased production of high grade aromatic cigarettes will further provide additional taxes to the government. More people will be employed resulting from the expanded operation of the cigarette factories to meet the increased demand for high grade cigarettes not only because of their acceptability to the smokers but also of the increasing smoking population. On the whole Philippine economy will be strengthened.

IMPROVED PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN RELATIONS

The decision of the Supreme Court on the tobacco question should improve Philippine-American relations by removing an irritant therein that has prejudiced Philippine interests from favorable action on the part of the U.S. Congress. However, the recent negative action by the U.S. House of Representatives on the War Damage bill has been a great disappointment to those of us who expected a greater chance of its passage as a result of the solution of the tobacco question. The statement made by President Kennedy, immediately following the disapproval of the bill, that the measure will be reintroduced next year, should revive hope that the United States will ultimately redeem its legal and moral obligation.

Statement of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies With Reference to the Purchase of U.N. Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a statement of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., with reference to the purchase of U.N. bonds, together with a list of the member societies of this organization.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT RE PURCHASE OF U.N. BONDS PRESENTED TO HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE JULY 24, 1962, BY LT. GEN. PEDRO DEL VALLE, ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER OF AMERICAN COALITION

The American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., of about 100 patriotic, civic, and fraternal organizations, at its 33d annual convention meeting at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 1, 1962, unanimously adopted the following resolution in opposition to the purchase of United Nations bonds by the United States:

"UNITED NATIONS BONDS

"Whereas, the United Nations proposes to issue bonds in the amount of $200 million; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has declared himself in favor of the purchase by the U.S. Government of at least one-half of the aforesaid bond issue and has stated his intention to recommend to the Congress that this purchase be approved; and

"Whereas the soundness of such an investment has been questioned by many informed citizens, including the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, who has declared that the purchase of these U.N. bonds 'would be unsound under any and all tests for prudent financial investment'; and

"Whereas the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies is convinced that the United Nations, having failed to adhere to the principles set forth in its charter, should receive no further financial aid in any form from the American people whose interests it has so badly served;

"*Resolved*, That the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies petitions the Congress of the United States to reject the recommendation of the President to purchase United Nations bonds."

In our financial system bonds are only issued when there are assets to back them. The United Nations has no assets. For it to issue bonds is a fraud. For the Congress of the United States to agree to buy these bonds of the United Nations would be compounding a fraud on the American people by the representatives of the sovereign people who must earn every dollar that the Congress loans or gives away. Our debts and obligations are already enormous as the committee and the Congress well know. The United Nations is a failure on the record.

The United Nations is already bankrupt morally as well as financially. Let us not try to rebuilt it on the same old sand foundation on which the leagues of history have failed. Only a free, solvent United States can hope to light the way for ourselves, our posterity, and the world's oppressed people.

For these and other reasons that have already been brought out in debate and by other witnesses, the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies opposes the purchase of United Nations bonds by the United States.

MILTON M. LORY,
President.

SOCIETIES COOPERATING WITH THE AMERICAN COALITION OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES, INC., 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE NW., WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Alliance, Inc.
American Coalition of New York.
The American Institute.
American Public Relations Forum, Inc.
American War Mothers.
Anti-Subversive League of South Dakota.
Associated Farmers of California, Inc.
Better Government Forum.
Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Queens County chapter.
Constitutional Study Group of South Dakota, Inc.
Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States.
Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States, District of Columbia.
Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Pennsylvania.
Daughters of America, National Council.
Daughters of America, Clara Barton Council No. 71.
Daughters of America, Pride of Baltimore Council No. 14.
Daughters of America, District of Columbia Council.
Daughters of America, New Jersey Council.
Daughters of the Revolution, National Society.
Daughters of the Revolution, New Jersey Society.
Daughters of the Revolution, New York Society.
Daughters of the Revolution, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Daughters of the Revolution, Ex-Officers Club.
Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc.
Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties, Arlington Chapter.
Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties, Virginia.
Delaware Defenders of the Republic, Inc.
Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence.
Farmers Liberty League.
Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies.
Fraternal Patriotic Americans, State of Pennsylvania, Inc.
General Society of the War of 1812.
General Society of the War of 1812, D.C. Division.
General Society of the War of 1812, New York Division.
Grass Roots League, Inc.
Junior Order United American Mechanics, New Jersey.
Junior Order United American Mechanics, New York.
Junior Order United American Mechanics, Pennsylvania.
Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.
Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of the Potomac.
Louisiana Committee of Correspondence.
Marine Corps League Auxiliary, Inc.
Massachusetts and Rhode Island Committees of Correspondence.
Michigan Coalition of Constitutionalists.
Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery in Chief.
Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the District of Columbia.
Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the State of New York.
Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the State of Pennsylvania.
Military Order of the World Wars.
Minnesota Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc.
The National Huguenot Society.
National Service Star Legion, Inc.
National Society, Congress of State Societies.
National Society for Constitutional Security.
National Society for Constitutional Security, Chapter I.
National Society for Constitutional Security, Chapter II.
National Society for Constitutional Security, Chapter III.
National Society, Daughters of the Union, 1861–65.
National Society, Magna Carta Dames.
National Society of New England Women.
National Society of New England Women, New York City Colony.
National Society, Patriotic Women of America, Inc.
National Society, Patriotic Women of America, District of Columbia Council.
National Society, Patriotic Women of America, New York Council.
National Society, Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims.
National Society, United States Daughters of 1812, State of New York.
National Society, Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Co.
National Sojourners, Inc.
National Women's Relief Corps.
National Women's Relief Corps. Department of Potomac.
Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, National Commandery.
Network of Patriotic Letter Writers.
New Jersey Coalition, Inc.
Ohio Coalition of Patriotic Societies.
Order of Fraternal Americans, Grand Council.
Order of Independent Americans, Inc., State Council of Pennsylvania.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, California.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, District of Columbia.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, Massachusetts.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, New Jersey.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, New York.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, Rhode Island.
Order of Washington.
Patriotic Order Sons of America, National Camp.
Patriotic Order Sons of America, State Camp of Pennsylvania.
Philadelphia Chapter, Council for Individual Freedom.
Society of Old Plymouth Colony Descendants.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, National Council.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council, Connecticut.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council, District of Columbia.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council, Maryland.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council, Massachusetts.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council, New Hampshire.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council, Pennsylvania.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council, Rhode Island.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State Council, Virginia.
Sons of the American Revolution, National Society.
Sons of the American Revolution, California Society.
Sons of the American Revolution, Empire State Society.
Sons of the American Revolution, Iowa Society.
Sons of the American Revolution, New Jersey Society.
Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War Commandery in Chief.
Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Massachusetts Department.
South Dakota Antisubversive League.
Sovereignty Preservation Council of Delaware.
Taxpayers, Inc.
Texas Voters for the Constitution.
United States Day Committee, Inc.
United States Flag Committee.
Watch Washington Club.
The Wheel of Progress.
William Thaw Council of Americans, Inc.
Women of Army and Navy Legion of Valor, U.S.A.
Women's National Defense Committee of Philadelphia.
Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc.

Government Hurts Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention an editorial which appeared in the Burbank Daily Review Friday, July 27, 1962. It points up the very great danger created by the administrations action in the threatened aerospace industry strike. It is imperative that collective bargaining remain free of government domination. This editorial clearly points out that compulsory unionism or "agency shop" is the major issue. I am pleased to insert this for the information of the House:

GOVERNMENTS HURTS NEGOTIATIONS

The Federal Government is so entangled in the current aerospace industry negotiations that it is in danger of becoming its own worst enemy.

Obviously, Uncle Sam cannot afford a strike in the plants which make the weapons which form our first line of defense in the cold war.

The Government knows this. Yet, administration spokesmen persist in statements and pressure tactics that can only impede a quick settlement.

There is one central issue in the present negotiations. It is the so-called agency shop, a form of union shop whereby employees would be required to join a union or pay a sum equal to union dues. The legality of this type of organization is being challenged in a Federal court at this time.

Douglas Aircraft Co. accepted labor's demands for the agency shop. It is significant that the company acted less than 24 hours after Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg said he would not hesitate to ask Congress for special legislation to forestall an aerospace industry strike.

The Douglas settlement could have been the result of administration pressure as was the steel industry's reaction to President Kennedy's tough tactics.

However, other aerospace manufacturers are holding firm against the union shop demands of the International Association of Machinists and United Auto Workers.

We find it hard to visualize general public support for a strike in this vital industry merely because a handful of labor bosses want to strengthen their own position.

Compulsory unionism is not a popular issue among the rank-and-file workers at many plants.

An aerospace strike would seriously strain America's missile muscle at this critical period of the cold war.

This is no time for an argument over compulsory unionism. Nor is it an opportunity for big government to dominate the bargaining table. It is instead a moment when both sides must sit down in good faith and work out a solution that will serve the community and the Nation.

Must State Aid Be Fatal to Art?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, in an article which appeared in the Washington Post, August 2, 1962, a statement of excerpts from an address by Mr. August Heckscher before the convention of the American Library Association in Miami might well be considered a poignant reminder of our need for renewed and continued efforts on the part of our Government to aid cultural development and see that the institutions of the arts become a significant national interest. I, therefore, include the complete column as it appeared in the Post:

MUST STATE AID BE FATAL TO ART?

(By August Heckscher)

(NOTE.—These excerpts are taken from a recent address by Mr. Heckscher, special consultant on the arts to the President, before the convention of the American Library Association in Miami.)

When I consider the role that Government will play in the next stage of our cultural development as a nation, I find a most suggestive precedent in the Library Services Act of 1956. Here, for the support of a cultural institution, was invoked a long-established American practice, the giving of grants-in-aid.

Since 1862, we have found this an effective and satisfactory way of encouraging and stimulating activities deemed important to the national interest. We have used this principle to stimulate qualified applicants both public and private; we have used it to help set standards and to improve administration as well as to give substantial financial support on the basis of matching funds. The Library Services Act aimed particularly to help libraries in communities under 10,000 population.

It might have had a severe defect in that it spread the available funds thin, but in its administration the act was wisely used to strengthen state library agencies and to organize and coordinate services rather than merely to scatter them.

No one has talked about the libraries being subverted—nor, for that matter, has it appeared that the Nation was going through dangerous fiscal waters as a result of these expenditures. The experience is sobering to the alarmists, and encouraging to those who would like to believe that the Government can act in the field of culture without harming the ends it seeks to serve.

It was right that we should have recognized the development of libraries as demonstrably related to the broad national interest. One day, not too far off, we may come to recognize that the development of certain other institutions is also a matter for national concern. We may decide that the growth of theater groups in states across the country is connected with our capacity as a people to perceive the deeper issues of man's fate, to realize the strange admixture of good and evil in the world, and in general to become more confident and mature as individuals.

The theater, or poetry, or music, may seem as significant as libraries were recognized to be in 1956—or as educational television was recognized through similar legislation in the current session of Congress. I hardly want to predict that so wonderful a thing will happen. But I think we can argue, on the basis of experience derived from the libraries, that when such a day comes we shall have methods and precedents which will permit us to put the Government safely in the service of these new cultural goals.

I say I connot predict when the day will come which will see the American people consciously affirming that the institutions of the arts represent a significant national ininterest—that they embody resources which we waste at our peril and answer to needs which cannot safely be ignored. Yet I will predict, after all, I believe such a day will come sooner than many now think—especially those who have been disheartened and wearied by a long struggle for the arts which has seemed to face insurmountable obstacles. When things begin to change in this country, they sometimes change very rapidly, And there has been a change in the way people look upon the resources of their cultural life.

Why there should be this fresh burgeoning of hope and desire it would be complex to analyze. When we are in a position to look back upon these times we shall see, I believe, that the development of the arts was linked with all the principal developments—political, economic and social—taking place within the great modern community.

Technology has brought new leisure; and the people are coming to know that leisure will be a debasing force except as it is animated by the pursuit of beauty and excellence.

Finally I suggest that in the development of our civilization as a whole a new determination has been formed: the determination not to be a lopsided people, excelling only in material benefits. For the individual we want the fullness of life which comes from enjoyment of the arts in all their guises. For the Nation as a whole we want the richness and diversity of cultural activities, combined with an outward scene—a landscape both natural and manmade—which reflects the inner qualities we strive to attain.

Capt. Chester Chastek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the July 26 issue of the Cashmere Valley Record, published in Cashmere, Wash.

It is the pleasure of Mrs. Horan and I to know Captain Chastek as a true friend since 1940. A great portion of that time he has been a most capable State director of the selective service of the State of Washington. He has performed that difficult function with courtesy, good judgment, justice, and distinction.

We are pleased to join Editor Charlie Heard in this editorial:

At the Cashmere Rotary Club the other day, Rotarians and guests were privileged to hear Navy Capt. Chester Chastek, State director, Selective Service, with headquarters in Tacoma.

Captain Chastek, in "leave" status and at his own expense was a member this spring of the American Legion's National Security Commission factfinding tour to NATO and SHAPE Headquarters, Paris, France, and to U.S. military installations in France, West Germany, West Berlin, and Italy in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Defense and the U.S. Department of State.

Ye editor was impressed by the speaking ability of this fine and splendid representative of the American Legion who made those present feel they were rejuvenated in the holy cause of freedom.

The American Legion may well be proud of the dedicated type of leadership manifested by Chester Chastek. He knows his subject and he knows how to present it. The Rotary Club of Cashmere deserves praise for having brought this fine speaker to our fair city.

Count Your Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by our distinguished Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges.

Secretary Hodges has reminded us of one of the most important freedoms we have under a democratic form of government: the freedom of choice.

The article, which appeared in the July 1, 1962, issue of This Week magazine, follows:

COUNT YOUR FREEDOMS

(By Luther H. Hodges, U.S. Secretary of Commerce)

(NOTE.—One of our most exciting American freedoms is one we seldom discuss: Freedom of choice. In a new kind of Fourth of July message, the Secretary of Commerce talks about its meanings for you.)

WASHINGTON.—When I was a boy in North Carolina, the Fourth of July was the most exciting holiday of the year. The whole town turned out for the races in the morning—sack races, three-legged races, and the wild race to capture a greased pig. Then we ate picnic lunches, bought lemonade at the refreshment stands and settled down for the speeches.

Thundering oratory was much admired in that pre-World War I time. We listened, entranced, to the rolling phrases celebrating the glorious declaration of liberation from tyranny and despotism which took place on July 4, 1776. The inspiring words still echoed in our minds hours later when brilliant fireworks exploded in the night sky.

The years passed and the Fourth of July emphasis gradually shifted from the independence as a Nation, won for us by our forefathers, to the precious individual freedoms that we ourselves must guard constantly against attack and erosion. The four freedoms of Franklin D. Roosevelt—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear—became the focus of our celebration.

This year I'd like to bring up a fifth freedom—a freedom we enjoy every minute of every day of our lives, yet one we rarely mention—freedom of choice.

What does this fifth freedom mean? Simply that in our personal, our business, and our community lives, we Americans have a range of free choices unmatched and almost undreamed of in many other parts of the world. For example:

FREEDOM OF CHOICE: WHERE WE LIVE

Americans are free to live wherever they please. One family moves from the city to a suburb. Another goes from a rented apartment to a house of its own. Still another heads west or north to a different State—in pursuit of a new job, a better school, fresher air, or merely a change of scene. People in many countries today do not have this freedom.

When I visited the Soviet Union in 1959 as one of nine State Governors, a man working in a factory told me, through an interpreter, that he came from a very beautiful, distant part of Russia where there were many vineyards.

"Would you like to work in the vineyards?" I asked.

"Oh yes," his face lit up.

"Then why don't you?" I inquired.

He shook his head. Later someone explained to me that in order to buy a railroad ticket to that distant place, the man would be required to show proof that he had a job there. But to obtain a job, he would have to be there. So the idea was hopeless, because he had no choice as to his location or his job.

Last fall in Berlin I noticed a dozen West Berliners standing on a mound near the East-West dividing line waving their handkerchiefs—some occasionally wiping away tears. I asked a woman to whom she was waving.

"To my daughter and her baby and my elderly mother," she told me.

I looked and saw another group of people 500 feet away in East Berlin—imprisoned behind the 7-foot wall topped by barbed wire and broken glass. The divided members of this family had written to each other making a date to wave at that particular time on that Sunday morning.

By contrast, our freedom to move about and live wherever we please is illustrated by a delightful letter received recently at the Department of Commerce census field office in Kansas City. A young woman, licensed to teach school anywhere in the State of Nebraska, asked the census people a simple and sensible question before accepting a job offer: "What city in Nebraska has the highest proportion of unmarried men between 30 and 40?"

FREEDOM OF CHOICE: WHAT WE BUY

The abundance of goods in our supermarkets and department stores is so overwhelming that we tend not to be aware of it until we travel to a place where scarcity prevails. In many parts of the Communist world there is outright famine today—no food to be had at any price. Even the poorest of our people, choosing an ice cream cone for a child from numerous flavors, has difficulty imagining mass starvation striking a country like a Biblical plague.

In East Germany, where the shops are nearly empty, a woman goes from queue to queue and spends half a day assembling the barest necessities for the next 24 hours. In the Soviet Union, everyone I saw appeared to be healthy and well-fed, but the diet is about 60 percent bread and 10 percent potatoes. Not much choice there. In fact, nearly everything of a luxury nature seemed to be pretty much out of reach of the average person.

But let us not be fat, dumb and happy about our good fortune. The graveyard of history is filled with the bones of people who became too complacent, and were overrun by the lean and hungry have-nots. We must help other nations, some of whose citizens exist on as little as $50 each year, to improve their lot. In so doing we will also help ourselves, because some day they will be able to buy automobiles and television sets from us.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE: HOW WE RUN A BUSINESS

The Americans who make and sell all those automobiles, desks, radios, and bicycles enjoy broad freedoms of choice which we call free enterprise. Of course, our commercial society is complex today and sometimes red tape and collisions of public and private interest tend to confuse us. I find this true in Government work, but the fundamental freedoms are always there and the goals are worth all our impatience and inconvenience.

An industrialist can make up his mind at lunch, "I'll build a front-wheel drive car that goes 150 miles an hour." A storekeeper can abruptly decide, "I'm bored with children's clothes—I'd rather sell hobby kits." A salesman can walk out of his job at an appliance company and look for work in the soft drink field. All three can set about their new projects that very afternoon, without the slightest thought of clearances, permits or authorizations.

The one person who exercises an ultimate veto over them is the consumer. He must freely choose to buy what they offer, or they'll soon have no factory, no store, no job. Essentially, ours is a consumer-controlled economy.

When I traveled in Communist countries, it took effort of will to grasp the idea that all business, trades, and industries are run and owned by the State. A workingman cannot casually change jobs. Neither can a factory operator make shirts instead of skirts, replace machinery or open new branches. These are official, not individual, choices.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE: THE WAY WE ADVERTISE

An important free choice of the American businessman is how he sells his product. He can put a sign in his window and hope the neighbors will see it. Or he can buy space in a publication or time on the air and, with the unique sales tool called advertising, try to sell to millions of people.

Of course this freedom is sometimes abused, but blanket criticism of advertising reflects a profound ignorance of its essential role in our economy. Without advertising to stimulate a constantly expanding demand for goods and services, we wouldn't be the wealthiest nation that has ever existed.

Under our system, profits make possible the investments that create jobs and increase production. To keep this cycle spiraling upward, potential demand must be transformed into actual sales. Advertising does this by informing purchasers of the choices offered them.

A single example will show the service rendered to our whole economy by the right kind of advertising. When the first manmade fabrics came out, they were referred to slightingly as "artificial silk" or "synthetic." The word "synthetic" was equivalent of "fake" and the public was disposed to think of the new materials as worthless.

But carefully thought-out advertising informed buyers of the special merits of each of the new fibers. The goods lived up to the promises made for them, and today the production of manmade fibers has reached an astonishing 2 billion pounds a year.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE: WHERE WE SELL

The American businessman can freely choose to sell locally or to faraway markets. Since the Department of Commerce began its current drive to raise our level of exports from 4 percent of our gross national product (Belgium-Luxembourg exports over 31 percent), many smaller businessmen have been amazed to learn that this choice is, as a practical matter, open to them.

One Midwest manufacturer of work clothes asked us if he really could sell his garments abroad. We put him in touch with agents in the United Kingdom and Germany. The salesman he sent to England wrote enough orders to swamp the factory and saved Germany for a later trip.

The 10 American exhibitors at our London Trade Center's lamps and home-lighting show this March wrote $125,000 in initial orders. The hit of the show was the three-way light bulb and switch, an everyday item for us, but a novelty in Britain. American factories are now rushing three-way units for shipment abroad.

I feel that far too few of our businessmen are taking advantage of their freedom to sell overseas. A recent U.S. trade mission to eight new West African Republics ran into many German and French salesmen, wide awake to the commercial potential of these new markets, but not a single American. Yet a 10-percent increase in our exports would virtually eliminate the deficit in our international accounts and create new jobs and profits.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE: WHAT KIND OF TOWN

Finally, I want to talk about the choices a community can make. As citizens you are free to decide what kind of town yours will be—residential or industrial, fast growing or slow to change, a place where people come to study, retire, get rich or kick up their heels.

And when things go wrong, you can choose remedies. Certain areas today are sorely depressed because resources have been depleted, industries have moved away, or leaders of the community have grown careless and indifferent. When this happens, people can simply bemoan their fate and accept relief, or they can leave and start somewhere else. Or they can act in concert to improve their condition.

I think particularly of a Maryland city with a real can-do spirit. In 1960, Cambridge, on the Eastern Shore, was in a decline after the closing of a major food plant. More than 12 percent of the labor force was idle. Stores were failing. The prospects were indeed bleak when four young businessmen formed an industrial committee and by ringing doorbells collected $15,000, partly in $1 and $5 bills.

With this money, hard work, and enthusiasm, they "sold Cambridge" to a manufacturing company, two boat companies and a publishing house. Later, a new sewage system was needed to serve expanding industry. The new area redevelopment program of the Department of Commerce assisted the city with a $68,000 loan and a $204,000 grant, and 875 more new jobs came into being. The people of Cambridge are taxpayers again instead of tax users—because they chose to do something about their problems. They made their choice.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE: LET'S KEEP IT

I get impatient with people who say we Americans have lost our freedoms, lost our momentum, lost our way. We have not. Sometimes I wish for a little of that rousing Fourth of July oratory of my boyhood so we could feel again the heady excitement and throbing sense of our destiny.

I think we need to remind ourselves that we are not forced to go where we are sent, do what we are told, or eat what we are given—because 186 years ago, we declared for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And as we exercise our freedom of choice in scores of ways, we can, by the unselfishness and the farsightedness of our choices, assure the continuation of the freedoms we cherish and their extension to others.

Agree, Mrs. Peterson?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an editorial which recently appeared in the Daytona Beach Evening News. The nursing profession is an honored and a dedicated one and the rewards, in service to mankind are great. The monetary rewards are quite another thing and there is real food for thought in this editorial:

Agree, Mrs. Peterson?

Recently, in the Evening News, there was an account of the work of Mrs. Esther Peterson, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, and her thinking on the problems of women who work. Those here who are fans of the Open Forum, held during the winter months, will remember Mrs. Peterson as a dynamic speaker at one of the Peabody Auditorium programs this year.

She talked then of many things in American life that are good or that need correcting. But then she talked but little on her favorite subject—the status of the working woman.

She believes it should be raised. She believes that when women do the same work as men, they should be paid what a man would command. And she believes that when a woman works and pays taxes to the Government, she should have the same privilege as any taxpaying business—the privilege of writing off the help she must hire to run her home or care for her children.

But she also believes that women should be willing to pay that domestic help adequately—not downgrade a very important job by rewarding it niggardly.

Working women are raising their voices in many areas of the country about the universal objection to being considered less qualified on the job because of their sex. In the years when the teaching profession in elementary grades largely was considered a feminine field, the pattern of low salaries for schoolteachers was set, and now both men and women struggle against it.

Another profession is making its voice heard on the subject of low salaries for women.

These are the nurses.

While doctors earn from $15,000 to $25,000 or more a year, these feminine members of the medical profession earn a median salary in nonfederal hospitals of $3,900 a year.

Even those who enjoy the distinction of being director of nurses get only about $6,000 a year.

Yet, a nurse on general duty in any hospital is performing a vital service. Without her, the doctors on the staff simply would not be able to earn the $200 fee he gets for performing surgery—while the nurse gets about $2 as his assistant.

She must be on the run all day performing the chores the males disdain.

In a recent survey, the Wall Street Journal found that discontent over their status as wage earners is running high among the nurses. In Illinois, a 23-nurse staff resigned en masse after an unsuccessful 2-year fight to obtain more pay. In another town in the same State, 24 of the 46-member staff at a privately supported local hospital walked off the job when they reached an impasse in trying to bargain with the administrator—and they still refuse to return to their jobs.

In Oregon, a powerful State nurses association became so riled over their situation that they went into politics. They succeeded in getting candidates for the legislature elected who would heed their anger, and they got a law passed that requires nonprofit hospitals to bargain collectively with nurses.

These were real departures from tradition. The American Nurses Association is on record as opposed to strikes by nurses. And nonprofit hospitals are exempt under the Taft-Hartley Act, which sets Federal rules for collective bargaining in other fields of labor.

Nonetheless, some nurses are too fed up with the way their plight is ignored to abide by the idealism attached to their profession and the rules Congress set which exclude them.

Vacancies in the profession reflect their anger. The ANA claims that poor pay in private or community supported hospitals is the cause for the fact that 20 percent of the budgeted jobs in hospitals go unfilled. Some 200,000 trained nurses on record in 1960 were not practicing.

The financial journal's survey showed that the lack is becoming serious. It told of a Florida nurse who related that one night a baby had a heart attack in a ward where no nurse was on duty. It wasn't until morning that the tragedy was discovered—had a nurse been there, she could have administered treatment at once.

She can perform this service because she is trained for it. Like doctors, nurses must go to school for a long time. The training requires 3 years of concentrated study almost as rigorous as that of doctors.

The reward ought to be almost the same when she goes to work.

Agree, Mrs. Peterson?

Youth Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our law-enforcement agencies desperately need the cooperation of parents, citizens, and every civic organization to curb juvenile crime. Unless halted, the increasing crime rate among young people could mushroom into complete destruction of our society.

J. Edgar Hoover has warned us for many years about this trend. Mr. Hoover recommends that our parents and the public provide more Sunday school, sports, and discipline for our young people.

The following Associated Press story appeared in the Washington Post, August 2:

Hoover Hits Big Rise in Youth Crime

A "massive avalanche of crime"—triggered by young criminals—is rolling over the Nation, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said yesterday.

"This problem boils down to the simple fact that in our land today the average man, woman, and child is in greater danger than ever before of becoming a victim of this criminal onslaught," Hoover said in an editorial in the FBI law enforcement bulletin.

He noted that the recent uniform crime reports showed a 4-percent increase last year in arrests of persons under 18.

Of 37 law-enforcement officers killed by criminals last year, Hoover said, 12 were slain by assailants 21 or younger.

Referring to reports of almost 2 million serious crimes committed in 1961, the FBI chief said:

"The massive avalanche of crime sweeping our Nation is a shocking disgrace and a broad indictment of the American people."

He said there is no single answer to the problem, adding there will be "no abatement in widespread lawlessness as long as there is wholesale disrespect for law and order in our Nation."

But community authorities and civic leaders "should lead the fight to halt the lawless hordes who prey on society," Hoover said.

Labor Dumps Baring for Stand Against Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the Congressional Record a reprint of a speech I made which was reprinted and circulated by friends who have the same belief as I do regarding medicare under the social security system, which appears to me to be the start of socialized medicine.

This speech was made at the AFL–CIO convention in Las Vegas, Nev., which endorsed my opponent after I had been told in advance that such endorsement would be mine if I would vote for the King-Andersen bill:

Nevada Labor Bosses Dump Congressman Baring for His Courageous Stand Against Socialized Medicine Plan

This will be the eighth time in 16 years that it has been my pleasure to appear before your group and seek labor's support for my candidacy for the Congress of the United States.

Seven times over a period of 14 years your group has overwhelmingly supported my candidacy. Labor has always joined with me and I with them in facing our common foe at election time. The results generally have been quite favorable but we have always had a pretty rough road to travel. The record of that 14 years speaks for itself.

Your national representatives have been high in their acclaim of my stand on matters affecting organized labor. Within the State itself, your leaders and members of the various locals have from time to time contacted me and have expressed their satisfaction with my representation not only of the State of Nevada, but of organized labor itself.

I have journeyed here for the purpose of receiving my eighth consecutive endorsement. I have read and heard of criticism in some quarters as to my standing on some present matters of legislation. Frankly, I was not too concerned. I attributed the apparent misunderstandings to an unfavorable press.

However, shortly after arriving in town I had a visit from two of the leaders of this State organization, and was advised by them that unless I came forward and made an out-and-out commitment to be in favor of the King-Anderson bill, otherwise known as medicare, my continuing support by your organization would be in jeopardy.

Let's see what my stand on this matter is.

The King-Anderson bill was introduced in both the House and the Senate, and in neither body were the proponents of the bill able to get it out of committee. (For your information, I did not serve on the House committee which had the bill under consideration. At the time the King-Anderson bill was introduced, it contained certain language and methods which I did not feel were in the interest of the majority of the people in either the State of Nevada or the United States of America. I therefore announced to the press that I was opposed to the King-Anderson bill in its original form. Let's see what happened.)

The proponents of the bill, who had the strong support of President Kennedy, and after consultation with him themselves decided that the bill in its original form had no chance of passing.

They amended and watered down the King-Anderson bill substantially through legislative maneuver, and put it on as a rider to the welfare bill in the Senate. The Senate defeated the measure by a narrow margin. Those voting against were 21 Democratic Senators, constituting a third of the Democrats in the Senate, and 31 Republican Senators. This bill has never been voted on in the House and will not be presented until the next session of the Congress.

I am as compassionate as anybody living for the fine elderly and needy people in our country who are now in the golden years of their life, and I am very cognizant that we do have quite a problem in this sphere. Something must be worked out to help them, but the manner in which we act is the deciding point.

The King-Anderson bill wants to put medicare under the Social Security Act, which makes the whole program one of compulsory health insurance. This is not in line with the American way of life and while, as I have said, we must have something to help, it must be on a voluntary basis or else the whole program is labeled as socialized medicine.

Having served on the scene for 10 years, I have lived with this situation, for the subject matter is not a new one. It started under President Truman's administration, continued through President Eisenhower's administration, and the same forces are still fighting to pass this compulsory health insurance under this administration.

I want to point out to you that in each successive Congress from and including Truman's administration until now the majority of the legislators in the National Congress have turned compulsory health insurance down because of the fear of socialized medicine.

I want to say that I know the proponents of the King-Anderson bill personally, and that their intention is to have a public law passed and signed so that it is on the books, and then they will remove the age limit of 65 so that the bill will encompass everyone of all ages. This is unconstitutional, for it would become a direct change in our American way of life.

The bill itself, as it stands today, only covers those people who are presently under the social security system. Those who have never had any social security do not get the benefits, and I think a much more appropriate plan would be to perhaps cut down our budget on some unnecessary foreign aid spending and make outright grants to those people who actually are in need of medical care, then it would not be compulsory insurance.

It would answer the problem and, surely in view of the light that we are taking care of foreigners all over the globe, we could take care of our own elderly people.

Now, one of my Democratic opponents has openly stated that he will be a rubber stamp to the administration, and has stated that I talk as a Republicn. My Republican opponent has publicly stated that I vote as a New Dealer. This is an unusual situation, and I'm telling you right here and now that both men are wrong.

I talk and vote an an American who believes in the Constitution of the United States, and I have stated publicly that I will conduct my campaign on an Americanism platform in defense of the Constitution.

How can anyone challenge this if he is a real American, unless he himself is a rubber stamp?

Where does loyalty start, to your country or to your party?

My party background is one of Jeffersonian Democracy, believing in States' rights. I do not like to see centralized government become so strong that it is only a hop, skip, and a jump from socialism, and we all know what the next step is after socialism.

Thomas Jefferson said: "The best government is the least government." He also said: "I place economy among the first and foremost virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. If we run into such debts we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labor and our amusements. If we can prevent the government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them. they will be happy." I repeat, under the pretense of caring for them—for I think this to be a most important thought.

This country has become most lethargic, and most people have gone along over the past two decades thinking that Uncle Sam is a magician and can do this and that at will via the public expense method. Somebody has to pay these bills, and that somebody is you, or you and me.

The national debt is now $308 billion, and this makes our financial system a very lopsided and dangerous state of affairs. Yet, there is a group of very powerful thinkers who are now in high Government places—in fact, some 33 in number—who are left of center and are all members of the ADA, a group which propounds Fabian socialism.

They are mixed into both parties, so I am critical of this group as it exists in both parties. This is not political, it is bipartisan. They have almost discarded American patriotism and to their way of thinking, such great Americans as Patrick Henry, Henry Clay, Thomas Jefferson become nothing but "bums" or, if you please, modern-day John Birchers. And yet, since I was a boy I was taught that patriotism for my country was the highest and greatest thing that one could show.

You have heard this same group label me and other good Americans with some fantastic name such as McCarthyites, Birchers or anything else fantastic, so as to throw the blame and suspicion of what they are actually doing. stating that these ultra-ultra rightists are bad for the country.

Somebody has to challenge them and show how bad this group of leftists is for our country, for they are not Americans at heart but are power hungry and are desirous of creating a one-world welfare state. Instead of trying to keep America sound the way it grew up, on supply and demand, free enterprise, and labor, they have thoroughly brainwashed many unsuspecting citizens into thinking that the Government should take care of them.

Let me remind you what Abraham Lincoln said: "You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves." While Lincoln was a Republican, and I have now quoted Jefferson and Lincoln, I want you to know that I stand firm in both men's beliefs. They were good Americans.

Delegates to this convention, I made an open stand to the people I represent in Nevada, which means all the people. I am frankly alarmed at this sudden turn to the left in government, and I want to leave this thought with you today—that a government that is big enough to give you everything you want is a government big enough to take everything you've got.

I am not McCarthy reborn, as was expressed in one of our local morning newspapers. I am not a John Bircher, or any other fantastic name. I am a legislator who studies cause and effect, and I vote what I think will do the best good for the majority of the people.

Above all, let me state to you here today that I am not a rubberstamp, for if we had a rubberstamp Congress you would not need a Congress. You would be under a dictatorship form of government.

Men have disagreed, parties have disagreed, over the last 200 years, and this is a healthy condition if we want to preserve our American way of life.

During the 10 years that I have represented you in the Congress, I can proudly say that I have always represented you with dignity and honesty.

If after 10 years I cannot get your support, with you knowing how I have worked for the working people of America, then I cannot come into your convention and ask your support under the provision that I must vote for one particular piece of legislation, or else.

I repeat, delegates, that I am not a rubberstamp—I am a representative of all the people.

I thank you for allowing me to appear before you today and make my position known to you. Thank you again.

Port of Philadelphia: First Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, last year I called to the attention of the Congress the fact that Philadelphia was the top port in the country in shipping tonnage in 1960.

Now I am pleased to report that Philadelphia leads the Nation in foreign trade tonnage in 1961.

I attach an editorial contained in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Monday, August 6, and hope that Members will agree that trade expansion can be accomplished even in these competitive days:

PORT OF PHILADELPHIA: FIRST AGAIN

Now that it's official—Philadelphia led the Nation in foreign trade tonnage in 1961, for the second consecutive year—promoters of commerce and industry throughout the Delaware Valley should be sure the facts and figures get into appropriate hands at home and abroad, along with the reasons underlying this area's continuing progress.

Philadelphia has been the No. 1 port in the country on import tonnage for 8 straight years. The city's emergence to leadership in both exports and imports is the result of a growing realization that cargo in either direction can be routed through Philadelphia at considerable savings in time and cost, and with many conveniences.

It's a record to be proud of. And it's a record to build on.

Who Wants War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the Brattleboro Daily Reformer of Thursday, August 2, 1962, the very able editor, John S. Hooper, devotes his attention to a small but highly organized and intensely vocal group of self-styled pacifists who seem to feel that the fate of the world rests in their hands and in their hands exclusively, and that anyone who disagrees with them must be in favor of a third world war and the extermination of the human race.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hooper's editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO WANTS WAR?

(By John S. Hooper)

We are getting a little tired of the holier-than-thou pamphlets that come to a newspaper editor's desk with the bland assumption that neither he nor the newspaper's readers ever heard of (1) the atomic threat to survival of the human race (2) the futility of atomic warfare in which both sides face extinction or (3) the danger of nuclear fallout from bomb tests. We are tired of the intellectual snobbery, of the selfish possessiveness of these pamphlet writers and the organizations they represent—who so obobviously believe that only they possess the information already held by millions of Americans, only they possess a solution to the terrible dilemmas posed by the A-bomb, only they are working to avoid the war that would unleash the A-bomb's horrors.

We won't classify them as pacifists, because they are so aggressive. We do classify them as proponents of appeasement, in the name of negotiation and compromise. We do say it is impossible to avoid the implication that those who disagree with their solutions do so because they do not want peace. By implication they accuse those who not agree with them of wanting war.

What a tragic approach to the world's problems. Within this writer's rather wide acquaintance, both direct and indirect, he knows of nobody who wants war. He knows of nobody who wants to see the A-bomb unleased. But he knows of many, and many, who have learned from history the terrible folly of appeasement—at Munich, in North Korea—the terrible folly of unpoliced disarmament following the Kellogg Pact, the results of onesided agreements at Yalta and Potsdam. He knows the overwhelming faith the great majority of Americans who had in the United Nations, in the Marshall plan and the hope they once had that from Geneva would come at last some show of concern for humanity from the Communist bloc.

Who wants war? Certainly there are only a few troubled minds that want war. The vast majority don't want war. They do want peace—an honest, honorable, indestructible peace that preserves freedom and human dignity. This they want—and they are tired of being told they don't want it by small but articulate groups of fearmongers, some of them appeasers.

James P. Warburg Discusses the "Bonn-Paris Axis"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished writer on foreign affairs, James P. Warburg, has contributed a thoughtful argument on free world relationship in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal:

IS NEW "BONN-PARIS AXIS" A DANGER TO PEACE AND WIDER UNITY OF WEST?

(By James P. Warburg)

The happy achievement of Franco-German reconciliation has unhappily resulted in a Franco-German policy which at present blocks almost every conceivable road to peace. Unconditional support of each other by Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and President Charles de Gaulle, in spite of often wholly disparate objectives, arises from the fears of one partner and the romantic ambitions of the other, as well as from a common desire to re-create and dominate the Europe of Charlemagne.

Adenauer has sacrificed all realistic hope of reunifying Germany for the sake of anchoring at least a part of his restless people to the west. Unable to admit this, he has evolved with De Gaulle, who clearly does not want Germany to be reunified, the cynical and dangerous fiction that utter intransigence toward Moscow will eventually bring about not only German unification but the reunification of Europe "from the Urals to the Atlantic."

Hence the Bonn-Paris axis opposes all efforts to relax East-West tensions and objects even to the discussion of the major tension causing problems.

Both partners are reluctant to dilute their hoped for dominance of a Carolingian Europe by admitting Britain. In addition, De Gaulle fears that British membership would bring the United States into what he considers strictly European affairs.

Adenauer shares De Gaulle's coolness toward Britain but not his apprehensions concerning the United States, recognizing that Europe cannot ask for America's military presence without accepting its diplomatic interest.

Recently, however, knowing that he can no longer mesmerize Washington as he did in the Acheson-Dulles era, Adenauer has thrown in his lot with De Gaulle's distrust of "les Anglo-Saxons," joining the French leader in making the difficult British decision to join even more difficult.

Beyond cooperating with De Gaulle in thus blocking the roads toward Atlantic partnership and a relaxation of east-west tensions, Adenauer tacitly supports his partner's contemptuous treatment of the United Nations—treatment which obstructs the creation of an effective world organization. He supports De Gaulle's nuclear policy which greatly hinders the achievement of a test ban treaty.

Is it no time to make clear to the leaders and to the people of France and Germany that, while we would welcome their helpful cooperation, we are not dependent upon it—that we cannot and will not permit a Bonn-Paris axis to stand athwart the roads to peace?

If a number of west European nations wish to create an independent bloc under Franco-German leadership, neither they nor the rest of western Europe nor the other free nations of the world can escape the very serious consequences. But the fact remains that common defense and common diplomacy can rest only upon common purpose.

"Les Anglo-Saxons" are by no means alone in their determination to create a partnership of those free nations which are dedicated to the easing of tensions, to ending the arms race, to the alleviation of poverty, injustice and discontent, and to the ultimate creation of a world in which all men may live in peace.

Such a partnership can, if necessary, be created without Germany and France. It might include—beside "les Anglo-Saxons"—the like-minded free nations of Latin America, Asia, and Africa as well as those free nations of Europe, such as the low countries and Scandinavia, which may prefer a wider international community to a Franco-German dominated Carolingia.

The United States has twice been drawn into war by Franco-German quarrels. It welcomes Franco-German reconciliation, but in this observer's opinion, it must not permit these two newly reconciled ancient enemies to gang up in blocking a wider reconciliation leading toward wider freedom and world peace.

The Making of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been an admirer of Senator KERR, of Oklahoma. I met him first in Oklahoma City when he was Governor of Oklahoma; at that time I was a Member of Congress serving on a House Newsprint Subcommittee which was studying newsprint problems of publishers throughout the Nation.

Later when Senator KERR came to the U.S. Senate, I renewed my acquaintance with him and have watched his work with appreciation and respect. We all know he is an unusually capable and outstanding man.

In the month of October 1960 during the presidential race, Senator KERR spoke in Longview, Tex., in behalf of the Democratic ticket. It was my privilege to introduce him in Longview, Tex., I am pleased to present for the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and others the enclosed editorial which appeared in the Longview Daily News. Indeed, the editorial is a splendid one. The editor in chief of the Longview News Journal is Mr. Ellie Hopkins and the publisher is Hon. Carl Estes.

The Makings of Opportunity

It is seldom that more than once during a lifetime does the opportunity present itself for a man to achieve true national greatness. U.S. Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, stands on the fiery threshold of such an opportunity today.

Senator Kerr is no novice, nor is he without high personal achievement. He is today nationally recognized as one of the most distinguished products of a State renowned for its distinguished citizen leaders.

Now at the peak of a career that has included oversea military service in the field artillery, successful business, and industrial operations, Governor of his State and Democratic national committeeman, Senator Kerr today occupies a strategic position in the senior body of the national administration.

It is precisely this position of trust and honor and high responsibility that affords Senator Kerr his unusual opportunity. For, standing as he does in a key position of senatorial power and influence in the high councils of the administration, the Oklahoman in the next several days can give enlightened direction to policy for an administration which has been sadly lacking in understanding and responsible direction toward the business and industrial community—the basis on which American strength and progress rests.

Senator Kerr's unusual opportunity arises by virtue of his key position concerning the major questions of national policy affecting the vital extractive industries—oil and gas, other minerals, and commercial earth elements of an exhaustible nature.

One of the major questions is the necessity for greater protection for oil and other mineral industries in President Kennedy's trade expansion bill. Senator Kerr believes, as do most of the domestic leaders of these industries, that the national security section of this bill must be strengthened. He is reported in news dispatches to believe that technical changes in the wording of the security section can achieve the desired security, and he has wisely said that any language in the bill must be broad enough to cover all domestic industry.

The Oklahoma Senator, one of the most knowledgeable men in the U.S. Senate concerning the minerals industries by reason of his own successful personal experience, believes the domestic oil industry is entitled to and should be assured its rightful and proportionate share of the domestic market. This objective he hopes to achieve through negotiation. He makes it clear he is going to support the trade bill, recognizing national needs and interests in this direction.

The other major issue—which is not officially before the Congress but which is being broadly considered in Government agency circles and widely discussed in national news media—is that of Federal tax treatment of the minerals industries.

The whole complicated field of taxation is under study and consideration. News and opinion column theorists and comic pundits are attacking the time-proved principle of depletion credit as a tax loophole which they say must be closed before any tax reform can be worked out. Other liberal self-anointed social reformers vie for hearing in the rising din of attack on depletion. Some even suggest that depletion be replaced by a system of Federal subsidies at taxpayer expense—a la the Federal agricultural program.

President Kennedy wisely has not called for abandonment of the depletion principle. Congress instituted this principle long ago and has stood by it for more than a generation—while domestic industry has given this Nation the greatest abundance of low-cost fuel and energy the world has ever known, and at no cost to the taxpayer.

Without a doubt, the President wants the Nation to go forward. One of his chief aims has been to increase the rate of economic growth. He has made some unfortunate blunders. He cannot now afford and would not knowingly adopt a course that would halt the progress of nearly 100 minerals industries which provide the basic employment, payrolls and economic backbone of some 35 States.

This is where Senator Kerr faces his great opportunity. Out of his broad personal experience in business and industry, he can render the administration most valuable advice and counsel. By his skill as a legislator, he can properly represent the legitimate interests of business and industry. Through his knowledge of economics, gained in both private business and in government, he can serve the consumer interests of the Nation in an enlightened and effective manner.

This is a complicated and difficult assignment. But we believe Senator Kerr has the experience and the judgment to realize that—politics and social reform to the contrary notwithstanding—any solution of these problems that does not strengthen and safeguard the vital minerals industries is in neither the short-term nor long-term public and national interest, and that which is not in the public and national interest surely is not and never can be in the best interest of good politics or good reform.

It is under just such trying circumstances and such great pressures as Senator Kerr faces today that men of courage and faith and dedication down through the ages have forged these characteristics into the stalwart stature of statesmen. The valiant-hearted Oklahoman can seize in these makings the opportunity of a lifetime to confirm for historians and posterity his right to the eminent honor of true statesmanship.

Address of Harllee Branch, Jr., President of the Southern Co., Atlanta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune a few days ago to read a speech which Mr. Harllee Branch, Jr., made on July 8, at the homecoming exercises of Davisboro Baptist Church, Davisboro, Ga.

Mr. Branch, although a young man, has, through his own ability, energy, and integrity, reached a top position in the Nation's business world. He is president of the Southern Co., and a director and strong influence in some of the Nation's leading business organizations.

Mr. Branch is an eloquent and gifted speaker, not given to bombast, slogans, and verbose nothings. His speech delivered on the above-mentioned occasion gives wise counsel to those who are striving to solve the problems of our day and time.

His speech emphasizes important truths which need to be kept constantly before us.

I have asked unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Congressional Record, and pursuant to that consent I insert it herewith:

Address by Harllee Branch, Jr.

The past week marked the 186th anniversary of our Nation's birth.

The event, as usual, was celebrated with parades, picnics, and pageantry. Politicians seized the occasion to advance their candidacies; merchants and hucksters to promote their sales. There was roistering in the taverns and slaughter on the highways. Unfortunately, there were few Americans—even among those who spent the Fourth of July with their families—who bothered to ask: "What is there about America, its institutions and traditions, that is of especial significance to mankind? What are the real foundations of this Nation? Do these foundation principles still have validity and, if so, what are we doing to preserve them?"

It is still not too late for us to ponder these questions, nor is it inappropriate, in my opinion, to ponder them in this holy sanctuary. For it was out of religious exercises, out of the devotion to religious commitments, and the application of religious truths to human affairs that our forefathers derived the principles and gained the convictions upon which this Nation was founded.

"Religion and morality are our indispensable supports," the Founding Fathers declared, "and whoever shall subvert these great pillars of human happiness shall not be entitled to claim the tribute of patriotism."

George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson—all of them—acknowledged that religion alone can establish the principles upon which freedom and popular government may stand and that "the liberties of a nation cannot be thought secure when we have removed the only firm basis—a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God."

The oldest, and in many ways the wisest, of the men who formulated our Declaration of Independence and national Constitution was Benjamin Franklin, journalist, scientist, philosopher, and statesman. Dr. Franklin was not a denominationalist, perhaps not even a churchman, in the usual sense of the word; but he had an abiding faith in God, and this faith was strengthened by a long life of study and of contact with men and affairs. When he arose in Philadelphia to counsel his younger colleagues, he said:

"I have lived, sirs, a long time and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sirs, in the sacred writings, that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war and conquest."

It is no longer fashionable to talk in words such as those of Dr. Franklin. Virtue and faith and commitment to principle—even patriotism itself—are scoffed at in too many quarters. We have become soft and smug and self-satisfied. We speak of ours as an age of sophistication. We are beguiled by politicians and professors who exhort us to abandon the cliches of our political, social and economic pasts, forgetting that sophistication is frequently the product of conceit, cynicism and shallowness; and that a new cliche may be even more dangerous than an older one.

Our forefathers were not afraid of cliches nor were they afraid to be called unsophisticated. They were completely willing to embrace change where change was warranted—indeed, they risked their lives in one of the most dramatic assaults on the status quo the world has ever witnessed. But they never sneered at the tried and the true merely because it was old. The idea which inspired the American revolution and which has guided our national life, and is still the most powerful force in the world today, is itself an old idea as Secretary of State Rusk has pointed out in an article published only a few days ago.

The Founding Fathers, says Secretary Rusk, "did not pretend to have invented anything new." The burden of complaint in our Declaration of Independence was that a tyrannical king was depriving the people of the American Colonies of the unalienable rights and liberties by which they had been endowed by God. The idea of man's individual sovereignty—of his right to be secure from the domination of an all-powerful, all-pervasive government—was not set forth as a novel doctrine. It was based on a principle older than the earth itself, on the principle of divine law, no less. It was presented as a universal, unchanging truth, arising out of a discourse on the nature and purpose of man which began in Greece nearly 2,000 years ago.

This is a fact we need to remember as we are called upon to reappraise the foundations of our Republic.

We are vastly more knowledgeable than the Founding Fathers, even the most educated of them. Indeed, the sum total of man's knowledge has doubled in the last 10 years alone, and it is estimated that it will double again in the next 5.

But knowledge is not wisdom, and one of the greatest threats to our way of life is that we may rely for leadership upon men who know more than they understand. Knowledge—mere factual knowledge, unleavened by spiritual truths—can be a snare and a delusion, as we should have already realized. For we have now penetrated many of the innermost secrets of the universe, we have learned to release the vast energies of the atom, yet we have not learned to live together in peace and helpfulness.

We have developed the ability to project ourselves into outer space yet our spirits do not soar. We have surrounded ourselves with machines capable of doing our work and even doing our thinking, and with processes which can increase our productivity, cure our bodily ailments and even extend our lives, yet our mood is alternately one of boredom, of frustration, and finally of terror lest these very machines and processes be used to destroy us and the puny terrestrial sphere we inhabit.

The great threat to our way of life is posed by atheistic, materialistic men, symbolized by the communistic hordes of the East and typified by the Soviet astronaut, Titov, who declared on his recent visit to our country: "Some people say there is a God out there but, in my travels around the earth all day long, I looked around and did not see him. I saw no God or angels—I do not believe in God. I believe in man, his strength, his possibilities, and his reason."

How silly can man get? Who ever suggested that God was such an entity as could be seen by an earthling such as Titov?

But, we must not become bemused by the idea that the Titovs of this world are men of ignorance. They are as knowledgeable as we in the purely physical aspects of the universe and, in some areas, their technology is believed to exceed our own. The one—the only—resource we have that the Soviet man does not possess is the resource of spiritual strength which is derived from our recognition of the fatherhood and supremacy of God and our dependence upon Him. Abandon this resource, allow it to become tarnished by sophistication and by conceit over our own assumed prowess, and we lose our individual freedoms and our dignity as surely as have the slaves of the Soviet superstate.

"Know the truth," said Jesus, "and the truth will make you free." Not facts, not scientific formulas, not physical abstractions, not beguiling theories—but the truth as revealed by God in the creation of the world and the incarnation of His Son.

This was the truth to which the Founding Fathers repaired in a period of national and individual crisis—this was the source of the principles upon which they founded this Nation—notwithstanding the sneers of those who called themselves "rationalists."

Now again the rationalists and the materialists are clamoring for acceptance—in America and elsewhere. Only a few weeks ago, a prominent American scholar suggested that, since science has reduced the area of the unknown and since technology has increased our ability to use our environment, the relationship between God and man no longer applies. This is sheer philosophical poppycock, the sort of poppycock that is responsible for much of the sickness of our times.

Mankind, with all his knowledge, has not replaced God, nor will he do so. The greatest of our scientific discoveries, properly correlated and evaluated, confirm rather than deny the existence of a divine order and man's dependence upon it.

Those who founded this Republic sought, with God's guidance, to create here a governmental system built on confidence in divine law and the principles of individual freedom, dignity and responsibility which depend upon that law and not upon human actions and assurances.

It is a tragic thing that their progeny, if enrolled in a public school, may no longer invoke, in voluntary classroom prayer, the guidance and blessings of the very God upon whom the founders of the Nation so singularly relied. Religious freedom is a cherished heritage of all Americans, but it does seem strange that the principle of separation of church and state should now be tortured into a separation of the state from God—for the two principles are certainly not the same. What we need to do is bring God more vividly into our school exercises, and into our governmental and private affairs as well for, as Justice Frankfurter has himself observed: "The ultimate foundation of a free society is the binding tie of cohesive sentiment. Such a sentiment is fostered by all those agencies of the mind and spirit which may serve to gather up the traditions of a people, transmit them from generation to generation, and thereby create that continuity of a treasured common life which constitutes a civilization." It is not enough to say that the Court has still left the individual the right to pray in private and outside the precincts of his state-supported institutions. The individual has that right in Russia, too. But religion cannot be just personal. If it is real, it must be present in all we do in public and in private, and if we take God from our public institutions, we are left with no foundation upon which to build.

We may produce as many and as excellent gadgets as we will (automobiles, missiles, telephones, radios, television sets, electronic computers, and what have you) but, America and the Western World will not survive unless it also develops excellent men—men of faith, of humility, of truth, of moral stature, of strength and resourcefulness of mind (of pregnant ideas), of courtesy, of universal sympathy and friendship and love. Men such as these can not be produced in a laboratory. They are produced only in good homes, good churches, good schools where the presence of God is ever apparent.

In closing, I would like to pass on to you a word of kindly caution from one who, although not a native of the Western World, has shown an extraordinary regard for its institutions. He is Dr. Charles Malik, distinguished teacher and philosopher and former Lebanese Minister to the United States. Dr. Malik has warned that: "If the West thinks that it is going to win or even hold its own without the living God who made it and has sustained its excellence, it is simply mistaken. * * * Not by cleverness, nor by humanism, nor by sentimentalism, nor by the manipulation of force, nor by reliance on reason and genius, nor by the supplying of loaves and the giving of machines—not by any or all of these things alone—is the West going to succeed in defending and extending truth and light and freedom, but by the humble return to the living Source of all truth, all light, and all freedom."

Seniority System Aids the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, two of my distinguished colleagues who are serving in the Congress from Arkansas are mentioned in Mr. William S. White's column, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, August 3, 1962. The State may well take pride in such representation and in the seniority of Senator FULBRIGHT and Congressman MILLS. The article in its entirety is attached for inclusion in the RECORD:

SENIORITY SYSTEM AIDS THE SOUTH—DIXIE'S POWER IN CONGRESS ATTRIBUTED TO LONG SERVICE BY ITS LAWMAKERS

(By William S. White)

The Southern Democratic primaries are returning more than familiar faces for the next Congress. They are also returning men whose already great power—gained through the congressional seniority system, plus high Southern personal political talent—is now being still more increased through the sheer fact that again they have survived.

Dixie, thus far in its primaries, is in no mood for much change in its congressional delegations. Senior Members are being renominated with little opposition or none. And in the South, still a one-party region so far as Congress is concerned, renomination is equivalent in nearly every case to reelection.

For Dixie understands what no other section understands half so well. To have really potent representation it is necessary to let your representatives stay in Congress long enough to accumulate real seniority.

So, the meaning of the South's primary mood this year is that the already deep entrenchments of southern power in Congress are being dug yet deeper and wider. Thus it is that southern primaries have a national significance not to be found in any other part of the Nation.

This is so because no one man's vote automatically equals another man's vote in Congress. The true decision rests in the legislative committees—and the kernel of the true decision rests within the chairmen. These chairmanships do not fall mostly to southerners through dark conspiracy. They fall that way because seniority of service is the route to chairmanship and the southern fellows have a way of coming back and back here to become incredibly "seniors."

Thus, little Arkansas, in reelecting Senator J. W. Fulbright, except for the formalities of the November election, has sent back a man whose voice in the great affairs of the world will easily surpass those of all the six Senators from our three biggest States—New York, California, and Pennsylvania.

For Senator Fulbright is chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. As such his views on the proper conduct of foreign policy are more nearly decisive, in the vital, inside stages, than those, say, of Senators Keating and Javits, of New York; Kuchel and Engle, of California; and Scott and Clark, of Pennsylvania, all put together.

Similarly, in reelecting Representative Wilbur Mills—again, except for the November formalities—an even smaller number of Arkansas voters has returned a man whose influence over the economic affairs of this Nation is greater than that of all the junior Congressmen from several States. For Mr. Mills is chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Apart from largely determining who shall pay what tax and what tariff and what welfare payroll deductions, Ways and Means has one other little function. It helps determine what new Congressman shall have what assignment to any other committee of the House.

Again, look at Louisiana. The thumping return there of two moderate veterans, Senator Russell Long and Representative Hale Boggs, is presented as a victory over right-wing challengers. But it is something else, too. Again, it shows that Dixie savvies how congressional power is arrived at—and kept. Long has been here 14 years; Boggs 16.

These are but a few examples from this primary season which support a central point: Those trying to raise northern big-city power in Congress and reduce southern rural power think they can do it by forcing congrassinal reapportionment. But given even the most extreme kind of reapportionment, they still will confront a basic fact. The urbanites will never make it unless they can persuade Congress to abandon the seniority system (which is quite hopeless) or learn to let their congressional people stay here long enough to learn what it is all about and to gather seniority to be able to do something about what it is all about.

Praise for Boys State Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, every year the American Legion in New Jersey sponsors a Boys State and a Girls State in order to give high school students a practical lesson in democracy. This year George T. Hayum, of Livingston, N.J., was elected governor of Boys State while Nancy Donohue of Collingswood, N.J., was named Girls State president.

The teaching of the mechanics of democracy in such a practical way is one of the finest contributions the American Legion has made to our country, for here is where our youth learn some of the political realities that help guide the fundamental decisions of our Government.

The Herald-News, of Passaic, N.J., has commented on this invaluable service of the American Legion. I, therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, the Herald-News' June 29 editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRAISE FOR BOYS STATE PROGRAM

A speaker at a New Jersey Boys State session at Rutgers was greatly impressed by the intense interest of the teenagers in public affairs. He observed afterward that this project of the American Legion provides an invaluable education in an important subject for a group of intelligent, alert youngsters.

His comment was deeply felt because in his work he constantly runs up against a shocking ignorance of Government and its operations. In a country like ours, where the voters must make fundamental decisions, the lack of knowledge can be dangerous.

There is hope that the youth programs such as New Jersey Boys State will help to turn out a better informed crop of voters than were produced in the past.

Credit Unions Recognized as Valuable Instrument of Assistance to Developing Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, credit unions have long been a part of our way of life in America, and people in many areas of the world today are learning what we have learned about them: that they are useful tools for stimulating personal savings and creating a source of low-cost credit where neither existed before. A credit union is a democratically controlled association, designed just for this purpose.

Several agencies of this Government have recognized the value of credit unions for spurring economic development abroad. The Agency for International Development and the Peace Corps both are working with the Credit Union National Association—CUNA—to encourage the growth of credit unions abroad.

As Franklin H. Williams, director of the Division of Private Organizations for the Peace Corps, has stated:

> We have long realized that basic to the needs of the underdeveloped nations are self-help programs, and that credit unions and co-ops are uniquely suited economically and socially to these needs.

Other governments, along with several agencies of the United Nations, have recognized the value of the credit union movement in developing areas of the world and have cooperated in varying degrees with CUNA's world extension department.

At a time when so many of the world's people are offered cure-alls for the overnight solution of their dire social and economic problems, the CUNA program is refreshing. CUNA's offer of sharing credit union expirence in self-help is more realistic and more compatible with the democratic goals of this Government.

CUNA's international program, then, should be of real interest to us in the Government. For that reason, I should like to place a copy of the annual report of CUNA's world extension department in the Record:

ANNUAL REPORT, 1961, CUNA WORLD EXTENSION DEPARTMENT

INTRODUCTION

The events of the past year mark an important milestone in the history of the credit union movement. During 1961, recognition of CUNA's program as a valuable instrument of assistance to developing nations has been definitely established. This recognition has come from leaders of many South American and Asian countries, officials from various voluntary agencies, the United Nations and its affiliates, and from the Canadian and United States Governments.

CUNA-AID PROGRAM

CUNA world extension department has been in contact with the Agency for International Development (AID), and its predecessor (ICA), since September 1960 when we were requested for the first time to present a project proposal for credit union development in Nigeria. Here are some of the most important recent events related to our contact with this Agency.

1. The department prepared two 5-year programs for credit union development: a worldwide 5-year credit union development program, submitted August 24, 1961, and the 5-year aid-CUNA credit union development program for South America, submitted December 13, 1961. Both of these proposals have been under study and consideration by AID.

2. In October, the director of the world extension department was appointed by the Department of State, Agency for International Development, as a member of a cooperative study team for South America. From November 4 to December 1, 1961, the group surveyed the cooperative movement in Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil, and Venezuela. It also acquainted USOM missions with the new emphasis on cooperatives and credit unions in government programs for technical and economic assistance. The cooperative study team reported its findings and recommendations at a meeting with Mr. Fowler Hamilton, Administrator of AID, and other members of his staff. These recommendations included stress on the development of credit unions and farmer cooperatives.

3. World extension department staff presented a paper at the Inter-American Conference on Cooperation in Bogotá, Colombia, November 5–11, 1961. This conference was called by a number of agencies and organizations with CUNA cosponsorship.

4. As of the present date, AID has approved an appropriation of $160,000 to be used by CUNA's world extension department for credit union development in South America during the next 12 months. This appropriation will enable the department to carry out a program concentrated in Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, and Peru, which will result in approximately 500 additional credit unions in South America. An additional amount of $150,000 for 1963 has been requested.

5. Another measure recently approved by AID, which will have an important effect on the overseas credit union program, is the approval of an International Cooperative Training Center. CUNA is represented by the managing director on the Board for International Training, which has been in charge of planning the center. The center will be established at the University of Wisconsin and CUNA will take an active part in its activities.

SIGNIFICANCE OF AID ASSISTANCE

The credit union program will be carried out directly by the world extension department as a CUNA program, with the obligation of a periodic report to AID regarding progress and allocation of funds. The economic assistance provided will give great impetus to credit union development in the selected countries and will continue to enhance CUNA's reputation in South America as a people-to-people agency, making a significant contribution to the welfare and economic and social development of the South American nations.

The need for assistance for credit union development around the world is enormous. The recently approved government program is limited to one area, and it is also of a temporary nature. However, one important result of the government assistance program is that it will permit us to do more with our regular budget in areas as yet untouched, such as Africa.

UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations Social and Economic Council has granted consultative status to CUNA in recognition of our contributions as an international organization in the field of economic and social development.

During 1961, the CUNA world extension department also continued to work closely with FAO and ILO, specialized agencies of the United Nations. We cooperated extensively with their field offices in various parts of the world, and a staff member lectured at the Inter-Regional Seminar on Cooperation, sponsored by these organizations and the Danish government, in Copenhagen, in July and August. The seminar brought 35 participants from 18 African and Asian countries.

REGIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Asia: CUNA opened an office in Manila, the Philippines, in June, and Jack L. Kent, of California, was hired as the Asia representative. Mr. Kent, so far, has concentrated on assisting the Philippine Credit Union League, but he has also worked in Hong Kong, Korea, and Japan.

Philippines: The Asian Regional Training Conference was held in Baguio City, Philippines, October 29—November 11, with 62 trainees in attendance, as follows: Ceylon, 2; Hong Kong, 3; Japan, 1; Korea, 6; Malay, 5; Thailand, 1; Vietnam, 3; and the Philippines, 41. The Asia Foundation contributed approximately $6,000 to this conference.

Pacific

Fiji: World extension department staff attended the annual meeting of the Fiji Credit Union League. A survey of the Fijian movement and its future influence in the South Pacific was made. There are now 257 credit unions in the islands. Through the Pacific Credit Union School, under the direction of Father Marion Ganey, S.J., and partly financed by CUNA, credit union leaders from other Pacific islands are being brought to Fiji for training. Substantial growth has been recorded in Samoa and Tonga.

Australia

New South Wales: World extension department staff attended the annual meeting of the New South Wales Credit Union League. As a result of this participation, a special meeting of members will be held during spring of 1962 to step up the league program. Staff participated in educational programs for the delegates to the annual meeting and several credit unions were visited. A special meeting was held in the office of the registrar of cooperatives to discuss problems of the credit union movement and a visit was paid to the minister of housing and cooperatives.

The credit union movement is gradually spreading to other states in Australia, with substantial gains in Victoria, Queensland, and western Australia.

Mexico

Staff continued its work of reorganization of the Mexican movement, based on the establishment of federations at the state level and on the establishment of a strong chapter program. By the end of this year, the state federations will have formed the first confederation of credit unions in Latin America. The reorganization program was accepted at a recent meeting organized by world extension staff. It is expected that the new program will be approved at the national annual meeting to be held in early 1962. There are 325 credit unions in Mexico at the present time, with 33,000 members.

Honduras

The "conversion" of Honduras multiple-service cooperatives to credit unions has made considerable progress and there were 20 such credit unions in operation at the end of the year. It is expected that a credit union league will be established in 1962.

Panama

The Credit Union Federation of Panama was organized with the help of world extension department staff. At the end of the year there were 48 credit unions in Panama.

Bolivia

A credit union league was organized by this country's 18 credit unions.

Colombia

UCONAL, the Colombian league of credit unions, has applied for membership in CUNA and its application will be submitted to the executive committee in May. Colombia will be headquarters for our South American program because of its central location. There are 60 credit unions in Colombia and a great potential for 1962.

Venezuela

The Venezuelan credit union movement has continued its rapid growth. There are now 20 chartered credit unions and 35 in various stages of organization. Two former trainees who attended the Fourth International Training Conference in Caracas in 1960 have, between them, organized 12 credit unions in the past year.

A league has been set up and a supply department has been established. Our Latin America representative has given assistance to the movement in Venezuela throughout the year, at the expense of that government.

Caribbean

World extension department activities during the past year in the Caribbean were centered mainly in Jamaica and Haiti. Our Caribbean fieldman concentrated his activities in laying the groundwork for the establishment of a permanent fulltime league office for the West Indian Confederation of Credit Societies (WICCS), generating services for the Caribbean area.

Brazil

A 2-week school attended by 34 leaders from nine different Brazilian states was conducted in Rio de Janeiro by world extension staff. Fifteen of the students were sent by industrial establishments where credit unions are already organized or where there is intention of organizing.

With the assistance of the world extension staff, the Brazilian Credit Union League was organized on June 22, 1961.

A 5-year credit union development program was prepared and submitted to the local AID office in Rio de Janeiro at the request of AID.

There are now 25 credit unions in Brazil, all organized under a program financed by the Illinois Credit Union League.

Europe

Eire: The movement in Eire continues to grow and the Credit Union League of Ireland was admitted to membership in CUNA during the year.

Africa

Credit union organization is taking place in Ghana, Nigeria, Tanganyika, Uganda, and Kenya. The department has received numerous requests for credit union information from these countries and has provided a great deal of material for a training center in Mwanza, Tanganyika, including a copy of the film "The People of Kolevu" to which a tape in Swahili has been added.

TRAINEES

Trainees from the following countries visited CUNA during 1961: Japan, the West Indies, British Guiana, Fiji, New South Wales, Nyasaland, Iraq, Venezuela, Vietnam, Peru, Tanganyika, British Honduras, Mexico, Basutoland, Guatemala, Indonesia, Ireland, Formosa, Nigeria, Uganda, Southern Rhodesia, Jordan, Liberia, Korea, Egypt, Canada, the Republic of the Philippines, and El Salvador.

PLANS FOR 1962

1. To a great extent, department personnel will be occupied with implementing and carrying out the CUNA–AID program in Latin America. However, this will not be done at the expense of the regular CUNA world extension program, as the staff will be expanded and compensated for under the government contract.

2. Closer cooperation will be sought with the Peace Corps. Preliminary discussions have already taken place in Washington, D.C., in regard to CUNA-Peace Corps projects for Tanganyika, Bolivia, and the Philippines, and CUNA has promised to help in the recruitment and training of Peace Corps volunteers who may be assigned to credit unions or similar work.

3. An African program, which we have been planning for a number of years, but which has had to be shelved because of lack of funds, has been initiated. A. A. Bailey, our Caribbean fieldman, left for Africa on March 5 to visit Liberia, Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, Tanganyika, Nyasaland, and Uganda, with the following objectives in mind:

(a) To evaluate existing credit unions and cooperatives in cooperation with Government and cooperative officials.

(b) To recommend to local leaders procedures for the promotion, development and supervision of credit unions and credit cooperatives.

(c) To seek possible candidates for credit union training in the United States.

(d) To look for a possible location for an Inter-Africa conference and seminar on credit unions and credit cooperatives, and governments and institutions which would be willing and able to cosponsor such a conference with CUNA.

An East African program will be carried out later in the year with funds contributed by the Credit Union League of Saskatchewan.

4. Preliminary investigation will be conducted to determine how a credit union program would fit into the new European economic image created by the Common Market.

5. International credit union training conferences are planned for Africa and possibly Australia.

Supreme Court's Prayer Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor of the Washington Star should be of interest to the en-

tire country. This letter was written by Charles S. Collier, distinguished professor of law, George Washington University:

HOLDS NO BRIEF FOR COURT'S PRAYER RULING

One troublesome aspect of the Supreme Court decision in the school prayer case (*Engle* v. *Vitale*) is the complete disregard therein manifested by the Court of the historic doctrine that parties who seek to obtain judicial restraining orders against the enforcement of legislation, State or National, must establish and demonstrate that they have sustained or will sustain peculiar and substantial harm or injury from the actual enforcement of such legislation.

This pervasive judicial doctrine has been plainly declared and unmistakably acted upon by the Supreme Court itself in many leading decisions.

This vital and practical doctrine applies with particular force to constitutional issues arising under the 14th amendment. Some Supreme Court Justices are fond of quoting the first amendment in cases arising under State or local laws that have been alleged to interfere with freedom of speech or with religious freedom. But the actual relevant language of the first amendment reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

It is Congress which is explicitly restrained by this provision. It seems impossible to read this provision as applying of its own force to State legislatures or to the Board of Regents of New York.

The majority opinion in the Engle case gives us no articulate or helpful explanation of this supposed mysterious amalgamation or confluence of the 1st and 14th amendments. Even if the 14th amendment can be treated as incorporating in some way the principle of the 1st amendment; this incorporation must be on terms that preserve all the essential juristic elements of the 14th amendment itself. The 14th amendment alone is directly operative on the States by its express terms and by its historical origin.

The 14th amendment is actually founded on the conception that the States are thereby prohibited only from actions that actually damage or wrongfully interfere directly with citizens or other persons. The purpose is simply to protect specific legal rights against concrete damage or actual harmful interference.

The central meaning of the 14th amendment lies in the following key passage:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The true prohibitions intended here are exposed in the active verbs that are used in the prohibiting clauses; namely, "abridge," "deprive," "deny."

There is nothing in the 14th amendment equivalent in form or substance to the 1st amendment language "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." The prohibitions of the 14th amendment are not defined with reference to the general subject matter of general classification of the laws themselves, that are under examination, but they are aimed against actual abridgment of the privileges of citizens; against actual deprivation of liberty such as violates due process of law, and against the actual denial of equal protection of the laws.

Now in the New York school prayer case, what harm or injury was done or threatened to anyone? Who was deprived of liberty or property in any substantial or realistic sense? Who was really denied the equal protection of the laws? What privileges or immunities that belong to citizens of the United States as such were abridged? In answering these questions it must be constantly kept in mind that no schoolchild was required under the New York rules to repeat the prayer recommended by the board of regents, or even to be present at all on the occasion thereof.

The opinion of the trial judge in New York in this case well illustrated and described the precautions taken by the New York administrative authorities in this matter of possible wrongful pressure on school pupils or others. This opinion by the judge, who heard all the evidence at first hand and who could himself interrogate the witnesses, states:

"It is enough on this score, however, that regulations such as were adopted by New York City's Board of Education in connection with its released time program be adopted (elsewhere), making clear that neither teachers nor any other school authority may comment on participation or nonparticipation in the exercise nor suggest or require that any posture or language be used or dress be worn or be not used or worn. Nonparticipation may take the form of either of remaining silent during the exercise or, if the parent or child so desires, of being excused entirely from its exercise. Such regulations must also make provision for those nonparticipants who are to be excused from the prayer exercise. The exact provision to be made is a matter for decision by the board rather than the court, within the framework of constitutional requirements."

All of this conscientious and sensitive preparation and intelligent study by the New York administrative authorities and by the New York courts, is held to be for naught by the Supreme Court majority which proceeds toward its monolithic and exaggerated conclusions in this historic decision with proud defiance of the actual key facts.

God save the United States and this honorable Court.

CHARLES S. COLLIER,
Professor Emeritus of Law, George Washington University.

Needed: A Reappraisal of the Veterans Pension Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the Members of Congress have been the target of an effective, well-organized campaign by veterans of World War I to obtain signatures on a discharge petition which would bring their special pension bill, H.R. 3745, to the House floor. While I have many fine friends who endorse this legislation, I cannot in good conscience sign this discharge petition. Since I know many of my colleagues have wrestled with this same decision, I want to share with them my thoughts contained in a letter addressed to a veterans' barracks in my hometown.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 6, 1962.

Mr. ALFRED B. MILLER,
Fublic Relations Officer, Veterans of World War I, Tucson, Ariz.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Thank you for your letter of July 28 in response to my letter of July 18 addressed Mr. Paul Russell.

I am sure you appreciate the fact that at any time I am under pressure from conflicting groups on dozens of matters before the Congress. Those on one side are just as vigorous in presenting their views as those on the other. Your fine organization has been doing a good job of making its views known to the Congress, and I must commend your national officers for their effectiveness. Nevertheless, I must say that, as in all other matters, I would be fulfilling less than my public trust if I simply listened to their arguments and ignored what others are saying or failed to make a study of the broad implications involved in H.R. 3745.

A question that concerns me greatly is the premise on which non-service-connected veterans' pensions are based. I understand that veterans of the Civil War and Spanish-American War received pensions. Some of their widows are still living, and they are continuing to receive pensions. Now World War I veterans seek a special pension of their own, and they base their claim on the fact that veterans of previous wars received them. I say this is not sufficient reason and that it is time as a Nation we took a second look at the veterans' pension concept. Because we did a thing once doesn't mean that we must or should go on doing it forever.

The principle your organization advocates is this: A minimum of 3 months of military service in one particular war entitles a man to a special tax-free pension when he reaches 65 years of age. Does this make sense? I am not persuaded that it does.

Just to put this request in perspective, consider this fact: When World War I ended, most of its participants left the service and returned to civilian life. But a few remained and made a career of military service. In 1947 some of those who enlisted in 1917 retired after 30 years of active duty and service in two wars. Those who had risen to the rating of master sergeant retired with pensions of $185.63 per month. Now your organization is asking $102.37—or 55 percent of a 30-year pension—for those of their fellow servicemen who left the service 29 years earlier. What kind of sense does this make?

I have refused to sign the discharge petition for these reasons:

I don't believe this is the way to enact legislation unless there is clear evidence of bad faith on the part of a committee and its chairman. While some of the members of this committee have signed the discharge petition under great pressure from this veterans' group, a majority have not, and the chairman is firmly opposed to this legislation. I have a high regard for these colleagues of mine, I think they have served the veterans of this country exceedingly well, and I do not believe other Members of Congress have the specialized knowledge of veterans' legislation possessed by members of this committee.

2. I fail to see how one can justify paying veterans of one particular war (and not other wars) a pension merely for having served 90 days or more during that war (the average service in World War I was 12 months). If there were a way to compensate the men who died in that war, the sky would be the limit; but the men who came back from camp or overseas hale and hearty clearly have not earned the right to pensions for which other people must work all their lives.

3. There already is a law providing non-service-connected old-age benefits to veterans (of all wars) who are in need.

There already are laws providing benefits to veterans with service-connected disabilities.

5. Veterans of the First World War comprise 15 percent of all U.S. veterans and have received 28 percent ($30 billion) of all expenditures for all veterans. In spite of the GI bill of World War II, veterans of World War I have received nearly twice as much

per capita ($7,000 compared to $3,700) as veterans of the Second World War.

6. If the principle of pensions for war service is right, then there can be no logical ground for refusing pensions to veterans of World War II and the Korean war who now or in the future are of retirement age. If this bill passed, American taxpayers would pay out an additional $4.3 billion by 1966 and $11.6 billion by the year 2000. If World War II and Korean war veterans were to receive the same pension (and passage of this bill would certainly make this a likely possibility), the additional cost might ultimately exceed $100 billion, or more than half the total debt this Nation incurred fighting a war on two fronts from 1941 to 1945.

7. The American Legion, Amvets and other veterans' groups oppose this kind of veterans' pension and rightly believe the enormous cost of such a program (an extra $1 billion the first year alone) would incur the wrath of taxpayers and hurt other necessary veterans' legislation.

8. If improvements are needed in benefits for needy veterans or those with service-connected disabilities, this is the wrong way to make them.

In the past few months I have received hundreds of letters and petitions urging me to sign the discharge petition for H.R. 3745, the pension bill. Various arguments are used by sincere people who believe wartime service gives a man a right to a lifetime pension. Perhaps the main argument is that veterans of World War I were badly treated, that they never received anything like the generous educational opportunities received by veterans of World War II. In part, this is true. In the years between the two great wars this country came to recognize more of an obligation to the men who risk their lives in war. As a veteran of World War II, I know that this country was most generous in helping veterans complete their interrupted education and to find places for themselves once again in society. I can understand the regret of World War I veterans that they had not received similar opportunities.

However, these facts should be recalled:

1. The average length of service in World War II was 2½ years, compared to 12 months for World War I.

2. Seventy-seven percent of World War II veterans served overseas, compared with 50 percent of World War I veterans.

3. Educating a man to reenter normal civilian life is a proper function of a nation that has taken years out of that man's life; providing him a lifetime pension when he retires is a very different kind of thing having no direct relationship to his military service.

I am sorry to see you citing my support of foreign aid as a vote against World War veterans. I voted for foreign aid, most of which is military assistance, because I believe this program is a positive way to prevent another war and to protect our country—not to engage in free handouts or meaningless generosity to unappreciative people, which is the usual senseless charge made against this program. My vote for foreign aid was cast along with the votes of the patriotic leaders of both political parties, and I am somewhat displeased to have you suggest that I was placing the interests of our country second to the interests of nameless foreigners.

With regard to the American Legion position I am enclosing a statement that is self-explanatory. I recognize that some Legion chapters and departments support the bill, but the position of the organization nationally is very much in opposition.

The statement is made so often that the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee is single-handedly holding up H.R. 3745 that I decided to look into this claim. I find, in the newspaper of your own organization, a list of Congressmen who reportedly have signed the discharge petition. Sen of them and only seven, are members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. The ranking Republican member, Congressman WILLIAM H. AYRES, of Ohio, not only has refused to sign the petition but has been outspoken in opposing the bill. Of the 25 Congressmen on the committee 18 have refused to sign the petition. This is not evidence of one-man dictatorial rule.

In addition, I might comment that I have talked personally and privately with members of this committee, and I can assure you that their unwillingness to bring this bill out stems from their own judgment, and not from dictatorial pressure from the chairman.

H.R. 3745 would not give pensions to every World War I veteran, but it would to most. There are limitations, to be sure. To receive a pension a veteran must have annual income of less than $2,400, if single, or $3,600 if married. However, he can exclude from his income all pensions, annuities, social security payments and the like—the cources of most retirement income. Thus, this bill would provide a penion of $102.37 per month to a married veteran already receiving $5,000 of income, provided only that $1,401 of that income came from social security and other public or private annuity plans (including insurance policies).

I greatly regret that I cannot justify signing this discharge petition. Nothing would please me more than to be able to comply with the wishes of many good friends who have asked me to do so. Unfortunately, a sound case has not been made for this bill. There are no adequate answers yet provided to the qeustions that arise concerning such legislation. It doesn't make sense to enact pensions for one set of retired war veterans and not another. Extending the pension principle to yet another war, with demands of World War II and Korean war veterans around the corner, makes very little sense. Giving a man a tax-free pension because he served 3 months or more during wartime is a concept that needs far more complete study than this discharge procedure would permit. For these and other reasons I must repeat that I am not ready to throw over the standard committee processes of this Congress in order to pass H.R. 3745.

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL.

Red Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the organized schemes of anti-Semitism launched by the Moscow regime have been a matter of growing concern to students of imperial Russian communism. These programs are official in character, organized by the leaders in the Kremlin and carried out by their agents in various parts of the Russian empire. Little has been reported in the free press about these evil developments. The full facts on these pogroms should be put before the people of the free world for judgment because they constitute another Russian breach of human rights and another violation of the principles of the U.N. charter.

Roscoe Drummond has exposed this evil hand of imperial Russia in an article entitled "Red Anti-Semitism," which appeared in the Washington Post on August 4, 1962. Mr. Drummond points out that a major propaganda effort has been launched against the Jews of the Soviet Union with the objective of fomenting public hostility. All the state-controlled press are turned loose in this program of incitement against the Jews.

Several weeks ago, in an address delivered in connection with the Cleveland observance of Captive Nations Week, I made reference to these pogroms. At that time I made the point that these latest campaigns of anti-Semitism were among the signs of mounting unrest within the U.S.S.R. Khrushchev, like Hitler, needs a scapegoat for the profound failures of the system he presides over. Like the Russian czars of the past, Khrushchev and company are encouraging the oppressed peoples of their empire to exhaust their pent-up feelings against the Jews. But this scheme must fail. We can help it to fail through programs on the Voice of America beamed to the people in the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R., exposing Khrushchev and company for what they are—modern day Hitlers.

Under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the article of Roscoe Drummond and commend it to the reading of all who believe in human rights:

RED ANTI-SEMITISM: PERSECUTIONS INCREASE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The mounting anti-Semitism, practiced officially by the Soviet Government against the 1½ million orthodox Jews in the U.S.S.R., is causing acute anxiety to Jewish leaders in many countries.

The Rabbinical Council of America has appealed to the religious leaders of all faiths "to arouse and mobilize the peoples and governments of the world in a vigorous campaign to reverse the anti-Semitic outbursts" in the Soviet Union.

There's good reason for this appeal. It rests upon the most detailed and documented evidence of Kremlin-sanctioned anti-Semitic acts carried out in the press and in the courts in many parts of the Soviet Union. These practices are directed against Jews individually, against the Jewish faith.

This is what has come out into the open in recent months:

A total of 17 Jewish citizens have been sentenced to death for alleged "economic offenses." Others have been sent to jail.

Six Jewish lay religious leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been arrested.

The Jewish congregational chairmen in Minsk, Riga, Kiev, Vilna and Tashkent have been deposed by the Government.

Anti-Semitic articles are appearing in the major newspapers of the large provincial cities—often in the same version.

These articles, together with the unusually detailed reports of the alleged "economic crimes" and the unprecedented death sentences, disclose a major propaganda offensive directed against the Jews of the Soviet Union by the Soviet Government.

The articles, which are clearly aimed to foment public hostility, appear almost exclusively in the cities which have large Jewish populations numbering many hundreds of thousands.

The substance of the articles, many of which I have examined in translation, seek to confirm or bolster all the old anti-Jewish stereotypes; they attack the Jewish religion and Jewish religious practices and practitioners; they viciously try to portray Jews as naturally and almost unanimously "money grubbers," "thieves," "deceivers," and either potentially or actually "subversives."

These featured "educational pieces" carry awesome and mystery-laden titles. One is called "Under the Dark Vaults of the Synagogue"; another "Under the Synagogue Vaults." A central theme is that "Jews are money worshipers." Rabbis and lay leaders are portrayed as exhorting money from the faithful for ostensibly religious purposes but really to feather their own nests. Drunkenness is suggested as a frequent incident in the synagogues and Jewish believers are described as devoted to drink, as tipsy guzzlers who "mix up their prayers while under the influence of alcohol." (Alcoholism is notably low among Jews throughout the world.)

The Russian Orthodox religion is allowed 1 church per 1,800 believers and 1 priest per 1,100 believers. Jews in Russia are allowed only 1 synagogue and 1 rabbi per 22,000 believers.

A Russian-language Bible was reprinted in 1957 for the Orthodox Church and for Baptists in 1958. The Koran was published for Moslems the same year. No Hebrew Bible has been permitted for Jews since 1917.

Thus another Soviet promise to its own people is torn and tattered—the promise of the Soviet Constitution that it would guarantee freedom of religious propaganda.

Statement on Supreme Court Decision on Regents' Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS
COUNCIL OF GREATER PITTSBURGH
Pittsburgh, Pa., July 23, 1962.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: Because of the widespread interest in the Supreme Court's decision on the regents' prayer, I believe it important to bring to your attention the position taken by the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh, of which Sylvan Libson is chairman. Mr. Libson made his statement on behalf of the council on June 26, 1962.

We believe this view represents the position taken by the vast majority of the Jews of this community, and we request that the statement be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,
MRS. LILLIAN A. FRIEDBERG,
Executive Director.

JUNE 26, 1962.

From Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh 234 McKee Place, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Re statement on Supreme Court decision on Regents' Prayer.

We are gratified that the decision of the Supreme Court on school prayer is clear and unequivocal. Although we recognize that American democracy is founded in large part upon ethical and moral concepts derived from the great religions of mankind, we believe that religious liberty is an indispensable aspect of democratic freedom. We believe that the growth of democracy in the United States is in large measure a product of that unique principle in our basic law that puts religion outside the jurisdiction of the state. Any impairment of that principle threatens religious liberty and brings other basic freedoms into jeopardy. The maintenance and furtherance of religion are the responsibility of synagogue, church and home, and not of the public school system. The utilization, in any manner, of time, facilities, personnel or funds of the public school system for purposes of religious instruction should not be permitted.

The Supreme Court decision will oblige those who desire to promote religious understanding and practice to do so within the framework of their homes and churches. At the same time, it will relieve school administrators of the responsibility for carrying out practices which are unconstitutional and which do not contribute to better intergroup relations among the pupils of varied faiths in the schools.

The fact that the Supreme Court opinion is based on a case involving the Regents' prayer confirms our belief that the attempt to neutralize religious differences by attaining a so-called common core religion or nonsectarian prayer is futile and cannot be depended upon for the solution of this problem without violating the American principle of separation of church and state.

SYLVAN LIBSON,
Chairman, Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh.

Uncle Sap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune. It relates some facts, which I feel are most important, regarding the proposed purchase of United Nations bonds by this country. I am pleased to bring it to the attention of the House:

UNCLE SAP

State Department testimony in support of Mr. Kennedy's appeal for authority to buy $100 million in United Nations bonds to tide the organization over a financial crisis arising from its military intervention in the Congo discloses this:

1. Without waiting for any authorization to buy bonds, the U.S. Government has voluntarily given the U.N. $215 million from foreign aid appropriations to keep it out of bankruptcy.

2. Upon pocketing these American funds, the U.N. then voted remission of a major share of assessments against a large number of member nations for support of the Congo operation.

3. The effect of this was to use the American handout to subsidize numerous U.N. members which are either hostile to the United States or indifferent to its foreign policy goals.

4. The total kicked back to these nations at the expense of the American taxpayer was $11,400,800. Thus Castro's Communist Cuba was provided with a gift of $140,800 at American expense; Poland, a Soviet satellite, with $512,000; Communist Yugoslavia with $243,000, and neutralist India with $140,800.

5. Some of the beneficiaries were deadbeats which had failed to pay their assessments for maintaining the U.N. peacekeeping forces in the Congo and Gaza strip. Among them were Poland and India. Thus, in effect, they were rewarded for dodging their share of the burden.

This all but unbelievable story was confirmed in testimony before a panel of the House Foreign Affairs Committee by Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs, who appeared in support of Mr. Kennedy's bond-buying scheme. Cleveland did not volunteer the information. It was dragged out of him.

Even Democratic supporters of the Kennedy proposal were stunned. "That's enough to kill the bill right now," said Representative HAYS, of Ohio. "How can we vote for this bill now?" asked Representative ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin. A Republican, Representative ADAIR, of Indiana, observed that the State Department seemed content that the United States should pick up check for all comers.

Practices of this kind, which are on their face the height of irresponsibility, certainly should put Congress on guard not only against the bond-buying device but against the whole reckless dissipation of tax money in foreign aid, for it is from this source that the money paid out by U.N. in gratuities to its delinquents came.

Cleveland's bland admission that the Government cheerfully allows itself to be played for a patsy puts in a stranger light than ever the charade enacted last week before the World Court. The United States had pressed this tribunal for an advisory opinion whether U.N. special assessments for the Congo were as binding upon the membership as the contributions for ordinary expenses of the U.N. The Court decreed that they were.

This ruling was sought by the Kennedy administration as evidence that, with all members required to pay, the investment in bonds would be safe. But now we know that the U.N. has rewarded its deadbeats for not paying, so that the Court's opinion is reduced to mere window dressing. In addition, Cleveland kept referring to the bonds as "stopgap aid." What that means is that the State Department regards the bond purchase as the first drop in the bucket in a never-ending process to keep the U.N. going, which will require, not buckets, but barrels of American cash.

Our Nation's Medical Societies Are Taking Positive Action To Insure Medical Care for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, over the past months America's doctors have been subjected to every kind of abusive attack by the proponents of medical aid and socialized medicine. From the President, from labor leaders, from all those who would change the finest medical system in the world for something untried or already proven failures in other countries, our doctors have been accused of selfishness, of putting greed ahead of their dedication to heal the sick. They have been maligned in the public press and have been vilified by

Cabinet members and in the Halls of Congress because they insisted upon their right to practice their noble profession as freemen without Federal control or Federal dictation.

I have always maintained that the doctors have done a poor job of public relations. In most part they have ignored the false charges against them and unfortunately too many people believed the charges. I think it is about time the doctors, and the friends of the doctors, and those who owe life and health to the doctors speak up in their defense. In the good old American sense of fairplay, we should set the record straight.

In all the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, even though I, along with several of my colleagues, challenged witness after witness to bring in proof of one case where anyone in America had been denied medical aid because of inability to pay, no such proof was ever produced. On the other side of the coin there are thousands of people today who are alive and in good health because of the skill and the effort of some doctor whose services were freely given because the patient was unable to pay. As a small sample of what is being done by the medical profession in many areas of our country, I would like to include the following article from the July 1962 issue of the magazine Today's Health. In all fairness those who have been so critical of the medical profession should make every effort to publicize this story to offset the slander and the downright falsifications which these critics have engendered.

The article follows:

How Medical Care Is Guaranteed to All—Across the Nation, Local Medical Societies Have Set Up Formal and Informal Programs To Assure Adequate Care for All, Regardless of Ability To Pay

(By Howard Earle)

One afternoon last July a man walked into the offices of the St. Louis County Medical Society in Clayton, Mo., a St. Louis suburb. His voice and his manner denoted extreme nervousness as he explained he was in need of immediate medical attention but could not afford it.

"I know you have a plan to help those 65 and over," said the man. "I thought maybe there was some way you could help me even though I'm not half of 65."

Edgar J. Mothershead, executive secretary of the St. Louis County Medical Society, explained that the "past 65 plan" did not hold rigidly to age limitations.

"Our purpose," said Mothershead, "is to make certain that no one needing medical care goes without it because of inability to pay. I'm sure we can help you."

Last fall, a mother came to the offices of the Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association in Oakland, Calif., across the bay from San Francisco. She asked to see Mrs. Muriel Hunter, a qualified social worker employed full time by the association.

"My husband and I moved to Berkeley recently," the woman explained. "I was told by the doctor who attended me when I had my last baby back East that I should have a hysterectomy, but I delayed it. Now I'm in a great deal of misery. Things haven't been going well with my husband and we just can't afford my operation now. The pastor at our church said you folks here could help me."

"No one has ever come to us needing medical attention and not received it—regardless of their ability to pay," answered Mrs. Hunter. "I'm sure you will be no exception."

The man in Clayton and the woman in Berkeley are not isolated cases of guaranteed medical care by the medical profession. Across the Nation, county and city medical societies have established formal and informal programs to assure adequate medical care for all regardless of their ability to pay. Some societies have inserted advertisements in local newspapers pointing out that no one need go without medical attention because of inability to pay. Some societies depend upon the Kerr-Mills law to supplement their own programs to care for those who need help. The American Medical Association, while supporting all the programs, also is cooperating with the Blue Shield plan to set up a special inexpensive medical and surgical care insurance program for those 65 and over.

The past-65 plan of the St. Louis County Medical Society is unique in that it establishes something similar to a discount card which a qualifying member presents to the physician upon each visit. The card specifies the percent of reduction from regular fees the patient is to receive. For instance, if the card calls for a 50-percent reduction, then a $4 office visit would cost the cardholder only $2. Similarly, a 75-percent reduction would reduce the cost of the visit to only $1. Discounts as high as 90 percent have been authorized by the society.

Establishing the discount rates to patients is the responsibility of Mrs. Robert Opal, who was trained by the St. Louis Credit Bureau to check credit records and determine, through interviews with the patients, their ability to pay. There is no embarrassment or uneasy moments. Actually, Mrs. Opal completes an interview in little more than half an hour, but many applicants feel so relaxed they turn the sessions into reminiscences of their histories.

"I had dreaded coming to see you," one elderly woman told Mrs. Opal as her interview neared an end. "But, my gracious, in the short time I've been here I feel like you are an old family friend."

Sometimes a patient is referred to the society by member doctors. The county society includes physicians in both the county and city of St. Louis. Some patients are referred by their pastors or friends, or have read about the work in their local newspaper. When referrals are made by those other than physicians, the applicant is given his choice of doctors. If he has none, Mrs. Opal refers him to a physician in his own neighborhood.

The plan was put into effect in the latter part of 1960 after Dr. Charles Miller headed a committee which originated the procedure. The program came as a result of a preponderance of the doctors in the society desiring to offer those past 65 low-cost medical care while preserving the right of the patient to choose his own doctor.

"We thought we would be swamped with requests for rate reduction cards," said Mothershed, "but surprisingly only 108 cards were issued during 1961, the plan's first full year of operation."

A card is issued for 12 months, after which the case is reviewed by Mrs. Opal. If the financial status of the patient has remained unchanged, the card is renewed for another year. If there has been a change, the percentage of reduction is lowered or increased as the change dictates. Sometimes the patient's situation is so improved that renewal of the card is not requested.

"We find our plan is proof that the medical profession does not knowingly permit anyone needing medical care to go without it," emphasized Mothershead. "More than 400 of the county's 450 physicians are members, along with most of the druggists, who fill prescriptions at reduced rates when cards are exhibited by the customers. The great majority of our cardholders are those past 65, so those in the medical profession not participating are mostly the obstetricians and pediatricians."

The St. Louis County Medical Society has received inquiries about its past-65 plan from more than 60 other medical societies throughout most of the States. Mothershead is not certain whether any other societies have inaugurated the St. Louis County plan but many, he says, have made rather exhaustive studies of the entire program.

It would be misleading to hail the past-65 plan as an entirely new idea. The society recognizes this fact, pointing out that "doctors, for years, have been charging undisclosed 'less than regular' fees when patients are unable to pay regular charges." In fact, a majority of physicians, especially specialists, set aside a certain amount of their time for charity practice. However, under the past-65 plan the patient will be told how much less he is paying than the physician's regular fee, and he carries a card enabling him to receive the same reduction from all physicians and druggists participating in the program.

Although they achieve the same objectives, there is little similarity between the St. Louis County Medical Society's past-65 plan and the Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association's program.

"Nobody in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties goes without medical care because of inability to pay," declared William K. Scheuber, executive secretary of the association. "Our program is geared to guarantee adequate medical care to all, and it does."

In the case of the woman needing a hysterectomy, Mrs. Hunter interviewed her to determine if she would be eligible for surgery in the county hospital at county expense or could be cared for at State expense, or through some other welfare agency. The interview brought out that the woman and her husband were practically without funds and unable to pay even a portion of the cost of her needed surgery. Unfortunately, she did not qualify for any kind of welfare or other aid.

"We certainly will not let you go without the medical attention you need," Mrs. Hunter explained to the woman. "You go home and I will call you later. He prepared for immediate entry in the hospital when I call."

After the woman lift, Mrs. Hunter contacted the county hospital and made arrangements for a bed, use of the operating room, and other facilities. Then she called one of the area's outstanding surgeons and cited the need. There were no questions. The surgeon gladly volunteered his services.

"She has never had the County Hospital or any physician turn her down," explained Scheuber. "We have 100-percent cooperation from everyone in the medical profession. We're proud of our record in bringing adequate medical care to all, without regard for their financial status."

The Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association has an impressive record of keeping the patients' needs the foremost objective of the medical profession. In the early 1950's, the association set up a day-and-night telephone-answering service and an emergency doctor-dispatching program. Once these twin projects were in operation, the association advertised in the local newspaper that medical service would be provided around the clock and made available to anyone, regardless of ability to pay.

Many medical societies do not find it necessary to set up any special program to care for the indigent. "We have an understanding among our members whereby anyone unable to pay, or anyone without means of paying the regular fee, either is attended without charge or at a fee based upon ability to pay. But we just don't talk about our Good Samaritan work. We know there are some less fortunate than others, and our doctors take care of them without fanfare," reported the chairman of a county medical society in downstate Illinois.

Last year, the American Medical Association submitted a questionnaire to local medical societies throughout the Nation, asking what type of medical programs the societies have to provide care for the needy. The survey revealed that as of the first of this year more than 70 percent of the societies had some specific program to assure medical services to all. Some were specified as formal and others as informal programs. Many didn't claim an actual program existed but pointed out that individual society members gave medical care to the indigent with no thought of remuneration.

"We have always handled this problem individually," wrote one society chairman. "It is handled quietly. We do not feel a need to do it otherwise. No individual in this county has been denied medical care because of his inability to pay."

Another society chairman wrote: "Every one of us sees patients every day for whom we know we will not receive pay. We don't talk about it—we just do it. That is and always will be part of the doctor's job."

Finally, this terse reply: "In small communities this is no problem, except to the doctor. We take care of people who are sick whether they can pay or not."

Results of the survey emphasized that doctors are reticent to publicize guarantees of service, fearing they will be flooded with requests from freeloaders. However, societies with formal programs report requests were about the same as expected, and more often less than expected.

The survey also disclosed that some doctors are unaware that some people feel they are denied care because of lack of funds. They show a blithe unconcern about the problem, feeling quite convinced nobody goes without care who needs it because they take care of the indigents among their own patients. Some societies have sought to rectify this veneer of indifference by advertisement in local newspapers.

In Ohio, the Jefferson County Medical Society inserted an advertisement in the Steubenville Herald-Star stating that the society knew of no one who had been denied needed medical care because the person could not afford it. An expression of opinion was asked. The advertisement brought two replies, neither asking for medical care and neither citing any cases where needed medical care had not been adequately provided.

In Illinois, the Belvidere Republican published a statement last March 8 by the Boone County Medical Society. The statement asserted, "If you have a misunderstanding with your doctor that you can't resolve in discussion with him, you can take the problem to our county medical grievance committee.

"Because this grievance committee exists, you never have to feel alone or helpless or without recourse in a dispute with your doctor. Our grievance committee is your grievance committee—set up to hear both sides of a doctor-patient dispute and to settle it as fairly as possible.

"If you have what you think is an honest complaint against a doctor, don't just tell your neighbors about it, tell our grievance committee. Contact either the president or secretary of the Boone County Medical Society by writing him. Give him as much detailed information as possible and give him your name and address."

The grievance committees of medical societies were originally established to investigate and rectify complaints of overcharges and any injustices which might be proved against society members. They also have been active in guaranteeing medical care to all regardless of ability to pay.

Clifton Reeder, M.D., chairman of the grievance committee of the Chicago Medical Society, says the committee learned of only one case last year of a physician refusing to care for a patient.

"The only case that came to our attention," said Dr. Reeder, "was that of a patient who collapsed in front of a clinic door and the doctor refused to care for him. It is safe to say that doctor will not pull such a stunt again."

Dr. Reeder pointed out that even with Chicago's increasing population, complaints are much fewer than they used to be. He interprets the decrease in complaints as a demonstration of the effectiveness of the grievance committee.

The Chicago Medical Society has one of the best emergency call services in the country. Its emergency medical service was established to guarantee the availability of doctors anytime, day or night. There are 275 doctors on the Chicago and Cook County emergency panel. They serviced more than 13,500 patients in 1960. Another 2,500 patients called but before the emergency doctor arrived the patients had contacted their own doctors who arrived to provide the needed medical care.

The emergency medical service telephone number is listed on the inside front cover of the Chicago telephone directory under "Doctor," along with the police and fire department numbers. The medical society maintains personnel at the answering service 24 hours a day. When an emergency call is received, the name and address of the caller is recorded and the doctor on the panel living nearest the caller is dispatched to the emergency. The emergency medical service eliminates complaints against the medical profession that "You can't get a doctor when you want one. It also is a part of the machinery across the country which guarantees medical care to anyone.

It is becoming customary throughout the country now for doctors to display plaques in their offices asking patients to discuss fees so the patient will know in advance what fees for various services will be. Both doctors and patients are urged by the American Medical Association to discuss cost where sizable amounts are involved. The program is another facet in the medical profession's guarantee that anyone neding medical attention will receive it, although the main purpose of fee discussion is to insure a continued happy relationship between patient and doctor when medical bills pile up. The contention is that by knowing costs in advance the patient is less likely to complain later.

The New York County Medical Society has no formal program for reduction of fees to the indigent such as developed in St. Louis County or Alameda-Contra Costa Counties. A spokesman for the New York County Society said that, aside from the large amount of work the individual doctor does for which he receives no fee, care of the indigent is well provided for under public assistance, the city hospitals, and through the Kerr-Mills law.

The Kerr-Mills bill became a law October 1, 1960, and as of January 1, 1962, 38 States had availed themselves of the advantages of the medical care measure. The bill provides Federal funds to those States which want to establish medical assistance to the aged (MAA) programs. The purpose is to provide care for those aged persons who are able to meet all normal living expenses except the cost of a major or prolonged illness.

The second part of the Kerr-Mills law provides matching funds to States desiring to improve the scope of medical benefits for aged persons who are on the State's old-age assistance (OAA) rolls. In addition to those States taking advantage of the measure, nine others had OAA medical programs which they considered adequate to provide necessary health care for those over 65. Two other States, before enactment of the Kerr-Mills legislation, had assistance programs at the local level which included medical care. And Alaska, while presently developing State medical care programs, had much of the medical care provided by the U.S. Public Health Service prior to statehood.

Shortly after the first of the year the President of the American Medical Association, Leonard W. Larson, M.D., pointed out that the quick acceptance of the Kerr-Mills legislation by the States contradicts statements by the measure's critics to the effect that the program can't and won't work.

Briefly summarized, the Kerr-Mills law authorizes the States, with Federal funds added to their own, to furnish medical care to all needy and near-needy citizens over 65. The medical care provided includes hospital and home nursing care, services of physicians and specialists, and practically everything else necessary for adequate health care.

Meanwhile, surgical and medical care benefits for persons over 65 are wrapped up in a new low-cost health insurance plan offered by Blue Shield. The plan was developed by Blue Shield and approved by the American Medical Association. It must be accepted by the State medical societies before becoming effective. However, State societies are approving the plan.

To qualify, a person must be over 65 with an annual income not exceeding $2,500. The combined yearly income of husband and wife must not be over $4,500. There is no limit on the net worth of each person. The premium is $3.20 a month per person and $6.10 monthly for husband and wife. There is a 180-day waiting period before the policy becomes effective.

The policy provides for: surgery, wherever performed, including multiple procedures and oral surgery; anesthesia service when ordered by and administered by a physician, other than the attending physician or his assistant; inhospital medical care covering physicians' visits to hospitalized patients for 70 days per admission—there must be a 90-day interval between discharge and readmission; medical care in nursing homes, covering physicians' visits in a licensed nursing home at one visit a week for 13 weeks following discharge from an acute hospital; radiation thereapy, including treatment for all conditions requiring use of X-ray, radium, and radioisotopes; X-ray examinations for hospitalized bed patients and for outpatients if needed in the initial diagnosis and treatment of injury; laboratory and pathological examinations for hospital patients, and prolonged detention, when constant and prolonged bedside attendance by a physician is necessary.

Commenting on the plan, U.S. Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican, of Texas, said: "I am delighted to know that the medical profession and hospital administrators have suggested a voluntary rather than a compulsory plan to attack whatever problem exists among our aged in meeting their medical care costs."

The plan constitutes another of the programs either sponsored directly or cosponsored by the medical profession to make certain that no one in need of medical care goes without it because of inability to pay medical costs.

Surrender in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the piecemeal surrender of the free world to the Communists is accelerating and the American public is fed an endless dosage of palliatives and propaganda in an attempt to make the administration's vacillation more palatable. No more glaring example of the New Frontier's self-styled "accommodation" of communism could be found than the recent sacrifices of the pro-Western and strongly anti-Communist Royal Lao Government to a Red-dominatted coalition. The State Department officials who engineered this backdown are attempting to rationalize their actions by insisting that the new rulers of Laos are neither Communists nor pro-Communists, but simply are intent upon maintaining true neutrality in a troubled area.

If these administration spokesmen know better, they are guilty of gross misrepresentation of fact to the American people who must finance their calamitous official conduct. If they do not know better, their naivete certainly must be viewed as a quality equally as dangerous as Russian missiles. But that they obviously are either completely ignorant of the consequences of their actions or are knowingly weakening America's principles was borne out recently by the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable CLARK MACGREGOR, during a radio broadcast at station KEVE in Minneapolis. Under unanimous consent, I include the following statement, made by the gentleman at that time, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF HON. CLARK MACGREGOR, OF MINNESOTA

During the past year the American taxpayers have financed the construction of a Communist "Trojan Horse" in the heart of southeast Asia. The architect and chief builder of this "Trojan Horse" has been Averell Harriman, our Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Why do I say this? I spent almost half an hour on Thursday night of this week talking with Prince Souvanna Phouma, the new Prime Minister of the supposedly neutralist government of Laos, and his Foreign Minister, pro-Communist Quinim Pholsena. They say "pro-Communist"; my observations from talking to him for 25 minutes through an interpreter—he speaks only French and Lao—is that he is a dedicated Communist. He is identified, this new foreign minister of Laos, as Prince Souphanouvong's right arm. Sophanouvong is the Communist leader in this troika government in Laos to which we have given our approval. You have heard me speak of Laos before. Many people say to me, "Can this be so important, really? Cuba is much more important to us—it's only 90 miles off our shores." Cuba is important, but Laos is an area of change; it's a time bomb for the future insofar as the policy of this country is concerned—insofar as our efforts are concerned to advance the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Why is this so? Well, let me go back a moment to remind you of what Tom Dooley said. Tom Dooley, you know, was the heroic young American doctor who sought to bring better medical opportunities—better medical practice—to Northern Laos. Tom Dooley, who unfortunately died of cancer a short while ago, used to refer to Laos as "the keystone of the arch of freedom in Southeast Asia—if Laos goes, all southeast Asia must necessarily follow."

From my experiences in World War II in the immediate area of northwestern Laos, I would refer to Laos as the hub of a wheel. From Laos there are critical supply lines that go to South Vietnam where we have American forces now; south into Cambodia which is a neutralist government which in my opinion has been moving closer to the Communist bloc; lines of supply directly to the southwest and to the west into Thailand where we have substantial American troops; and to the northwest into Burma where I served for about a year and a half in Burma itself in World War II. Laos is a small country—about the size of Utah; it is mountainous, to be sure, and it is heavily affected in its lower regions by the monsoon rains. It has 2½ to 3 million people. Perhaps it isn't, at first blush, so very important, but when you consider its strategic location in southeast Asia, its importance takes on new meaning. Also, from a psychological standpoint, if America can be shown by the Communists to be, in fact, a paper tiger in Laos, that impression will radiate in waves throughout southeast Asia and substantially damage our position. This comes down right to reality, to many American homes who have marines and soldier sons who are actually serving in South Vietnam and in Thailand at the present time.

Let's come up to date more recently and see what has happened in the last week. Early this week in Geneva, there was finally concluded a 14-power agreement, supposedly guaranteeing the neutrality of the Kingdom of Laos and its population. Prince Souvanna Phouma, the new Prime Minister of this Kingdom, arrived in Washington on Thursday of this week, late in the afternoon. Accompanying him from Geneva and from Vientiane, the capital of Laos, was a tough-minded little man called Quinim Pholsena. He is the man with whom I spent about 25 minutes in conversation last night through a State Department interpreter. I asked him several specific questions about the future of this country and about its prospects for being truly neutral. There are four questions that were of vital importance to me.

First, "Will there be a true integration into one military force of the three armies in Laos?" You know, over the past year and a half—a little more than that—there has been fighting in Laos between the military forces, first, which were pro-Western, fighting for the retention of the government that we recognized; secondly, there were the Communist forces under the leadership of Souphanouvong; third, there were the supposedly neutralist forces under the leadership of a paratroop captain, who is probably now a general or soon will be, named Kong Le. I wanted to know whether or not the reports were true that we had heard, that the pro-Communist and neutralist military forces in the last month or so have been moving into areas formerly held by the pro-Western military forces, but that the military forces of the elements favorable to freedom were not accorded a similar right. The foreign minister, when I put this direct question to him, explained that I must be talking about primarily the areas of northern Laos and he was from the southern part of the country and, therefore, couldn't speak about that, but he said that many of the newspaper reports were exaggerated and were designed to sell papers. His response reflected typical oriental evasiveness.

Secondly, I asked him about that part of the 14-power agreement providing for the withdrawal of all foreign troops in Laos during the course of the next 75 days—the next 2½ months. He answered very quickly that it was imperative for the future neutrality of Laos that the American forces be immediately withdrawn. I then asked him about the reported 10,000 Communist forces from North Vietnam and perhaps from Communist China that are in northern Laos. He started to shake his head back and forth and his answer was, "No, there are no such forces." Well, quite obviously, that is a flat falsehood, but perhaps he would say, since he was from southern Laos, he wasn't familiar with the situation of the Communist infiltration by foreign troops in northern Laos, but quite obviously all of the reports from our State Department and our newspapers cannot be wrong on that point.

Next I asked him about the Ho Chi Minh trail. I asked specifically about that jungle approach down the southeastern spine of Laos. This is now in country in which he said he was very familiar and in which he had been born and raised. I asked the pro-Communist Foreign Minister of Laos whether or not it wasn't true that the Viet Cong, the Communist troops from North Vietnam, were using this avenue through Laos to pour men and material into South Vietnam to subvert and overthrow the pro-Western government there to which this country is committed. He indicated—and this was, I thought, a significant answer—that the new government has many more pressing problems, more immediate problems, more vital problems than to be concerned about a remote area in southeastern Laos.

Then I asked him the question whose answer was already apparent to me—the item No. 4. "What are your intentions with respect to aid from foreign nations toward building a truly neutral Laos?" And this answer of his, I think, is most significant for those of us who are concerned about the future of freedom in southeast Asia. He said, "I hope you will understand that it is important for us to get aid from Peiping and Moscow, from Communist China and from Russia, before we balance that aid from America—before we look to America to get a balance of aid." Then he went on to say, "You see, it is important that throughout the world we show that we equally favor the best of communism and the best of the West."

This has not been a particularly pleasant report, but it indicates to me that what I heard Averell Harriman say about 2 or 2½ months ago is truly indicative of the way the Kennedy administration's foreign policy is to be carried out in southeast Asia. What Averell Harriman said was simply this—that it didn't matter too much to us, to America, one way or the other what happened to Laos. Unfortunately, that sort of attitude, to my judgment, will serve to bring down the cause of freedom and free peoples in southeast Asia.

More important than that, it will directly threaten the safety of the American forces now aiding the cause of freedom in Thailand and South Vietnam. I think that this attitude strengthens the hand of the Communists. It is significant, I believe, that Averell Harriman was making these statements 2½ months ago at the same time that there were delicate negotiations going on in Laos as to whether the Communists of the pro-Western elements would get the key positions in the new Government. One of those key positions, of course, in any government is the minister of foreign affairs, a position that is comparable to the position held by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in our Government. Last night at the Embassy of Laos, where I was privileged to be the only Member of the Congress who is not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to be included at the reception and conference, I was told by the State Department that we in this country had worked our hardest to prevent the post of foreign affairs of the new Government from falling into pro-Communist hands. We were unsuccessful. I see now how serious that failure will be in the future. To have as the Foreign Minister of the new Government of Laos a man such as Quinim Pholsena with whom I talked last night—an admitted pro-Communist, in my judgment a dedicated Communist—is disastrous.

Bear in mind, we have been for the past 2 months, giving almost $3 million a month to sustain this new, supposedly neutralist Government. You know for the 6-month period before that we were withholding that same $3 million a month from the pro-Western Government so as to force it into a coalition under the leadership of Prince Souvanna Phouma in order to destroy the pro-Western Government and to create this neutralist Government.

Now, one more thing about this agreement that has been signed in Geneva. It gives to a three-power, a three-state International Control Commission—Canada, Poland, India—the right to supervise the terms of the agreement. Well, the agreement itself doesn't sound too bad. If it were, in fact, lived up to by the Communist elements in Laos, there might be some hope for a truly neutral Laos, but here is one thing that hasn't been given much attention in the press. Each one of these 3 members, each one of the 3 member countries supervising this new 14-nation agreement to guarantee the neutrality of Laos has a veto, has a veto over any decisions that the other 2 want to make—to inspect any violations of the agreement, any violations of the truce, to see if the Communist forces are indeed leaving the country—the foreign military forces of North Vietnam and Communist China are, in fact, leaving the country. There is a veto, and you can be sure that the representative of Poland on that Control Commission will veto any decision made which will be at all inimicable to the interests of communism and to the takeover of Laos by Communists. It is a situation again where, as I said to the pro-Communist Foreign Minister of Laos, "Will the Communists treat this agreement with the same good faith and live up to it with the same good faith that we in this country will urge the elements pro-Western and favorable to us to take?" His answer, "We expect, naturally, all parties to approach the difficult problems of Laos and of enforcing this treaty in good faith." And I said to the Communist Foreign Minister of Laos, "But specifically, will you and the forces under Souphanouvong live up to this agreement in good faith as we intend to do?" His answer was a smile and a pretending on his part that he didn't fully understand my question.

In view of recent events and attitudes such as those expressed above, I have made these positive and constructive suggestions, publicly, in the last week:

First. Through our SEATO allies, we should station observers on the South Vietnam and Thailand sides of the Laos borders.

Second. An infiltration of Communist military forces through Laos should be promptly publicized, principally by Adlai Stevenson in the United Nations.

Third. If observation and publicity are insufficient to halt the flow of Communist men and material, we should convene an emergency meeting of our SEATO allies to consider the stationing of indigenous southeast Asian forces just beyond the Laotian borders so as to frustrate Communist efforts to infiltrate, subvert, and overthrow the remaining free government in that area.

A Reply to the Extreme Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the June 1962 issue of the bulletin of the Anti-Defamation League.

A rational plea for sane anticommunism, this article by Father Nevins is an important contribution to the thinking on this subject. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

REPLY TO THE EXTREME RIGHT—THERE ARE FAR BETTER WAYS OF FIGHTING COMMUNISM THAN NAME CALLING OR THE TEACHING OF SUSPICION AND HATE; WAYS AS OLD AS THE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN TRADITION, AS DYNAMIC AS DEMOCRACY

(By Albert J. Nevins)

(Father Nevins is president of the Catholic Press Association and editor of Maryknoll magazine. This article is adapted from his address at the How To Combat Communism Session, sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League, at the 89th annual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare.)

There is a phenomenon peculiar to the Catholic Church which happens every spring. It is the ritual known as the communion breakfast. How many cups of coffee are drunk, how many rolls are broken, and how many eggs are consumed would make an interesting statistic. But more staggering would be the number of words poured forth at these gatherings. And I am willing to wager that if some record were kept of these communion breakfast talks, you would find 7 out of 10 of them are on the single subject of communism.

The Catholic's preoccupation with communism is nothing new. It has been going on as long as I can remember. We have been conditioned to it from our youth. It has taken on the nature of a 20th-century crusade—a crusade of words, but a crusade nonetheless. It has some very surprising results. All of us are against communism, but too many of us are for anyone who is opposed to communism; we adopt them 100 percent. It may not matter that some other of his ideas are wrong or dangerous; he is anti-Communist and that is enough to give him the stamp of approval. And reversely, if the Communist is for something, no matter how good, we are against it.

Please do not misunderstand me. Communism is an evil and godless system that seeks to subvert the world through propaganda; infiltration, subversion, false fronts, sabotage, terror, civil strife and treacherous diplomacy. As the late Justice Robert Jackson wrote in one of his Supreme Court opinions, "This Communist movement is a counterrevolution to the American Revolution, designed to undo the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and our Bill of Rights, and overturn our system of free, representative self-government."

The fact is that the Soviet Union challenges us in every field of endeavor. In 40 years, a once backward nation has become our leading competitor. The Soviets challenge us in education. They challenge us in missiles and in space. The Soviets challenge us in industrial superiority. They challenge us in economic competition for the underdeveloped areas of the world. They challenge us in fields of pure research. They challenge us in world propaganda.

There is an increasing tendency among the American people to think that we have arrived. We talk about new frontiers but we ride to them in air-conditioned autos to the sound of FM radio. Dr. Grayson Kirk remarked recently, "Somewhere along the line we have become fat, smug, and spiritually anemic. We interpret the 'pursuit of happiness' to mean the pursuit of leisure. * * * Other people before us have been wrecked by indolence, self-seeking and a decay in national ideals."

One of the disturbing indications of this indolence has been the violent reaction of increasing numbers of our young people who are adopting extremely conservative positions. This anomaly plays havoc with many fixed ideas.

Conservatism was formerly the prerogative of age, associated with the time when one began to carry an umbrella and wear arch supports. It was a state of mind induced by satisfaction with one's life and opposed to any change in the modus vivendi. Youth on the other hand was the age for tilting lances at windmills. It was the area in life set aside for altruism—the time of promise, the moment for joy. There was a positive dedication to youth, perhaps not always mature, not always sensible, but ever challenging and inspiring.

Today we find youth retreating from the world of reality, withdrawing from any personal commitment with the problems of their times. There is an attempt to turn the clock back, to resurrect principles no longer valid in a nuclear world. How is this denial of youth's essential being to be explained? What forces create this metamorphosis? The answer, I think, lies in the world in which today's youth finds itself.

Our youth today is dwelling in what is the most hypocritical society of history. We profess equality and practice segregation. We proclaim our belief in good government but are apathetic to graft and corruption. We ban bingo and proscribe bookies but ignore extensive gambling controlled by racketeers or legalized at the track. College basketball fixes, scales that give short weight, diskjockey payola, fixed quiz programs, substitute hired brains to write one's thesis, mink coats and shakedowns, double standards, political platitudes that are meaningless—these and many, many more are enough to cause any integral idealist to want to turn away from the world in which he finds himself.

Add to this the intercontinental ballistic missile aimed at our shores, international betrayals and broken promises, brush-fire wars starting anywhere at the whim of the Communists, enslaved peoples, cosmonauts piloting sputniks over our heads, the insidious and never really challenged world perversions of the Reds, the infiltration of materialism and sublimated atheism into the bloodstream of the West, the hesitation and compromise of free nations when faced with a basic international moral problem—consider these and you will know why youth searches for principles of abiding value. Youth has not lost its idealism. It merely wishes to reject and withdraw from its present environment.

Today's youth looks for a vigorous answer to the problems of its times. Weary of evasions, compromises, words without meaning, the search of youth is a search for candor. Youth looks for leaders who will face up to the modern world without qualms, free of pressure, honestly. Youth is tired of talk, weary of platitudes, disgusted by the mess made by its elders. Its Holy Grail is that which is brave, bold, new. It searches for the voice of truth crying out in a 20th-century atomic wilderness.

And, in its inexperience, what does it find? Reeds shaken by the wind. Retailers of phrases, and dealers in remnants of remnants. Mossbacks who do not realize that a century ago the Civil War decided once and for all time the issue of States rights, and that World War II ended any possibility of American isolation.

This insecurity of youth in an even more insecure world causes a double flip that lands it in the ring of conservatism. Here is the new philosophy of idealism, the intellectual purification, the moral purge. Here is the reaction to the liberalism of the past. "Let us conserve the little good that is left to us," says the youthful conservative. "Let us return to those principles that made America great. Free enterprise. Climb high, climb far. Carry a big stick. The best governed is the least governed. America first, last, and always. Business is business. Safe for democracy. Let the chips fall where they may."

Modern conservatism is a series of slogans—some without meaning, most negative. It is the adoption of a philosophy without any basic ideology, for if one follows the conservative arguments, it is quickly apparent that it is inconsistent, varying from issue to issue. Modern conservatism is color blind—everything is black and white, with no in-between shades; one is either for or against something wholeheartedly, there is no such thing as neutrality or distinctions; there are only extremes—left and right, liberal and conservative, Communist, anti-Communist.

What is particularly frightening in the new conservatism is that sections of it breed hate for fellow humans and contempt for authority. Accuse the Catholic liberal of what you will but I for one can find no instance where a Catholic liberal has contravened ecclesiastical authority. But one can cite many instances where Catholic conservatives have defied their bishops, ranging from New Orleans to Lafayette to Pittsburgh. I challenge Catholic conservatives to justify their positions from Catholic theology and social teachings as expounded by papal encyclicals. I recall an instance where a reader of a magazine I edit objected to an editorial I wrote. I answered her with Catholic teaching. She replied that I was wrong. I then spent many hours getting quotations from papal teaching on the subject. But the correspondence came to an end when she replied that if the Holy Father had said that he also was wrong.

The extreme right refuses to admit the social doctrine of the church. When "Mater et Magistra" (Christianity and Social Progress) was published last year, the opinion of the radical right was epitomized by the National Review in its very clever headline, "Mater, Si. Magistra, No." When Father John Cronin of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference published an objective study called "Communism: Threat to Freedom," he was vigorously attacked. Why? Because he contradicted the first principle of the extreme right which declares: "The danger is almost entirely internal, from Communist influence right in our midst and treason right in our Government." Father Cronin had the temerity to suggest that the strong reaction sweeping our country against domestic communism should be turned toward the far greater danger of Communist subversion in Asia, Africa and Latin America. To the conservative extreme this is heresy.

With conservatives of this type reasonable discussion becomes impossible. They will not move from fixed positions. Their leaders carry more weight than the Pope. Their publications are more authoritative than the New Testament. When Dwight D. Eisenhower is labeled a Communist, they offer no dissent. When the Foreign Policy Association is called a Communist front, the statement becomes infallible, to be accepted without question. This lunacy of the extreme right is just as dangerous to freedom as the subversion of the extreme left.

We are not going to overcome evil with evil, but only with good. Lies, distortions, suspicions passed off as fact, slanders—this is the character of a great deal of conservative literature. No one is going to convince me that hate and the division of the American people are the answers to today's problems. There can be no respect in any mind for a leading conservative magazine that prints an article ridiculing the Christian virtue of love or an article in praise of Machiavelli. There can be no respect for another magazine which brands prominent Americans who have contributed much to this country as "Communists." These mouthpieces for the conservative position are founded on negative principles, they are opposed to change on principle, they are intolerant of the principles of others and ready to damn by ridicule anyone who fails to agree with them. We will not defeat communism by fighting among ourselves.

The conservative extreme has its platform—a platform which makes anything of a social nature suspect as communistic. Articles of this platform include these, among others: Repeal the income tax; get out of the United Nations; withdraw from NATO; end foreign aid; fight fluoridation of water; decentralize the National Government; and stop Government interference with segregation.

It was Gerard Sherry, managing editor of the Central California Register, who observed that, "Fundamentally the conservative is sensitive to dangers, and the liberal is sensitive to opportunities." The conservative constructs defenses to maintain his position and he pushes the barricades out as far as possible. He tends to make absolutes out of relatives and to blur the distinctions between essentials and accidentals.

If we are going to succeed in our struggle against communism, we must reject all labels. We must maintain our independence to decide each issue on its own merits. We must know what we believe and the principles by which we are to live.

This is what I believe—I believe in the natural rights of man; I believe in the quality of men before God; I believe in human brotherhood; I believe in the eminent dignity of the human person, and the right of every man to lead his life in dignity; I believe in the Judeo-Christian concept of private property; I believe in the moral obligation to love one's country; I believe in the primacy of the common good; I believe in the liberty of men, opposed to totalitarianism, I believe in justice as a necessary basis for international life; I believe that charity is the keystone of life.

On the practical point of our defense against communism, a distinction must be made between external and internal subversion. We already have the organizations necessary to handle internal subversion—the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Internal Security Committee, the FBI. We do not need the witch-hunting committees that have appeared in the last few years. To meet the threat of external subversion, we must educate every American to understand the Communist ideology; we must maintain the military strength of our country and see to it that our allies remain strong, too. Foreign aid is not Communist doctrine—it is sound American policy.

We must see communism for what it is—an evil and godless system that seeks to subvert the world through propaganda, infiltration, subversion, false fronts, sabotage, terror, civil strife, and treacherous diplomacy. But while we see it for what it is we must not apply its label to things and people indiscriminately.

Our people must know why they should be opposed to communism, not how to falsely brand prominent Americans who have contributed much to this country as Communists. Our people must grasp the ideological reasons why they must be opposed to communism, that fundamentally the dichotomy between Marxism and our democracy involves the Communist's basic opposition to God and that the annihilation of the fundamental Judeo-Christian traditions which founded our country.

Each of us must seek to awaken the conscience of America. Our community is our world. Start there—not by dividing and hating your neighbors, but by loving them. It is only love that has the power to recreate.

We will love our neighbors and those far away. We will love our friends and we will love our enemies. We will love Catholics, Jews, Protestants, the indifferent, Moslems, pagans, atheists. We will love all social classes, but especially those more in need of assistance. We will love those who scoff at us, those who despise us, those who persecute us. We will love those who deserve to be loved and those who do not deserve it. We will love as we try to understand, to sympathize, to esteem, to serve.

We will love with the fullness of God.

Moses Meets the Press Head On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, how long have we waited, anesthetized by trivia, submerged in rhetorical molasses, for one man to hoist the banner once proudly displayed by the assemblage of great American humorists? Where is a Woolcott from Weehawken, a Twain from Tuxedo Park, a Lewis from Larchmont, a Mencken from Manhasset, a Benchley from Valhalla? What quixotic knight comes in our time to thrust his lance through the thick mist of weighty, cliche-laden prose?

At last one has appeared. His shafts are dipped in the curare of insight and irony. Gratefully, we are spared the pomp of lofty indignation.

Who is this metropolitan mountebank? None other that Robert Moses, a colossus rising out of the city planning commission, who now suddenly bestrides the small world of intelligent humor and truthful criticism.

Here is a splendid article which I commend to my colleagues and those members of the fourth estate with a taste for humor.

MOSES MEETS THE PRESS HEAD ON

(By Robert Moses)

(Drawing upon his years of experience, one of our town's best known public servants describes the oft-tangled relations of his colleagues and their journalistic chroniclers.)

Every now and then, on a dead day in the news, I am asked to comment about the press and government—that is, on the relations of the happy, articulate reporter to the hapless, smarting, tongue-tied bureaucrat. I could write with comparative immunity about parks, St. Lawrence and Niagara power, conservation, preservaton of the shore front, arterial construction or the World's Fair of 1964–65 and duck controversy, but regardless of consequences, I shall proceed with this dangerous topic in the hope that the press may be disarmed by frankness and encouraged to enlarge the not inconsiderable area of common ground.

The newspapers which dish it out every day should have the stomach to take it. I do not hand reporters a copy of Milton's "Areopagitica" and tell them to be guided by it and, by the same token, expect them to give me Dale Carnegie's "How To Win Friends and Influence People" with the expectation that I might be a much nicer character if I patterned my life on it. I have been asked for frankness. Here it is. It comes from one who does not claim to have been angel of grace, who attributes what little he has been able to accomplish to stubbornness rather than innate nobility, and has never found it worth his while to lie.

At the very start I shall make an admission against interest. The journalist is by definition the creature of a day. He can't be an overnight expert on everything. He has to meet the news more than halfway and indeed, if we are to accept the proud boast of the profession, to anticipate it. By some strange instinct, as mysterious and imperious as the flight of birds and the leap of fishes upstream, he has to be on hand where and when it happens.

There is still another consideration. The commuters seek more than coverage of the news with their breakfast. There are legions who can't touch their scrambled eggs until they have absorbed the oracular Grapenuts of Walter Lippmann, and won't take a swallow of coffee until they have looked at the Dick Tracy strip for B.O. Plenty and Vitamin Flintheart, so long and unaccountably absent (can they, God forbid, be dead like Breathless Mahoney?), and for Sparkle Plenty, by now perhaps married and herself a mother, or skimmed through the columns for the latest antics of that Serpent of Old Nile, Elizabeth Taylor. The notion that we are essentially a nation of serious readers is one of the delightful and harmless fantasies of our civilization.

I make no extravagant charges or claims. I simply challenge the theory that a currently informed world, fed the raw, uncooked products of journalism every hour, will necessarily be a highly intelligent and friendly one, and I question equally the assumption of the little grubbing insects of bureaucracy that their daily labors, endlessly multiplied, will produce giant coral reefs to which nameless birds will bring verdure and civilization.

No newspaper, not even the justly famous New York Times, has the resources in men and facilities to employ genuine experts on every conceivable subject to convert spot news into the language and reliability of an encyclopedia. Those of us who demand space and objectivity for what we conceive to be important must realize that we are in competition with all the multifarious doings of mankind, that space is limited, that objectivity is for philosophers and that all that is fit to print is not necessarily news.

The recent practice of government to draw on capitol, city hall, and political reporters for secretaries to elected and other officials, and to incorporate them as public-relations counselors in the permanent bureaucracy, is supposed to protect the splayfooted honorables, smooth the rough road of the commissar, and bridge the yawning gap between government and the press. The trouble with this device is that the reporter alumnus has much less influence at Old Siwash than he is supposed to have. Access by back doors is barred because the press simply changes the locks, and the old, blind, private telephone number doesn't answer because the editor got himself a new one.

One thing is sure—that the graduates of journalism who have become the press representatives of bureaucracy have done little to counteract the justified disgust of reporters and city editors with the stream of turgid current releases, graceless handouts, and dull, statistical, and unreasonable reports of the average government agency. The cynicism and ribald amusement of the old press pros over official pronouncements account in considerable measure for the present low estate of those described as feeding at the public trough.

The power of the press, radio, and television to make or break any man in public life sufficiently prominent to be featured is awesome and often grossly unfair from the point of view of impartial presentation and the weighing of the ultimate verities. The press, for the ostensible purpose of keeping it honest, has done much to make public employment dangerous and unattractive. Certainly, decent, timid officials have been too often subject to the crushing weight of gratuitous derision and undeserved public obloquy. Detraction becomes a habit, and no one has yet found a cure for the common scold.

Many a good official has been frightened or flattened by idle gossip, random criticism or attack, lost to initiative and reduced to automation and contemplation of retirement. He lifts his eyes to the hills and there is no answering light. Aaron and Hur do not hold up his arms so that his side may gain the victory. He is no longer capable of indignation. He gives up.

Many a decent deputy has become paralyzed by a dart from a blowgun thoughtfully dipped in curare. After casting a roving, romantic eye on Hawaii, Papeete, the Windward Islands, Minorca and other distant tropical islands in the sun, he settles for a bungalow near a municipal fishing pier on the west coast of Florida where he rocks on the porch, exchanges gossip, reads a local paper or home weekly, keeps the radio going, looks at television in the nearest tavern, pities the poor devils up North and placidly awaits what the municipal departments of sanitation call final disposal.

Reporters who turn in factual and therefore unexciting stories are often sent back to get an "angle." If this is not readily found, they invent one. An eye-catching headline is added. Pretty soon the anthill has become a mountain. Then they look around for some reluctant Mahomet and demand that he stop being so damn arrogant and come to it.

There is a type, fortunately, rare, which is indifferent to the ordinary decencies and proprieties, skilled in eavesdropping, glued to keyholes, willing to embarrass families and friends, a species to whom nothing is sacred. Such reporters, if they could, would wire and violate the confessional. The photographer who cleverly strapped a camera to his leg and snapped Ruth Snyder in her death convulsion got a prize for it, persumably for vindicating the freedom of the press.

Engineering difficulties did not inhibit the building of the Panama Canal. It was stymied by mosquitoes and the yellow fever they carried with them. The battle for the Canal was won in a side engagement by a great sanitarian, Colonel Gorgas, who analyzed, trenched and oiled out the mosquitoes. I sometimes wish we had a few Gorgases to keep yellow journalists off our necks so that we would be free to do our work.

Admittedly, there are plenty of cases of insolence, incompetence, abracadabra, cowardice, equivocation and sheer ignorance in public office. Yet too much of the press builds up and tears down the same people—with an appalling indifference to both logic and human considerations. How often we have witnessed some sappy little fellow played up as a giant on the printed page and over the air, and then dropped like a hot cake. The poor fellow, beefed up by indigestible publicity, becomes an addict dependent on a drug he can no longer get.

Perceptive journalists sense that the public has tired of hearing Aristides called "The Just," and therefore yell for his ostracism. It may be that the crafty Greeks of old anticipated the Greek shipping magnates of today and aimed at tourism rather than exile. To keep public figures sane, balanced, and modest, there is something to be said for frequent vacations, cruises, and disappearances into foreign parts as distinguished from exile.

There is a notable tendency in the press to cut officials to one size in a sort of bed of Procrustes, to put on spiked shoes and cleats and to jump on victims when they are down, like the mob at the fights shouting with glee when an aging champion is beaten up and dethroned. There is also a potent minority of jackals and vultures who hang around the outskirts and hover over trouble spots to discover a wound or blood and then close in or swoop down for the kill. You may not altogether relish such metaphors, but remember that they were old when the Old Testament was written: "For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together."

I speak feelingly, not for myself, but for sensitive second-string officials who lack rhinoceros hides, shrivel and get ulcers and coronaries when they feel the full impact of a slanted story, a snotty editorial, a caricature cartoon and selected poison-pen letters, all in one issue of a sensational newspaper. Any morning, the victim may discover a candid-camera thug hiding in the bushes to snap a quick picture of the vaguely accused kissing his family goodby, leaving his home probably for the last time, like John Brown of Osawatomie on the way to the gallows. Or he may be pictured as riding insolently in a big, 7-passenger, maroon chauffeur-driven limousine owned by the lame and threadbare taxpayers. If the truth finally comes out, it is in small type next to the stockyard quotations. There are, to be sure, laws of libel, but cynical counsel will tell you that invoking them is exactly like throwing mud into a fan.

How many good men have been frightened out of or away from public office by warnings of conflict of interests so bizarre that no one with experience, investments, friends and the remotest relations with any corporation doing business with the Government is safe from suspicion, smear and innuendo? Yes, there are heels in Government, high and low. You must weigh the insolence of office against the proud man's contumely.

You may say that the beleaguered bureaucrat should hear the applause of his conscience, not the jeers of the crowd. But how many have that much self-confidence? And what of the telephone calls at midnight from reporters who have wangled a private number and demand to know if the accused is an ape or an angel? And what of the children whose classmates have read that Pop is in contempt of the Senate or House of Representatives and vaguely associate him with Benedict Arnold and John Wilkes Booth? No wonder the bureaucrat decides he should have been a savings-bank president or a walking delegate for Pretzel Varnishers Union No. 2.

Cleverly and dramatically reflecting public opinion is one thing. Planting suspicion, poisoning minds, rousing the mob spirit, quoting out of context—these are cute tricks far removed from straight honest reporting. The captious critic, masquerading as an honest observer, as Bernard Shaw once said, leaves no turn unstoned. Critics build nothing. The only excuse for a critic is to toughen the hides of his victims. The private, as well as the corporate, image is easily distorted. It took the genius of an Ivy Lee to turn the accepted caricature of the original John D. Rockefeller as "Oily John" into an appealing figure of benevolence and philanthropy.

Cultivation of the press has become one of the major courses in the teaching of the black art of public relations. It is an art which reaches beyond contacts, personal acquaintances, convention, club and bistro friendships, and the Tinker-to-Evers-to-Chance double plays, right into the countingrooms where advertising reigns and 15 percent is the standard rate of interest.

I would not insinuate that advertising always, or even usually, controls news. It has, however, been known to influence it. On the whole, the independence of news and editorials has been a bright page in journalism but it is an independence which every honest publisher will admit needs constant watching. The Bible says that "where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." It is an adage which should be a constant warning.

Success in elective office is often dependent on skill in promising anything and everything to sensitive and easily influenced groups. The arithmetic of demagoguery is simple indeed: the sum of minorities is a majority in the election. It is not unnatural that the metropolitan press should seek the good will of the same minorities which add up to a big circulation, and therefore back the demogogs. The candidate who scrupulously avoids guady promises and insincere gestures and is unwilling to descend into gutter politics is a pretty lonesome character, not likely to be appreciated until he is retired, becomes an elder statesman or is dead. In this process both politicians and the press lose public respect, and pretty soon the electorate believes neither of them.

Let me turn now to what I believe to be one of the most reprehensible practices of public officials in their handouts and releases the great organs of communication—namely, ambitious pronouncements. In every department of government you can hear the syncopated music of duplicating machines ceaselessly grinding out official releases advertising "Be Kind to Cats Week," serums, antibiotics, aphrodisiacs, pharmaceuticals, lotions, specifics and surefire remedies to cure all the ills of mankind, recipes for rebuilding cities, committees to have, restore and enhance this and that, quaint devices to lift tabernacles in wildernesses, to whisk travelers back and forth and here and there by magic carpets, to control climate, seed clouds, stop storms, cultivate arts and amenities and make two blades grow where one grew before. Add the felicitous remarks of political shills and barkers on the daises at lunches and dinners and you have all the makings of what the press bluntly characterizes as bull.

When you come to think of it, the main objective of all this boilerplate, wadding and propaganda is to have everything run from Washington, the State capitol, the county seat or city hall—or by some scheme of super-duper regional government. I wish I knew how far beyond the framework of living the eager bureaucrats should be allowed to go. The Good Samaritan, having helped and given first aid to the man from Jerusalem and put him up at an inn, did not adopt him, and become responsible for the remainder of his life. And he surely did not ask the government to do so. Because the Communists overwhelm their millions with massive all-embracing plans, we need not necessarily imitate them.

Maybe liberty lies in the discovery of the precise limits where paternalism ends and tyranny begins. Maybe freedom is the right to make mistakes with impunity provided others are not injured in the process. Maybe home rule is better than all-embracing central government. The exiled geniuses who were driven out of central Europe by the dictators carried with them to democracy the secrets of ultimate victory. There may be a subtle lesson in this for those who believe that everything can be regimented.

The journalists have their role, so have we. At best, both are honorable. Let us concede that nobody can suppress the press and that quite a few public officials are equally irrepressible. We cannot live without each other and must learn to get along.

If I were to ask of newsmen any special favor or dispensation for my side, it would be to give a break to those in public office who try to get things done in their time with the instruments at hand, with the skill and courage they can muster, with perhaps an occasional vista of a better world, and, if possible, with a touch of humor. Some of us like to think that we, like Scaramouche, were born with the gift of laughter and a sense that the world is mad.

Go easy on those who have not yet succumbed to security and the pressure to please everybody. I know what you are thinking—that my next effort will be a recitation of "Invictus" with violin music. Well, it may be sophomoric, but I proclaim that there are those who under the bludgeonings of chance may not be masters of their fate but try at least to be captains of their souls.

The press finds it easiest to lump together and label all irritating public officials as controversial, uncooperative, pugnacious, and generally obnoxious, without any nice distinctions and qualifications and regardless of motivation and human chemistry. This makes for simplicity. The man is either a good guy or a bastard. As a matter of fact, there is quite a gap between a battler and a fanatic. The former goes after immediate objectives in which he honestly believes. The latter is an intolerant lout who confuses his cruelties with divine will.

The battler has a short memory. He believes in a periodic audit of fights, striking a balance, wiping the slate clean, canceling old debts and looking ahead to better times. The difficulty, of course, is to fix the exact date of the audit. He can't stop right in the middle of a fight.

If you observe the battler smiling privately, you will know he is laughing at himself. The fanatic never laughs. The warrior is happy much of the time. The fanatic is in a chronic state of gloom and rage, wrath, and tears.

I am duly grateful for the decency and forbearance of the press in the past, no doubt in the face of considerable provocation, and for the sportsmanship of the Times in giving me space with no Marquis of Queensberry rules and no holds barred. In the lodge, off the record, sub the rose, I've led a most interesting life, to which the press has contributed, usually most generously and sometime unintentionally. At best, the press keeps us of the Government on our toes and makes it possible for little officials to repay some of the immense debt we owe to our wonderful country for the opportunity to be forthright and independent.

Educational Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Morning Call, Paterson, N.J., and the Washington Post have editorially commented on the anniversary of the Morrill Act that was signed into law on July 2, 1862, by President Abraham Lincoln.

The Morrill Act was one of the most progressive pieces of legislation in its day. It is because of this act and the tenacity and vision of Senator Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, that 68 flourishing colleges and universities receive substantial Federal support, among them Rutgers, Cornell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, California, Wisconsin, the University of Maryland, and Virginia State College. One in every five college students attends an institution that gratefully remembers Senator Morrill.

On the occasion of the 100th anniversary of this great act, it is well for us to remember that we are honoring a man whose parents could not afford to send to college; that we are honoring a man for his long fight to sell Federal land in order to support "people's colleges" for "those at the bottom of the ladder who want to climb up." Few people today dispute the wisdom of this act of Federal aid to education. Yet, the Call said:

> All Justin Morrill had to go on was unsubstantiated foresight that the Nation in the future would require the services of a trained citizenry to aid in its role as world leader—a destiny which was not at all clear in 1862.

In 1962 we also have men of vision, men like our President who has asked for further Federal support to aid in our great educational effort in the years ahead. The Post commented that Morrill's bill of vision "has done more for higher education in America than any other single act of government."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the Call's June 29 editorial, "Educational Milestone," and the Post's July 3 editorial, "The Land's Great Dream."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, June 29, 1962]

EDUCATIONAL MILESTONE

President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act into law July 2, 1862, and in the century that has since elapsed millions of Americans have been provided an education which otherwise might have been denied them. The Land Grant Act of 1862 was an offer to each State of 30,000 acres of Federal land or land scrip for each Member of Congress.

This land was then sold to provide a permanent endownment for one or more State colleges. This provision of a subsidiary source of income, a bold and imaginative idea for its time, has enabled countless Americans to obtain a good education for one-third its cost.

Justin S. Morrill, sponsor of the Land Grant Act, spent 44 years in Congress, but none of his achievements has served his name better than the 68 land-grant colleges now located in every section of the country. More than 700,000 students annually attend these institutions. This is one of every five college students.

Endowments have become a traditional source of funds for almost every college today, including private schools. The rising cost of education has made the search for income other than tuition mandatory. Even with multi-million-dollar endowments, many of the larger schools today are operating in deficits. They are attempting to meet the burden of mushrooming building and faculty costs by increasing endowment funds through public subscription and alumni donation.

In 1862, colleges were rare, small, and inexpensive. The proposal to promote higher education by multiplying the number of institutions and underwriting part of the students' costs must have seemed a strange move to many citizens in the Civil War period. Grammar school educations were not common in those days, and the predominantly agricultural economy found little time for prolonged schooling.

It is possible to look back upon the Land Grant Act with the hindsight that State colleges have made a substantial contribution to the American high standard of living. All Justin Morrill had to go on was unsubstantiated foresight that the Nation in the future would require the services of a trained citizenry to aid in its role as world leader—a destiny which was not at all clear in 1862.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 3, 1962]

THE LAND-GRANT DREAM

Just 100 years ago yesterday, President Lincoln signed the bill that has done more for higher education in America than any other single act of Government. The Land-Grant Act of 1862 was based on a simple yet inspired idea advanced by a blacksmith's son, Senator Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont. Under its terms, 30,000 acres were provided to each Senator and Representative; the land was to be sold and the money invested in at least one college in each State. From this seed grew 68 schools, including the great State universities that are an ornament to American learning.

The land-grant campuses that stretch from Puerto Rico to Hawaii are the best monument to Senator Morrill, who devoted 33 years to fostering his vision. Vetoed by President Buchanan as a dangerous novelty, the bill was warmly approved by Lincoln, who saw its virtue as an emancipating force. The land-grant colleges are more than academies of enlightenment; they are also practical instruments as Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN remarked in a memorial address, "designed to teach people how to do for themselves."

Hence it is wholly fitting that the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges has appointed a special committee to work with the Alliance for Progress. The idea that our State agricultural schools could play a unique role in the Alliance was suggested last February by an editorial in this newspaper. Now the association has agreed to play "an expanded role" in the Alliance with special emphasis on aiding rural development programs in Latin America. This, too, is a seed that can yield bountiful fruit; the land-grant colleges are to be congratulated both on their anniversary and on this first step into a challenging frontier.

Little People to Little People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago Peter Rodino III, the 10-year-old son of the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman PETER RODINO, JR., organized with the help of his father the little-people-to-little-people program through which youths of America correspond with the children of the world and especially with those behind the Iron Curtain. This program will undoubtedly increase understanding between nations thereby enhancing the chances for ultimate peace.

Recently the Lido Civic Club selected Pete Rodino to receive the Boy-of-the-Year Award. The Lido Civic Club is comprised of leading Americans of Italian ancestry residing in Washington, D.C. In addition to its civic and charitable activities, this organization seeks to honor persons who have distinguished themselves in the fields of government, sports, and so forth. Senator JOHN O. Pastore and the outstanding American jockey, Eddie Arcaro, have been recipients of the club's awards. The receive such an award is a true honor and few are more deserving of such an honor than Peter Rodino III.

I would like to insert the following letter from the club's president, Michael Vitale, to Peter, for I feel that it gives an accurate account of Peter's meritorious character of which his father and all can be genuinely proud:

JULY 30, 1962.

Mr. PETER W. RODINO III,
Newark, N.J.

DEAR PETER: We wish to thank you for accepting, in the name of the little people, an award commending you for the-little-people-to-little-people program.

It is regretted, however, that you feel unable to appear and accept the citation at an offical gathering. Your withdrawal from any personal glory so as to not ever shadow the idea conceived by you again demonstrates your sincerity to accomplish the objective of such a program—peace. We admire the humility shown by you in avoiding personal publicity.

We understand and appreciate your feeling in this matter; however, at a later date we would like to present to your father, Congressman PETER W. RODINO, JR., a plaque recognizing your efforts in this program. The inscription on the plaque reads as follows:

"LIDO CIVIC CLUB BOY-OF-THE-YEAR AWARD TO PETER W. RODINO III

"In recognition of his efforts to serve his country and humanity through his little-people-to-little-people program—a program conceived by him to achieve a lasting peace by promoting better understanding and friendship among the children of the world."

We trust that our interest in your commendable undertaking will serve as an inspiration to you and your friends, and we offer the services of our club and membership to assist you in any manner you feel would help to promote the little-people-to-little-people program. If you are ever in Washington, we would feel honored to have you visit us.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. VITALE.

Undermining the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a major portion of an article that appears in the summer number of Prevent World War III:

UNDERMINING THE U.N.

Edmund Burke, the distinguished English parliamentarian, once remarked: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." Implicit in this wise observation is the fact that one cannot escape responsibilities by assuming a "do-nothing" posture. On the contrary, passivity can wreak as much damage as an active policy which is specifically designed for that purpose.

These thoughts come to mind as we reflect on the workings of U.S. policy in the Middle East. Several months ago the Saturday Evening Post published a series of articles on the Middle East, based on a 3-month on-the-spot survey by Harold Martin, one of its crack reporters. The articles are most informative, and the Saturday Evening Post deserves commendation for services rendered to its readers.

The conclusion of the first article bears a striking relevancy to Edmund Burke's judgment. Thus after pinpointing the dangers and bitter conflicts which have turned the Middle East into a cauldron of hatred, Mr. Martin writes: "The final question is: What should the United States do in the dangerous years ahead to try to keep the peace in the Middle East? The answer at the moment seems to be nothing." As if to emphasize this point, Mr. Martin quotes an unnamed American, presumably someone in authority, as stating: "If we can just keep them from fighting, maybe in a few years the old hatreds will begin to die down and some sort of stability will come."

Does Mr. Martin accurately describe the essence of U.S. policy in the Middle East? If we judge from recent performances by our policymakers, then we must come to the conclusion that "do-nothingism" is indeed the touchstone of the U.S. approach to the Middle East. Surely the strange, to say the least, position taken by Washington during the last session of the U.N. General Assembly leads us to no other conclusion. It is not generally known, for the press gave it little publilicity, that 16 nations, including 9 African states, sponsored a resolution which called upon Israel and the Arab States "to undertake direct negotiations * * * with a view to finding a solution, acceptable to all the parties concerned, for all the questions and disputes between them, particularly the question of the Arab refugees."

This resolution envisaged direct negotiation under U.N. auspices. This was indeed a sensational and significant move. It was the first time since 1952 that member states of the U.N. had come forward to try to break the impasse and to put an end once and for all to the explosive situation which hovers over the Middle East.

It is interesting to note that nations proposing peaceful negotiations were not the large powers. On the contrary, they were relatively small states which have presumably recognized the validity of the late Dag Hammarskjold's assertion that in the last analysis the U.N. is more important to the small states than to the big powers who can take care of their own interests.

There is no question but that this fresh breeze calling for peace in the Middle East aroused the hopes of many member states. There is no doubt that if the big powers had shown that they too were anxious to dampen the dry tinder in the Middle East, the resolution would have been carried overwhelming. But just as quickly as hopes had risen, so were they defeated. When the U.S. delegation made it clear that it would have nothing to do with this resolution for peace, the result was a foregone conclusion. The resolution received 34 affirmative votes, but it failed to obtain a majority in the special U.N. Political Committee and it was thereby defeated with 20 abstentions. The fact that all of the big powers opposed the resolution tempts one to conclude that there was some sort of tacit agreement among them to continue their cold war maneuvers at the expense of the peoples living in the Middle East.

It is no wonder that the Arab States without exception also voted "no." The shocking performance of the U.S. delegation placed Washington in a rather embarrassing position. The excuses thought up by the U.S. delegation to justify the veto were quite transparent. They all boiled down to the contention that the 16 member states peace initiative was unrealistic at this time, because the Arabs show no inclination to sit down and talk peace.

On March 27, 10 U.S. Senators sent a joint wire to the Secretary of State calling upon our Government to encourage direct peace talks between Israel and her Arab neighbors. The State Department's reply may be summed up in this one sentence: "The Department is convinced that before the direct negotiations can become feasible, and in order to enhance the prospects for a fundamental improvement in Arab-Israel relations, considerable progress can and should be made on the most serious differences which divide the parties."

The most poignant commentary which we have seen on the State Department's explanation that peace talks are "premature" was contained in an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune December 22, 1961: "What is particularly distressing was that the U.S. delegation voted against it [the resolution]—on the ground that it did not seem 'practical' because the Arabs have always refused to negotiate with Israel. If there's any more practical way of settling a problem than of having the two disputants talk about it, we wish our delegation would let us in on the secret."

The net effect of the State Department's position is to bolster the sharp divisions which now exist in the Middle East. Needless to say, this can only play into the hands of the demagogs and firebrands who maintain their power by keeping the atmosphere in the Middle East at fever pitch. It is no wonder that Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, labeled the State Department's alibi as the "most pro-Arab statement I have seen from the State Department in all my years in Congress." Here was the "do-nothingism" in action and at its worst. It also underlies the prophetic quality of Edmund Burke's wisdom, for within 2 months after this peace resolution was rejected, the border between Israel and Syria became the scene of a series of armed clashes.

This is not to imply that the failure to carry the resolution, was the direct cause of this armed outbreak. However, it is part and parcel of the "do nothing" policy which permits aggressive forces to play havoc with the lives and welfare of the peoples of the Middle East. Basically the clash between Israel and Syria is but one manifestation of the differences which can only be solved through negotiations as contemplated by the defeated resolution.

The terrible danger of war in the Middle East can no longer permit the pursuance of a policy of passivity. The United States must develop positive actions that will root out the war-breeding forces in that area of the world.

The present administration in Washington has a particular responsibility to meet this challenge head on. In the platform adopted by the Democratic Party at its convention in 1960, it was clearly stated that "In the Middle East we will work for guarantees to insure independence for all states. We will encourage Arab-Israel peace negotiations, the resettlement of the Arab refugees, in land where there is room and opportunity for them, an end to boycotts and blockades, and unrestricted use of the Suez Canal by all nations." Here is a clear-cut program for a policy of "live and let live" for all of the states in the Middle East.

Has this program been sacrificed for illusory advantage? If this be the case, then Middle East peace, so essential to the national interest, becomes a fleeting mirage.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Report of Supreme Governor of the Loyal Order of Moose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the report of the supreme governor of the Loyal Order of Moose to the 1962 convention of that estimable fraternal organization.

I believe that Supreme Governor Byrd's remarks are especially worthy of note in these times of international conflict and tension because of the emphasis they place on the Moose ideal of brotherhood and on the obligations of man to man.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF SUPREME GOVERNOR HARRY C. BYRD TO THE 1962 CONVENTION OF LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

As members of the supreme lodge, we, who are here this morning, have a one great basic duty to perform; namely, to go back to our lodges prepared for the job of educating our people to a full understanding of the Moose order, dedicated to helping all our lodges to profit from what the best of our lodges have accomplished. Then, too, we should inspire each of our members to become a salesman to spread everywhere knowledge of the principles and objectives of our fraternity. What these principles and objectives are may be briefly stated by you to all:

First. We are building a great organization on the basic principle of brotherhood. That man does not live by bread alone, but by a high spiritual concept of man's duty to man.

Second. That the Moose provides protection through the maintenance of Mooseheart for a member's wife and children such as none of us could afford to buy. That if we become delinquent in dues we forfeit this precious protection for our families.

Third. That protection through Moosehaven is provided for the old who can no longer look after themselves.

Fourth. A social program is maintained which brings together families and creates recreational opportunities for a better social life.

Fifth. The civic affairs program offers advantages for service in and to a community which are not offered in any other fraternity and which make a community better because the Moose lodge is there.

Sixth. The Moose ritual teaches not only the brotherhood of man, but that true spirit of brotherhood stems from religious worship, a confidence in the mercy of an everlasting God.

Seventh. We teach, nay, expect and demand, loyalty to our country; and dedicate ourselves to perpetuation of those freedoms and liberties given to us. And we should emphasize the strategic position, and duty of every Moose lodge to meet as a unit in its community whatever crises may confront us as a nation.

Yes, we have a magnificent concept of our order to present to our friends, but this presentation will not get done of itself, we must do it. As I've traveled many thousands of miles, come in contact with people everywhere, seen indications of willingness to sacrifice, my term as supreme governor has become an inspiration.

I've learned that the hearts of our members are warm with appreciation of the high principles of our order and what we are trying to accomplish.

More and more has it become evident to me that the women of the Moose are playing a vital part in developing the order, in maintaining high ideals, and in all kinds of cooperative efforts. Let us foster this great group of dedicated women. They are of incalculable value and a needed part of our organization.

I've come to understand that the potentialities of the Moose are virtually unlimited; that the order is accomplishing much for the communities in which lodges exist; that members generally believe in the principle of helpfulness to others, and understand the real meaning of brotherhood.

Over and above all, though, I've learned that we are one nation, all with the same basic ideals. And our British brothers are no different. They believe as we believe. Lithuanian, French, or English brothers in Canada; Georgians, New Yorkers, the Pacific coast, the Middle West, all are a conscious part of our great brotherhood. All will unite to defend the freedoms and liberties on which the two nations were founded and in which the Moose order believes. We know of no borderlines when it comes to the ideal of mutual helpfulness, all for one and one for all. I know that all the good works of the Moose have their basis in the deep-seated religious conceptions of our membership and that what we do in helping others is God's will.

So today, I say these things to you because they are the standards by which I've come to know you. Thus do I state my estimate of your potentialities. May God give you grace, vision, understanding, and determination to realize them.

The Breadth of Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important functions in our society—a function that is as much a job of the private sector as it is of the governmental and perhaps more so—is the preservation of civil liberties. The concept of our Government is that, through a common effort, the rights of the individual can more fully flourish. These civil liberties are central to our national philosophy.

The increasing complexity of our society brings greater tests for the individuals and groups seeking to uphold civil liberties. It is for this reason that I wish to take this opportunity to commend, although somewhat belatedly, the actions of the American Civil Liberties Union in its statement calling attention to the infringements upon the rights of interested parties in investigatory hearings by the Federal Trade Commission.

We must, in fighting for the preservation of civil liberties, make sure we cover the full range of these liberties. I think the American Civil Liberties Union has done a fine thing in helping those truly interested in civil liberties to remember how broad they really are.

I am placing in the RECORD the news release of the American Civil Liberties Union and its letter to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. I am also placing in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 2–3 commenting on the action of the American Civil Liberties Union and praising the American Civil Liberties Union for it:

NEW YORK, N.Y., May 6.—The procedures of the Federal Trade Commission's investigatory hearings came in for sharp criticism today from the American Civil Liberties Union.

The civil liberties organization said that the FTC policy of conducting an investigatory hearing in public and not permitting counsel for companies under investigation to participate fully in the hearing infringed on due process of law.

The American Civil Liberties Union's executive director, John de J. Pemberton, Jr., made public a letter sent to FTC Chairman Paul Rand Dixon which called on the Federal regulatory agency to revise its rules and regulations to provide greater due process safeguards. "In the absence of such action," the American Civil Liberties Union said, it "will offer support to any individual or company that declines to produce documentary evidence at a public investigatory hearing of the Commission."

The union's review of the FTC procedures was prompted by a March 14 hearing in Indianapolis into the pricing and sale of milk at which the Kroger Co. and other food chains were called to testify.

"There are two civil liberties aspects of this controversy which gravely disturb the union," Pemberton wrote. "One is the holding of an investigatory hearing, analogous to a grand jury investigation, in public. The second concerns the failure to allow counsel for companies under investigation adequate participation in the hearing in behalf of their clients. Both combine to create a breach of the safeguards embodied in the idea of due process of law, the touchstone of our democratic system which should be especially respected in the relationship between the Government and the citizen."

Emphasizing the parallel between an administrative investigative proceeding and a grand jury investigation, the American Civil

Liberties Union said that the "standards and protections governing the latter should apply equally to the former. High on the list of these guarantees is the nonpublic character of investigatory proceedings. This right to privacy is one of the integral elements of due process because it assures the individual—or the company—that they are not considered to have engaged in a wrongful act until sufficient evidence has been accumulated to warrant a specific indictment—until they know the charges and can prepare to defend themselves at a subsequent trial."

A public factfinding investigation, "by its very nature," the American Civil Liberties Union said, "can't offer this protection; indeed it places the individual—or company—in a position where the search for information about them is secondary and primarily they are regarded as having been charged with committing an offense. The experience of congressional investigating committees probing Communist influence in the last 15 years amply illustrates this. These inquiries made crystal clear that in a hostile, accusatory atmosphere created by such hearings, persons brought publicly into the investigation are stigmatized and regarded as having been involved in some kind of wrongdoing."

Asserting that because the FTC serves as investigator, grand jury, and judge, it should take special pains to afford all the due process protections of a judicial proceedings, the American Civil Liberties Union noted that at the March 14 hearing, counsel for the Kroger Co. was not allowed to object to questions on grounds of relevance, competence, or materiality, to introduce evidence or cross-examine, or to make any statement for the record. Moreover, the American Civil Liberties Union said, the FTC's rules (sec. 1.40) reinforces this burden on the company under investigation by providing: "Any party compelled to testify or to produce documentary evidence may be accompanied and advised by counsel, but counsel may not as a matter of right, otherwise participate in the investigation."

This, the union continued, "is a severe restriction of legal representation which deprives a party of his due process rights to full representation. If any public investigation hearings are to be permitted, the person or party under investigation must have the opportunity to be confronted by his accusers, if any, and an opportunity to cross-examine them. He must also have the opportunity and right to object to the introduction of material that is irrelevant or otherwise improper. In addition he must have the right to introduce such material and testimony as he and his counsel deem fit in his own defense. If these procedural safeguards are abused by counsel, steps should be taken to curb such abuses—but only after, not before, the problem arises."

The full text of the letter is attached:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York, N.Y., April 20, 1962.

MR. PAUL RAND DIXON,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DIXON: The American Civil Liberties Union has studied with great care the current controversy concerning the Federal Trade Commission's new policy of conducting investigatory hearings in public. We refer particularly to the March 14 hearing in Indianapolis, whose alleged purpose was to determine if the Kroger Co. and other food chains violated the law concerning the pricing and sale of milk.

There are two civil liberties aspects of this controversy which gravely disturbs the union and which we urge the Commission seriously to consider. One is the holding of an investigatory hearing, analagous to a grand jury investigation, in public. The second concerns the failure to allow counsel for companies under investigation adequate participation in the hearing in behalf of their clients. Both combine to create a breach of the safeguards embodied in the idea of due process of law, the touchstone of our democratic system which should be especially respected in the relationship between the Government and the citizen.

The analogy between an administrative investigatory proceeding and a grand jury investigation has been often made. One of the more emphatic statements on the subject was made by the late Justice Jackson of the U.S. Supreme Court in *U.S.* v. *Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632 (1950): It [the administrative agency] has a power of inquisition, if one chooses to call it that, which is not derived from the judicial function. It is more analogous to the grand jury, which does not depend on a case or controversy for power to get evidence but can investigate merely on suspicion that the law is being violated, or even just because it wants assurance that it is not. When investigative and accusatory duties are delegated by statute to an administrative body, it too, may take steps to inform itself as to whether there is probably violation of the law.'

If an administrative investigatory proceeding is, as we agree with Justice Jackson, directly parallel to a grand jury investigation, it follows that the standards and protections governing the latter should apply equally to the former. High on the list of these guarantees is the nonpublic character of investigatory proceedings. This right to privacy is one of the integral elements of due process because it assures the individual—or the company—that they are not considered to have engaged in a wrongful act until sufficient evidence has been accumulated to warrant a specific indictment—until they know the charges and can prepare to defend themselves at a subsequent trial.

A public factfinding investigation, by its very nature, can't offer this protection; indeed it places the individual—or company—in a position where the search for information about them is secondary and primarily they are regarded as having been charged with committing an offense. The experience of congressional investigating committees probing Communist influence in the last 15 years amply illustrates this. These inquiries made crystal clear that in an hostile, accusatory atmosphere created by such hearings persons brought publicly into the investigation are stigmatized and regarded as having been involved in some kind of wrongdoings. The American Civil Liberties Union has protested congressional inquiries concerned mainly with 'exposure for exposure's sake,' and the U.S. Supreme Court in *Watkins* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 178, concluded that such investigations are improper.

We refer to the congressional committee investigation because we read in the March 25 Washington Star that the FTC's public investigatory hearings are following the form of congressional hearings. But we submit there is a significant difference between these two kinds of hearings, a difference which places a greater responsibility on the FTC to adhere scrupulously to fair procedures. Unlike the congressional committee whose authority rests on obtaining information on which the Congress can act to write new laws, the FTC itself can use the information it gathers in investigatory hearings in a later adjudicatory hearing which can result in an order or the imposing of sanctions where a violation is found to exist. As the Commission serves as investigator, grand jury, and judge, it should take special pains to afford all the due process protections of a judicial proceeding.

The failure to provide such protection was demonstrated in the recent hearing in Indianapolis concerning the Kroger Co., as described in this statement by the company:

"The investigation is being conducted in public, although the Commission concedes that it has no reason to believe that Kroger has committed any violation of law. It is therefore a public adversary proceeding in which Kroger is for practical purposes in the position of a defendant.

"Yet the presiding attorney insists that Kroger's counsel may not participate in this public proceeding except to the limited extent of advising Kroger witnesses, off the record. He insists that Kroger's counsel may not object to questions on grounds of relevance, competence, or materiality; he may not cross-examine or introduce evidence; and may not even make any statements of any kind on the record. On the contrary, when Kroger's counsel has attempted to speak, the presiding attorney has directed the reporter to go off the record, while directing that the response of Commission's counsel shall be taken down on the record.

* * * * *

"It is totally incompatible with the American judicial system to allow charges to be hurled in public against anyone who is simultaneously denied any opportunity for self-defense in public. Such a procedure is characteristic of the police state. It is totally in conflict with the democratic and representative form of free government symbolized in principle and practice by our great Nation."

We are aware of section 1.40 of the Commission's rules which states: 'Any party compelled to testify or to produce documentary evidence may be accompanied and advised by counsel, but counsel may not as a matter of right, otherwise participate in the investigation.'

We also read in the March 25 Washington Star story your comment that if lawyers were allowed to intervene, the hearing would become an endless 'rhubarb' and the basic facts would not be obtained.

We believe section 1.40 and your comment, especially in the context of a public investigatory proceeding, is a severe restriction of legal representation which deprives a party of his due process right to full representation. If any public investigation hearings are to be permitted, the person or party under investigation must have an opportunity to be confronted by his accusers, if any, and an opportunity to cross-examine them. He must also have the opportunity and right to object to the introduction of material that is irrelevant or otherwise improper. In addition, he must have the right to introduce such material and testimony as he and his counsel deem fit in his own defense. If these procedural safeguards are abused by counsel, steps should be taken to curb such abuses—but only after, not before, the problem arises.

Because of the growth and size of Government agencies required to deal with the complexity of today's economic and social problems, there is inherent danger to individual rights whenever the power of Government is employed. The experience of the 1950's, when the constitutional freedoms of persons caught in the toils of the Federal employee security program were frequently infringed presents dramatic proof of this problem. As the need for Government involvement in the lives of citizens increases, as it appears to be doing, agencies of a Government based on respect for democratic standards should be particularly alert to invasions of individual rights. We therefore urge that the Commission consider changes in its rules and regulations that will provide a greater measure of due process. In the absence of such action the American Civil Liberties Union will offer support to any individual or company that declines to produce documentary evidence at a public investigatory hearing of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN DE J. PEMBERTON, Jr.,
Executive Director.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, June 23, 1962]

RIGHTS FOR REDS, NOT BUSINESS

If an American Communist is asked to tell a congressional committee about his activities, or the party's, he is treated with kid gloves. The rules of the House Un-American Activities Committee, for example, provide that:

1. Any witness may "make a prepared or written statement for the record."
2. At every hearing, public or otherwise, the witness "shall be accorded the privilege of having counsel of his own choosing."
3. The subject of the investigation must be outlined in an opening statement and "the information sought" must be "relevant and germane."

Of course, the House committee has been bitterly castigated by leftwing foes, including the American Civil Liberties Union, for alleged unfairness to witnesses. That, of course, is false.

Now the American Civil Liberties Union has discovered that American business firms get shorter shrift from the Federal Trade Commission than Communists get from congressional committees.

Recently, the FTC hailed the Kroger Co. and some other food chains to a public hearing in Indianapolis. Although this was "analogous to a grand jury investigation," the American Civil Liberties Union charges, the business firms were denied many of the rights due them under our system of law.

For example, it said, they were not allowed to make any statement for the record. Nor were their lawyers permitted to object to questions on the grounds that they were irrelevant or immaterial.

The American Civil Liberties Union also criticized the Federal agency for holding a public hearing, until the witnesses "know the charges and can prepare to defend themselves."

Not one American in a thousand is aware of the fact that a reputable American business firm brought before the FTC is denied legal advantages which the House Un-American Activities Committee accords even to members of Moscow's American fifth column.

On the contrary, Communists, fellow-travelers and the leftwing claque have managed to deceive many into believing this House committee is an inquisition complete with rack and screw.

More than 10 years ago, a subcommittee of the American Bar Association made a close study of the committee's proceedings. It issued this verdict: "We are satisfied that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are being treated fairly and properly in all respects, and we also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded full protection so far as his constitutional or other legal rights are involved; moreover, the confidential communications between attorneys and clients have been fully respected."

Apparently the FTC can't make the same boast.

The Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is often said that Americans take too lightly their right to vote. That, however, is not the case with at least one voter in Tennessee, Mr. Herrick Brown.

Mr. Brown's attitude toward the voting privilege—an attitude that all Americans would do well to adopt—is simply told in an Associated Press story from Gatlinburg, Tenn., which appeared in the Knoxville Journal on August 3. I ask unanimous consent that this story be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESIDENT WALKS 13 MILES TO VOTE

GATLINBURG, August 2.—Herrick Brown walked more than 13 miles to vote today.

Brown, operator of a lodge atop Mount Le Conte in the Great Smoky Mountains, walked down to Gatlinburg to cast his ballot and then hiked back up the mountain—5,593 feet high.

The Lesson of the Preamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the June–July issue of Highway Highlights there is carried the text of an address given by our colleague, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, before the National Highway Users Conference earlier this year. This address is a splendid presentation and an excellent warning to all Americans. It urges them to guard the sovereignty of the individual States and the individual authorities against further encroachments by the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks of Senator MUNDT printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LESSON OF THE PREAMBLE—AMERICANS ARE URGED TO GUARD STATE SOVEREIGNTY, INDIVIDUAL AUTHORITIES AGAINST FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT)

Back on the third day of July 1776, the day before the Declaration of Independence was signed, a great American wrote a letter to his wife, Abigail. This American was John Adams, and he wrote his wife and said, "Yesterday the greatest question was decided which ever was debated in America, and a greater problem will probably never be debated. A resolution was passed, without one dissenting colony, that these united Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States."

That sentiment was found in the Declaration of Independence, too: "these united Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States."

From that early beginning, there has been a continuing controversy in America as to what is the rightful position of the individual citizen; as to what is the individual position of the individual State, and as to what are the proper responsibilities and authorities to be delegated to the central state and to our Federal Government.

ONLY IN THE UNITED STATES

While we have sought to encourage other lands and other areas to follow our example in that regard, it is only in the United States where it is specifically put down in the charter of freedom that the rights of people in jobs like mine, your Federal politicians, shall be limited solely to those rights and authorities specifically delegated to us by the States or by the people.

While I am normally described as a Midwestern conservative, I am an advocate of a constitutional formula which is the greatest liberal document of government ever written or employed anywhere. Because down through history the liberal has always been opposed to a concentration of authority; that was the liberalism of Woodrow Wilson, that was the liberalism of Thomas Jefferson. That to me is the only kind of liberalism which is genuine, and anybody who describes liberalism as a device for giving fewer men more power over additional people is describing a synthetic form of liberalism and an error of semanticism. Because, as a liberal who believes that the functions should lie with the people in States and in individual offices and shops and businesses, and that Federal politicians in jobs like mine should be circumscribed in the powers we exercise over the average citizen, I submit that this is a concept which is, in fact, genuine liberalism.

That being true, I speak, as one who believes that instead of trying to delegate more power and more authority and more responsibility to the central state, somehow or other, we should learn as States and as individuals, as groups and as organizations and as entities, to assume the responsibilities and exercise the authorities which are essential to progress.

HIGHWAY PROBLEMS

I think that is true in the field of safety legislation, for example, in highways; I think it is true in the controversial problem of reciprocity. I think it is true in the field of uniform highway traffic signals. These are all important to all Americans. Somebody will have to solve the problem. Wherever a problem gets too tough, or remains unsolved, or the situation becomes too odious, a clamor arises at once for the Federal Government to step in, and pass a whole family of bills.

I think nobody will quarrel with the fact that reciprocity is desirable, that safety is desirable, that uniformity in traffic signals is desirable; but I don't think you have to go to the Federal Government to achieve these desirable objectives, because, when we pass legislation, we have to exercise controls. Inevitably, we have to do something to you when we are doing something for you. We can't just by a magic wand create utopia in a painless fashion.

I happen to be the owner of a nice new 1962 automobile. It is a mighty fine automobile. It is the best automobile I have ever driven, but some engineer, if you please, hid the signal lever, which indicates whether you are going to turn right or left, some place down on the dashboard, where I guarantee even an FBI agent couldn't find it.

A colleague in the Senate bought the same kind of car I had. He wants to have a Federal law making it illegal to hide the signal lever in that car, but I don't think it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to nurse these automobile manufacturers along and tell them how much horsepower they have to have and what is the maximum and minimum speed on the highway and how many layers of nylon or whatever to put in automobile tires.

UNIFORMITY

The matter of uniformity of traffic law happens to be a special fetish of mine, because on at least three occasions I have been privileged to visit in virtually all of the countries of Europe and on two occasions all of them. I was impressed, most of all, by something which I suppose escapes the eyes of many tourists, but the one lasting impact made upon me was the fact that throughout Europe with all its diversity of languages and flags and nationalities and passports and currencies and border controls, they have been able to develop a uniformity of traffic signals far exceeding anything we have in the United States.

I think it is a very desirable objective. In a part of the world that can agree on virtually nothing else, where you have a wall between East Berlin and West Berlin, the only thing the same on both sides of Germany today are the traffic signals on the highway.

I don't know how they did it, but I am glad they did it because that demonstrates to me that there certainly must be some way that in America we can develop a degree of uniformity in traffic signals without having Uncle Sam do the job, because they haven't any central government there. They did it somehow through conferences, somehow through private people working through their respective government to say, "This is a good idea." And they said, "Ja," or "Oui," or "Da-Da," or whatever the language happened to be, and they succeeded.

We can do that in our country. If we can do that in highways, we can do it in a great many other areas of activities, I think. Therefore, it is important that you guard your State sovereignties, that you guard your individual authorities, that you question with a jaundiced eye any—any—additional suggestion to expand the power of people in jobs like mine over people in jobs like yours, because, if you don't, we find this increased power to be a kind of heady and intoxicating wine. It is kind of enjoyable to be able to push a lot of people around and pass a lot of legislation and make everybody call you on the telephone to see whether they can buy a new automobile or whether they can do this or that. And the thing tends to grow.

It has been seriously suggested, and so far not acted upon either affirmatively or negatively by this session of Congress, that we should deliver to the Executive power by his own decree and his own decision to modify the tax structure of America, to reduce, to change, to modify. This is a pretty serious encroachment to my way of thinking on the powers of the people and the powers of the Congress.

Another great controversy raging in this country involves tariffs, which would propose to give to the Executive the entire authority to levy tariffs, to increase them, to decrease them, to abolish them, or to impose them on any segment of the economy. Just as the power to tax is the power to destroy, the power to decide which industry has a tariff and which does not also is the power to compel or to coerce and to destroy.

TARIFF VIEW

Now, I say this as one who believes that our tariff legislation in operation is hopelessly out of date. I say that as one who was appointed to serve as a delegate to the NATO conference in Paris this last year, and served my good friend Lyndon Johnson.

Lyndon came to me and he said, "Karl, we have to have some Republicans among the delegates to the NATO Conference, and as long as I have an appointment, I might as well appoint a black one. How would you like to go?"

So I went. I visited for a long time with the members of the countries who are going into the Common Market. I think it is a wise decision on their part. I think Britain in self-defense is going to be compelled to go in. I think this faces us up to a whole new economic challenge in America.

That far I go along. Where I disagree is the fact that, having confronted this great serious new challenge, we ought to delegate its solution to a group of nameless, faceless individuals over whom you have no control at all.

I would like to do it by empowering the Tariff Commission, which is a branch of the Congress, with additional flexibility and authority, so when the thing goes wrong, you can still hold the people responsible closest to you and look to them for correction.

These are areas, it seems to me, in which highway users should be interested, because a drift or a drive or a tendency to build up this much concentrated power in the hands of people in Washington cannot possibly overlook for long the various particular aspects of freedom in which they are essentially interested. This age-old controversy about which John Adams wrote his wife in 1776 is still with us. It is still being decided.

We are an impatient group of people, sometimes in our impatience to get something done fast, we fail to recognize the damage that we are doing to a formula which has enabled us to get things done enduringly and successfully down through the ages.

THE DIFFERENCE

I think those who wrote the Constitution put it all pretty well in the preamble when they spelled out the eternal underlying difference between our concept of a private economy and individual responsibility and a division of powers between the Central Government and the States. When they wrote out the preamble as a reason for having a Constitution and a government, as justification of the Revolutionary War, as a lodestar toward which to move in this new Republic, along with talking about domestic tranquillity and many other things, they got around to the functions of the Federal state and part of the function of the Federal state, they rightly said, was to provide the common defense. And what is the next statement in the preamble? "In order to provide the common defense, promote the general welfare." Have you ever stopped to reflect how easy it would have been for those fellows at Philadelphia to have said "in order to provide the common defense and the general welfare," just a simple little conjunction, but those meticulous men and those linguistic masters, to whom every syllable meant a sermon in its own, carefully used a different word. The one that will provide is the central state; when it comes to the general welfare, our responsibilities are to promote the conditions, the environment, the opportunities for people and for States to help themselves.

I hope we don't forget the lesson of the preamble to the greatest Constitution ever written.

Cooperative Forestry Research

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the dramatic advances in agricultural technology underscore the importance of Federal leadership in stimulating expanded research. The proposed bill would assure for forestry research comparable recognition and progress. The program would be administered on a cooperative basis with emphasis on the role of land-grant colleges which have constituted a major force in the scientific development of our land and forestry resources. Increasing demands upon wood products by our growing population require proper preservation and efficient utilization of our Nation's forests.

The concern of my State of New York in such matters spans the entire history of the conservation movement. The contribution of Theodore Roosevelt in this field is well known as well as the leadership of our great land-grant college, Cornell University at Ithaca, N.Y.

Especially commendable is the dedicated, capable leadership provided by our distinguished colleague, Clifford G. McIntire, whose close association I enjoyed while serving as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. I wish to congratulate him for his untiring effort in behalf of this bill.

Red Cuba in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of August 6, 1962:

Red Cuba in Trouble

Dictator Fidel Castro's Red tyranny in Havana is making such a desperate mess of things in Cuba that serious and potentially explosive discontent is increasing everywhere throughout that sorely betrayed land. As one result, according to official admission, major acts of sabotage are on the rise and Communist militiamen are being shot down, in ever-growing numbers, by so-called counterrevolutionaries.

The mess is clear enough. The captive Cuban people have not only been robbed of all their fundamental liberties—such as a free press and free elections—but they also have had imposed upon them drastic rationing programs taking food out of their mouths and making it exceedingly hard for them to get things like shoes and clothing. Quite obviously everything has gone from bad to worse since the overthrow of Fulgencio Batista and the subsequent communization of the country as carried out by Fidel and his coconspirators—with the enthusiastic help of Moscow and Peiping.

Havana itself, of course, once gay, once thriving, has become a grim and relatively dead city whose former tourist business (highly profitable) has been quite thoroughly killed off by the Castro dictatorship. As for Cuba's economy as a whole, it has undergone a steady deterioration—to the point of catastrophe—ever since the Communist seizure, confiscation, and "collectivization" of the sugarcane fields and a wide variety of formerly efficient and booming industries (many of them directed by some of our own country's best corporations). These have been so shockingly mismanaged under Fidel that they are in a state of near-chaos.

This is one of the major findings set forth in what appears to be an authentic copy of a special study made for the Castro regime by a group of Communist experts (including some from Czechoslovakia). The study, according to a Cuban exile group in Miami, is not the invention of proagandists seeking to discredit the Havana regime, but is actually the work of Red economists. It is doubly significant for that reason—a Marxist-Leninist document that condemns, in effect, the way Fidel, Ernesto Guevara, and Havana's other bearded comrades are running Cuba's economy.

In any case, the study released by the Miami group leaves no room for doubt that

Castro and his colleagues are caught up in an economic shambles of the first magnitude—a shambles of their own making. As doctrinaire Communists, they have swept away private enterprise and substituted in its place an absolutely disorderly situation resulting primarily from party-line mismanagement of a kind that has led in turn to almost unbelievable stupidities.

So it is that Red Cuba today is in the deepest kind of trouble. The people of the country have been outrageously misled by the insufferably loquacious Fidel. Worse still, they have been dragged and dragooned along a politico-economic road that will lead them to disaster unless somehow, someday, before it is too late, they liberate themselves from the Castro incubus.

Tribute to Edward L. Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, one of Minnesota's distinguished and capable public servants, Edward L. Rogers, county attorney of Cass County, Minn., has been selected as the outstanding county attorney in the Nation. He will be honored by the National County Attorneys Association in Philadelphia on August 15.

A football hero of the early 1900's, Mr. Rogers was captain of the Golden Gophers and kicked the tieing point in the famous Minnesota-Michigan game which began the traditional Little Brown Jug rivalry.

His 46 years of elective office in Cass County attest to the respect he has earned among his fellow citizens. We congratulate them and Mr. Rogers on the national recognition given to his record of conscientious public service.

I ask unanimous consent that a news account of the award which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on August 6 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Attorneys Will Honor Edward L. Rogers

Walker, Minn.—National recognition will come to Edward L. Rogers August 16 in Philadelphia when he is honored by the National County Attorneys Association as the outstanding county attorney in the Nation.

Rogers, 86, has served 46 years as county attorney for Cass County, Minn. He plans to retire next January when his term expires but will continue a private practice here.

Ed Rogers is perhaps best known for his football exploits around the turn of the century when he starred for the famed Carlisle Indians and the University of Minnesota. He succeeded "Pop" Warner as Carlisle coach in 1904 after ending his playing career.

Rogers, son of a Chippewa Indian medicine woman and a Scotch lumber mill operator, went to Walker in 1906 and established a law office.

He ran for county attorney for the first time in 1912 and was elected. He has been reelected regularly since, except for a 4-year period from 1930 to 1934.

Rogers, who still plays a round of golf nearly every day, enjoyed one of his proudest moments in the 1903 football season when he kicked the point that tied Minnesota and Michigan in the game that touched off the traditional "little brown jug" rivalry.

Rogers captained the Gophers that year, and earlier had been captain of the Carlisle team.

Migratory Farmworkers Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the economic and social deprivation which are characteristic of the migratory farmworker's life and work are not a new phenomenon within our affluent society. Of recent origin, however, are the current efforts within the Congress to extend to migratory farmworkers through Federal legislation the benefits and protections long available to other groups of workers generally.

Under the able leadership of the junior Senator from New Jersey, Harrison A. Williams, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, five migratory farmworker bills have come to the House of Representatives with the approval of the full Senate and the Kennedy administration. This accomplishment is highly significant because it represents the first real opportunity for the Congress to enact practical legislation which will bring material improvement not only in the lives of migratory farm families but also the overall economy.

The Senate-passed bills would provide improved educational opportunities for migratory farm children and adults, prohibitions against agricultural child labor, Federal registration of crew leaders, improved health services for migratory farm families, and the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor.

In evaluating the need for this legislation, I would agree with an editorial published by the New York Post on July 19:

> We have an excellent catalog of the scandal in the fields; it is high time we act on our grim knowledge.

With Senate approval and administration support of these bills, the responsibility for their enactment rests solely with the House of Representatives. It is, I believe, a responsibility which we, as enlightened legislators and as representatives of the people, cannot ignore.

Rules have been requested for the four Senate passed migratory labor bills which have been reported to the House by the Committee on Education and Labor. Another bill, the health bill, is pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I would, therefore, urge prompt and favorable committee action on these bills so that we may fulfill some of our responsibility to our migratory farm citizens before adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, because the New York Post editorial is an incisive reminder of our duty in this important area, under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Record at this point:

Children of the Fields

In a recent speech on migrant labor, Senator Harrison Williams said he would not "flog the obvious facts or call forth the usual parade of horribles."

We agree with his restraint. The misery of agricultural labor has been televised, surveyed, charted, and analyzed. We have an excellent catalog of the scandal in the fields; it is high time we act on our grim knowledge.

There are three bills which Williams singled out for comment. Incredible as it may sound in the most advanced society in the world, they are designed to deal with the evils of child labor.

One proposal would give the migrant children a real chance for schooling. Another would provide Federal funds to local school boards facing a seasonal influx of migrant pupils. Both have been passed by the Senate and are up for House consideration.

The third proposal is part of the welfare bill passed by the Senate a few days ago. It would grant day-care facilities to migrant children.

We are almost embarrassed to have to comment on such desperately needed and modest bills. Yet, after the defeat of medicare and other recent congressional antics, one cannot take simple humanity for granted on the Hill. These minimal proposals must be passed and we must proceed on to a more massive assault on the scandal of migrant misery.

Uniform Voting Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Honorable Walter P. Armstrong, Jr., of Memphis, Tenn., has the honor of serving as president of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. It was in this capacity on August 4, 1962, that he announced important action by the conference in approving two proposed uniform State laws concerned with voting. One proposal deals with absentee voting by members of the military service and the other deals with residence requirements for voting in presidential elections.

The disfranchisement of voters merely because they have moved across State lines is an important problem which last year received the attention of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments in its hearings on the Federal elections system. I have the honor to be a cosponsor with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] of a proposed constitutional amendment which would deal with this problem. This is Senate Joint Resolution 128, which was approved by the subcommittee and is now pending before the full Committee on the Judiciary.

Uniform State laws is a different method of dealing with the problem but thus far only eight States have made any effort to handle the matter by State legislation. The action of the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws should add great impetus to the movement for corrective State legislation and I commend them for this step forward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release issued from Monterey, Calif., on August 4, 1962, concerning the action of the conference, be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Walter P. Armstrong, Jr., of Memphis, Tenn., president of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws today announced that yesterday by an overwhelming majority the conference at its meeting in Monterey, approved for submission to the house of delegates of the American Bar Association at its annual meeting in San Francisco next week, the uniform act for voting by new residents in presidental elections and also the Uniform Federal Services Absentee Ballot Act. If approved by the American Bar Association, the proposals will be submitted to State legislatures at their 1963 and 1964 sessions.

The purposes of the Uniform Federal Services Absentee Ballot Act is to simplify and standardize the procedures for absentee voting in all types of elections for members of the Armed Forces of the United States, certain civilian employees of the Federal Government and members of their families.

The uniform act for voting by new residents in presidential elections is the result of several years of efforts by various national organizations to eliminate disenfranchisement in presidential elections of a large number of voters who move from one State to another and who through no fault of their own are not qualified to vote in their new State of residence. After the 1960 presidential election it was estimated that from 5 to 8 million American citizens lost their right to vote due to strict residence requirements in all but a few States. A recent report of the Senate Judiciary Commmittee Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments states in this regard:

"Apart from the possible effects upon election results, this produces apathy and bitterness in such people toward governments which cheat them of their democratic birthright merely because they change their residence."

The uniform act for voting by new residents in presidential elections would eliminate the requirement of a definite period of residence so that new residents will be allowed to vote if they would otherwise be qualified by filing an application to vote in ample time to enable election officials to process the application and to take safeguards against fraudulent and double voting.

The philosophy underlying this proposal is that residence in a State for a reasonable period of time might be essential to enable a voter to pass upon State and local candidates and issues, but that since the President is the representative of the entire Nation, a change of residence from one State to another should not in any way detract from a voter's ability to make a choice for President.

Constitutional amendments to accomplish the objectives of the uniform act for voting by new residents have been introduced in Congress, but such proposals would require the approval of three-fourths of the States.

Only eight States, Wisconsin, Oregon, California, Missouri, Ohio, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Vermont have made any effort to deal with the problem of disenfranchisement of migratory voters in presidential elections.

Louis A. Kohn of Chicago is chairman of the conference committee which prepared both uniform acts, and Judge Harry H. Lugg of Rockville, Conn., is chairman of the subcommittees which prepared the Uniform Federal Services Absentee Ballot Act.

The other members are: John M. Bailey, national chairman, Hartford, Conn., Democrat; John B. Breckinridge, attorney general of Kentucky, Frankfurt, Ky.; Henry S. Fraser, Syracuse, N.Y.; Bernard Hellring, Newark, N.J.; George Longmire, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Senator Fred S. Farr, Carmel, Calif., who presided at the sessions of the conference considering these acts; Commissioner Joseph McKeown, Coos Bay, Oreg., who as chairman of one of the conference sections coordinated the work of the drafting committees.

Mr. Kohn stated: "It is hoped that between now and the 1964 presidential election, all of the States will have adopted laws of the types suggested in order to minimize disenfranchisement of voters. The widespread dissatisfaction with the State laws, which impose strict residence requirements for voting in presidential elections, makes the early enactment of remedial legislation imperative. We believe the uniform act for voting by new residents in presidential elections which is based on years of study and actual experience in a number of States having similar legislation is carefully designed to accomplish this purpose.

"We hope both acts will be well received by the State legislatures to the end that there be assurance to voters in all the States one of the most priceless heritages of a democracy."

Why Am I a Republican?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Margaret Hopkins Worrell, a former national president of the Ladies of GAR and a patriot, has sent me a dissertation entitled "Why Am I a Republican?" She has asked me to place this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it can be made a part of the permanent RECORD and where it can be read and noted by Americans everywhere.

I am glad to respond to this request because I have some fundamental beliefs which are reflected in this article and further I feel the clear thinking of the dynamic action implied and the understanding of the author will serve the public interest by developing the interest in the Government and a better understanding of its objectives under freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know Mr. John Lupton, the author of this dissertation, except by reputation. I believe that reputation to be a good one. In serving his country through his political party he is performing in a manner which would be applauded by the early pioneers and should be applauded by party leaders of both major parties and all who are interested in promoting government at every level. I am glad to have this opportunity to place this item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge all the Members and all subscribers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to read it and think on the important observations made by this keen young American.

WHY AM I A REPUBLICAN?

What things do I believe in? What things lead me to be a Republican?

I believe in the people. All of the people. Not just the little people, or the forgotten people; not the laborer; not the farmer; not the consumer; not the capitalist; not the Negro nor the Jew nor the Old Yankee; not the statistical nonentity of the bureaucrat. I believe in the people. All of the people.

And because I believe in the people I believe in the republican form of government in which all ultimate power is vested in the people, who in turn give to designated officials a limited power to act for them. And I believe, too, that the faith of the people is not to be abused; and the trust of the people is not lightly to be considered; and the heritage of the people is not to be traded, nor, like the property of a bankrupt businessman, sold to the highest bidder.

I believe the people want honesty, integrity, realistic sincerity. I believe the people want to be treated forthrightly, and I believe the people can take the bad along with the good. To treat the people in any other way is stupid. More, it represents a cynical regard for the basis of our whole structure of representative government. It is worship of the consequences rather than of the causes of our freedoms.

I believe, too, in a constitutional government. I believe that such a government has made America strong because it has provided succeeding generations with unmistakable guideposts, and has at the same time established an orderly system of detours when detours became necessary. I believe that our Constitution is not something to be ridiculed, nor ignored. It is not something to be chnaged by legislative default or executive usurpation or judicial fiat.

I believe in all honesty in our capitalistic system. I believe in it because I have seen the greatness of the country which it has helped to produce; because I know that time and time again its strength has been called on to save the free world.

And, finally, I believe that there is a power greater in world history than that of any man, or, of all the people themselves. I believe that no government, no nation, no people can long survive in disregard of that power.

These beliefs I hold. They rest on principles which seem to me to be self-evident. Their implications for me, at least, are clear. As an American I want to held my head high at home and abroad. I want to live in a country ruled ultimately by people who are self-reliant, whose integrity and character have not been vitiated by the blandishments of even the most benignly paternal government, whose futures and the power to shape them remain still primarily in their own hands, who live in harmony at home, who deal honestly abroad, who seek no special favors and make no shoddy deals, and who, most importantly, look unashamedly for guidance to God.

Such an America is in the traditions of its founding. Such an America can face any task before it. Such an American is worthy of the best that we can dream for, work for, and love. Such an America we can achieve.

That is why I call myself—and proudly so—a Republican.

(From a speech delivered by John Mather Lupton, State chairman of the Connecticut Young Republicans, before the Norwalk Woman's Republican Club and the Westport Young Republican Club.)

Myths and Legends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared in the Wednesday, June 13, 1962 edition of the Columbus Citizen-Journal entitled "Myths and Legends." It pierces the mirage of words in the President's Yale address and includes some very good thinking.

I commend this article to the reading of the Members of the House.

MYTHS AND LEGENDS

"Then the gods of the market tumbled, and
their smooth-tongued wizards withdrew,
And the hearts of the meanest were humbled and began to believe it was true
That all is not gold that glitters and two
and two make four—
And the gods of the copybook headings
limped up
To explain it once more."

These lines by the late Rudyard Kipling, deploring the fact that we never learn, come to mind while reading the speech of President Kennedy, Monday at Yale.

He referred to the "cliches of our forebears" which distract us from action. The worlds of Calhoun and Taft, he said, were quite different from this one. Such issues as the disposal of public lands, nullification or union, freedom or slavery, gold or silver "have largely disappeared."

We submit that only the names have changed. The issues are with us yet under such designations as farm relief, desegregation, communism, and inflation. And the fundamental principles which underlie them all have not changed.

No one any longer argues seriously for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. William Jennings Bryan's political fortunes ebbed with boredom over that particular phrasing of the question.

But those who thought they could create money by passing a law as to silver are succeeded by a generation of economic theorists who would pass the same kind of miracles without even the silver.

It is a myth, the President insisted, that Federal deficits create inflation. He should tell that to the Germans who remember when a million marks wouldn't buy a sausage. Or the French, whose 20-cent francs finally were worth two-tenths of a cent. Or the Italians, the Greeks, the Romans or anyone else who ever resorted to the printing press to pay the public bills, as we have in effect been doing off and on for the last generation.

None of these governments, which are still in existence, will try it again, at least not until new generations have had time to forget as in Kipling's words, "the burnt fool's bandaged finger goes wobbling back to the fire."

Sizable budget surpluses after World War II did not prevent inflation, President Kennedy said. These surpluses were minute compared to vast wartime debts. The prewar dollar now buys less than 50 cents' worth.

Persistent deficits for the last several years have not upset our basic price stability, the President continued. Yet prices still are headed up, according to the Government's own figures.

And that, by no means, is all. The mere interest on our $300 billion debt amounts to $9 billion a year, increasing by $30 million or more with each added billion of debt. If we had that $9 billion back it would be enough to cut income taxes 15 percent, or corporation taxes almost in half.

Times have changed, but not that much. Anyone who habitually spends more than his income is headed for trouble, maybe sooner, maybe later. If the President thinks it is different for governments, let him reflect on the experiences of some of the countries mentioned above.

Once it was the royal alchemists who labored to make gold out of base metals. Even here times haven't changed materially. The presidential economists still are at it, substituting paper for lead and charts for cauldrons. The objective still is something for nothing. It is no great credit to Mr. Kennedy that he pays them so much mind.

Northwest Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter by Mr. Alex Radin, having to do with the power supply in the Northwest, which was published in the New York Times for August 4, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRICITY FOR NORTHWEST: HOUSE REJECTION OF PLAN TO USE WASTE STEAM CRITICIZED

TO the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I wish to commend you for your editorial support (July 17) of the proposal by local public agencies in the Pacific Northwest to pay the Federal Government for the privilege of putting waste heat to use to produce electricity at the Atomic Energy Commission's new plutonium-production reactor at Hanford, Wash.

The House's refusal to authorize this arrangement will prove very costly to the Government, which already has an investment of $25 million previously approved by Congress for features which would permit the reactor to produce both plutonium and power. The action of the House was costly because it rejected up to $125 million in revenues to the Federal Treasury from sale of steam; costly because it prevented the Federal Bonneville Power Administration from "firming up" presently unsalable power and thus increasing its income; costly because it put a stamp of approval on the permanent waste of this natural resource.

Neither the private power companies nor the coal industry—both of whom opposed the proposal—would be injured. Private power companies were offered half of the output of the powerplant.

Not a single miner will go back to work as a result of the House action and not a solitary mine would be adversely affected by approval of the plan. The Northwest is dependent upon hydropower for 96 percent of its electricity and no coal is imported for thermal generation. Plans for use of limited local coal resources are complementary, not competitive with the Hanford project, in view of the region's rapidly growing loads.

Testimony by experts indicated that national defense alone would justify the Hanford powerplant. Yet these selfish interests opposed, and the House defeated, a proposal which would have cost the Government nothing, which would have produced revenue for the Government, and which would have given this country the world's largest atomic powerplant—and a striking example of peaceful use of atomic energy.

Your support of this project was based on unassailable logic. It will be tragic if the Nation loses the benefits of this development. I seriously doubt whether any country—even one as wealthy as the United States—can afford the luxury of such profligate waste of its resources.

ALEX RADIN,
General Manager, American Public Power Association.
WASHINGTON, *July 31, 1962.*

Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Rev. E. Warren Rust is pastor of the First Baptist Church of Cleveland, Tenn., and also has the honor of holding the office of president of the Tennessee Baptist Convention.

On July 15, Reverend Rust delivered in his church an important sermon under the title "Prayer, the Bible, and the Public Schools."

This sermon is a thoughtful and persuasive statement in support of the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court concerning the school prayer prescribed by the Board of Regents of the State of New York. This sermon is worthy of the consideration of all who are concerned with this issue, regardless of their viewpoint, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER, THE BIBLE, AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Public indignation, regret, and disgust have been deeply aroused by the recent decision of the highest Court in our land. The Supreme Court ruled that the prayer recommended by the New York Board of Regents for use in the public schools is unconstitutional. The prayer recommended by the board and required by local school boards for use in the public schools reads: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

The prayer was held to be constitutional by the high court of New York State but was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in a 6 to 1 decision. Two of the members of the High Court did not vote on this decision.

The State Board of Regents in New York is a governmental agency created by the constitutional processes of that State. It has broad supervisory, executive and legislative powers over the public school system. In 1951 this board composed the prayer for use in the public schools every morning along with the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States. Under the instructions of the board, the teacher was obligated to conduct this opening exercise, but the pupils participated or refused to participate voluntarily.

The Supreme Court presented a 15-page opinion read by Mr. Justice Black. Mr. Justice Stewart presented a 6-page dissent. On the surface, it seems the Court has laid down a ruling in opposition to prayer. The ruling insists that (1) The regulation of religion or "establishment" of religion by the State is a breach of the vital principle of separation of church and State; (2) composition of prayers by a legislative body is an imposition of religion upon some people who might not want it; (3) the State has no business composing official prayers for any group of American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by the Government.

The pro and con of this decision will be discussed for months and years. It is a tragedy and a bad commentary upon our forebears, our liberties and our religious fundamentals when a right ruling is set in the backdrop of antireligious intentions. While the Court was deciding essentially on the question of composition of prayers directed by an agency of the government, the common understanding and interpretation of the judgment of this Court is that they have ruled it wrong to pray. It is common knowledge that the pressure on this issue was placed by irreligious people. The plaintiffs are from minority groups and atheists who feel that their rights and liberties are being violated by majority pressures and compulsions. Their children were not required to recite the prayer, participation was voluntary. This definite minority group will, no doubt, persist with this encouragement to further use the public school system as a whipping boy for their persistent attack upon religion in our Nation. They seem to be shooting at the tearing down of every form or symbol which would give evidence of the religious roots of our Nation by using the legislative process through our public schools. They have a dedication to eliminate all hymns, poems, religious paintings, and special events, as Christmas, Thanksgiving, and Easter, which have spiritual significance.

This is not the only issue. In Maryland, the court of appeals ruled 4 to 3 that required reading and/or recitation of the Lord's Prayer was constitutional. This case is headed to the Supreme Court. In Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, District of Columbia, and in Virginia, the school officials are struggling over religious practices in the public schools.

Our Nation had deep religious roots. If we understand the intention of the sentences of our Bill of Rights we must understand at least three things: (1) The setting in which they were framed; (2) the men who participated in their construction; (3) the purposes our forebears saw in government relations to the basic institutions of the home, the school, and the church.

These are all a matter of 186 years of history. In the home, the schools and the churches of 1776 the Bible and prayer were conspicuous and experiential. It was never the intention of our forebears to eliminate either prayer or the Bible from the roots of any or all of these institutions. Rather, it seems evident, they intended that they stay and be used.

Through this almost two-century period strange conceptions and ideas have now developed. Some good people feel that the Christian faith should be formally written into our Constitution, a kind of European state-churchism, and some Baptists are buying the idea.

Some would turn Christian citizenship into a quasi-political party, a type of Christion front like the European Roman Catholic political thrusts. Some would organize Protestants against the Roman Catholics, or against the Jews, or against Democrats or against Republicans. Some would organize the church against labor and some against management. "Freedom" tends to be the cry raised against government when it serves the other fellow. Anyone who doesn't see things exactly according to the warped design of some minds is a "Communist."

There are some questions which must be answered, and Baptists must accept their part in bringing forth the answers.

Our Nation has rolled over in our beds of passive response and after 186 years of nominal acceptance that ours is a great religious heritage yet we wake now to try to find out what this heritage means. We must rethink our principles and premises in terms of current revelance. It is like writing some statements hundreds of years ago and letting them grow cold from misuse or no use, and then, reading them back to ourselves, we ask, "What did we mean?" We keep running head on into situations which call to focus our modern dilemma: What is the place of religion in public education, in tax policies, where the church is concerned, the place of our denomination's institutions in relation to government, the role of the Christian in politics, the monopoly of radio and television where religion or irreligion is flashed before millions of homes in America daily—Supreme Court has solved only one dilemma. They have said that government has not right to write prayers and these prayers become a part of the academic setting in our public schools. They have said that government agencies should be out of the business of directing the prayers of American people.

I concur enthusiastically in this decision. The Court could have ruled no other way without doing an injustice to the fundamental concept of our Constitution. When I first heard of this decision, I felt as many others. I got the impression through the press that our highest Court had outlawed prayer. I was fit to be tied. I felt that this was the last straw. I even questioned when it would become unlawful to pray about anything. However, upon further investigation and consideration of the Court ruling, I feel that it is, and will prove to be, a fundamental decision upon which many areas of our religious liberties can be determined. Historically, it reads like a Baptist document out of our yesterdays. It is filled with concepts and history which Baptists of a hundred years would thoroughly concur.

But more questions have to be answered. What is the relationship of this decision to a previous decision (*Everson* v. *Board of Education*) in which the Court ruled it constitutional to transport parochial school children to parochial schools? Is it constitutional to pay part of the bill for private schools to indoctrinate children for the benefit of one religious group and unconstitutional to make prayers to be read in the public schools? Does this ruling mean that no parochial school should ever constitutionally receive tax money? In a neighboring State a judgment was given by their high court that garbed nuns dedicated to just one religious group can teach in the public schools. How can a nonsectarian prayer be out and garbed nuns be in? Is the Government right in outlawing nonsectarian prayer in public schools and at the same time picking up part of the check for parochial school systems across our country which teach a regular religious catechism? Is our constituency going to keep peace with ourselves when we outlaw nonsectarian prayer, the Lord's Prayer, and the reading of the Bible, while many teachers persist in using their classroom for denouncing religious truth? Is it wrong to represent religious truth in our schools and right to denounce them? These seem to be pertinent questions in the light of this recent and right decision.

What is the obligation of the church in these complex matters? The current problem of the church is similar to the family that pulled the old clock from the attic to grace their living room. It had been so long since used that they couldn't find the way to make it run. Therefore, it became only a piece of furniture in the living room. We have written in our past a fundamental concept of relation of the church and the state. but we are having difficulty determining how to apply it.

Baptists have never been institutionalists. We do not stake God's ultimate purpose in one of two institutions. Rather, we have depended on a gospel preached and Christian witness to proclaim that "Christ is the Way, the Truth and the Life." In this preaching of the gospel we have not depended on church to establish a fundamental concept of the mind of Christ. We have not depended on state to establish Christianity. We have tenaciously held to the autonomy of the individual and the priesthood of the believer as basic tenets in the propagation of the Gospel.

We have established institutions for healing, teaching, training, and extending the purposes of the local church, beyond our immediate communities. Yet, because of our understanding of how God deals with men, we have continuously insisted on separation of church and state. But as Baptists, we do not run the Nation. Nor should any other religious group.

In the 186 years since the establishment of this country we have grown, but so has our Nation. And with its growth has come a heterogeneous population. Across this population has come the fundamental concept of separation of church and state and we have made the mistake of allowing others to define our position. We must come to do our own thinking on the current issues of religious liberty. Our forebears did well in their day, but they did not deal with our questions in our day. They stated the answers in general terms. We have suffered more confusion by accepting the instruction of legalistic, non-Baptists, and even, in many instances, non-Christian minds regarding the positions we should hold. It is urgent that we accept our own responsibilities and representations. We need to find ways and means of several things: We need to find ways and means of establishing principles and policies that enable our institutions to be representative of our ideas and commitments. Correlation of policy is so necessary where hospitals, homes for the aged, homes for children, colleges and all other institutions are implicated. Institutional policies as well as the local church policies should represent our commitment to Him who is "the Life."

We need to exchange thought and information between areas where Baptist policy is determined. Various State conventions need to avoid confusing the Nation and the political leadership as to what Baptists mean in the separation of church and state.

We need to educate our own people in the principle that adheres to our faith. The public press and mass media cannot do it. They are limited by compromise of political interests, and political pressures. The promotional efforts of civil liberty organizations can help make us good citizens but hardly good Baptists. We must, in this sense find a process of cultivating civil competence and experience of our people. They have a responsibility for the Christian use of stewardship of influence.

We need to find ways and means of correlating our Christian influence, conviction and witness with other religious groups who advocate and defend this fundamental American and Christian concept.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

1. With regard to prayer in our public schools: The nonsectarian prayer composed by the officials of New York would be no advantage to a Baptist who believes in fashioning his own prayers and saying them from his heart. True prayers are not written or composed by others and read as a ritual. Our Lord gave us the fundamental in prayer when He said, "Ask, and ye shall receive, seek, and ye shall find, knock and the door shall be opened." The Court has not said, "No prayer." It has said that government has no business in composing prayer. Prayer must never be legalistic and ritual. It must be personal and sincere, from the heart. Our children can be taught prayer in our homes and in their churches and can have the example of lives of parents and teachers whose practices of prayer are evidenced in their moral conduct.

2. A Christian constituency can permeate our schools and can undergird public school education by a spirit of prayer for every child, every school administrator, and every teacher. If ours is a Christian Nation, we have a right to assume that every facet of it will be permeated by a spirit of prayer in our homes and in our churches and in the lives of public school personnel.

3. While our schools cannot promote any one church, it is inconceivable that public interest and concern could not be expressed pertaining to administrators and teachers who use their classroom to denounce religion and advocate atheistic ideas and immoral and unchristian conduct and behavior. The same interpretation which says, "Do not advocate or promote" must also be interpreted "do not denounce or oppose."

4. There is no law, or even any suggestion of any law that prohibits the prayer life of the church. Christian people can pray. They can pray anywhere. In Acts, chapter 4, two preachers, Peter and John, were forbidden to preach. The church gathered for prayer. The outcome was a complete dedication of themselves to carry God's message through their testimony and commitment. They prayed with such effectiveness that they brought their personal possessions and laid them down at the feet of the Apostles. They were men of one heart and one mind and one purpose. This is as God would want it.

Three men had a leadership position in the formulation of the Declaration of Independence. Drafted by Thomas Jefferson, a Virginia landowner, and edited by John Adams from Massachusetts, it came to the hands of Benjamin Franklin of Philadelphia. Where Jefferson had written, "We hold these truths to be sacred and undeniable", Franklin has penned out "sacred and undeniable" and wrote in "self-evident". This was the religious consciousness of those who formulated the document around which our Nation was founded. It was self-evident that this Nation's identity was wrapped up in religious truths. We must not chisel the inscription "In God We Trust" from our coins, nor delete "one nation under God, indivisible" from the pledge to our flag. On the contrary we must go back and find those roots and water them and nurture them and cultivate them. It is as true today as it was a long time ago that God waits to find the response of a people upon whom He has laid His hand to influencethis world for Him.

"If My people, which are called by My name, will humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land."

The Farmer's Market Is Worldwide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, we who represent the Midwest in Congress have a great responsibility to agriculture. One of the ablest spokesmen for the farmer is my colleague from Minnesota, Congressman ANCHER NELSEN. On August 6 Mr. NELSEN addressed the silver anniversary of soybean processing at Mankato, Minn., and I believe his remarks on that occasion will be of interest to all Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his speech herewith:

THE FARMER'S MARKET IS WORLDWIDE

Some months ago, when the idea for this meeting began to take shape, I was intrigued with the proposal and delighted that I should be asked to participate. And, as I thought about it, it seemed to me to be a fine opportunity for all of us to talk awhile about the things that bring us together rather than the things that divide us. I've made this special trip from Washington in the midst of much turmoil, political and economic, where the angry heat of a Washington summer and the hot winds of campaign argument sometimes warp the judgments of the sanest man.

So in this atmosphere of southern Minnesota perhaps we can look at some of these matters with more objectivity, as we join in celebrating the silver anniversary of an industry which was nothing 30 years ago, and which now represents America's fifth biggest cash crop—a billion dollar soybean product with its countless ramifications in farm income, in industrial employment and in foreign trade.

I come to you, therefore, knowing that though we may differ sharply on matters which are close to us, we have a number of substantial common interests. Suppose, for my text, I recite some of these common interests:

First. I'm certain that I shall have no argument when I say that every person in this room is interested in a prosperous and successful agriculture.

Second. I am equally certain that every one of us accepts the fact that foreign trade is of vital importance to us all.

Third. There can be no argument, I know, that every one of us is for a strong, healthy, peaceful America.

And finally—you can argue this one with me if you like, but I offer it regardless—every last one of us is interested in his own personal well-being.

Now, suppose we take each of these points and look at the facts. First, that we agree we want a prosperous agriculture. Sometimes, I suppose, it doesn't look that way as we quarrel about how to achieve it, but I think it's fair to say that as you look back over the years, there has never been any program dealing with agriculture that has stabilized in any one pattern long enough to establish its worth as far as achievements are concerned. You don't have to dig very deeply into the record of farm programs for 30 years or more to find a bewildering maze of actions which range from plowing under corn to crusading for big production for war, to bemoaning the billion dollar surplus stocks of wheat.

And you don't have to dig very deep to find puzzlement in shifting proposals of high supports, low supports, flexible supports; of controlled production and freedom; of penalties and incentives.

And right on the surface are the obvious facts of political parties and farm organizations alike fighting perennial contests to prove that you're wrong and I'm right; of Farm Bureau with one story, Farmers Union with another, and the Grange frequently in the middle. Pity the poor city Congressman who tries to referee between these arguments, while he seeks to protect his consumers; while we who represent the farmers watch with constant concern as we strive for badly needed increases in farm income.

I do not propose to add to the turmoil in this discussion, because I am hopeful that we are getting a farm program at least for next year which will be good for most of us. That is, we may get an acceptable program, although the maneuvers between Senate and House the last week or two leave plenty of room for doubt. The feed grain bill of last year had many desirable features, actually very much like the bill which I and some of my Midwest colleagues introduced in the previous session. I, however, did not like the feature of the bill which was designed to interfere with the free marketing of grain. I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture should have power to dump grain on the market at will, at prices of his choosing, setting aside normal marketing procedures to the injury of private trade and farmers alike. Similarly, I support extension of the law for the next year—a matter still pending between the two Houses—in the hope that sooner or later we could get earnestly to work on a long-range program.

I'd like to talk a little about my view of such a long-range program, but first it might be well to review briefly a few of the factors which have made this year's debate so involved.

In the first place, in considering the proposals presented by the administration, let's recall that Secretaries of Agriculture for many years had the right under the law to include corn in a controlled program. And yet, whether the Secretary was Henry Wallace or Claude Wickard or Clinton Anderson or Charles Brannan or Ezra Benson, never did he at any time submit corn and feed grains to a program of controls, and you must admit that this was indeed a diverse series of Secretaries of Agriculture.

So when the GTA Digest said as long ago as last February that "This may be too much for Congress to swallow in one gulp—it may even be more than farmers are ready right now to approve at the ballot boxes," it was, to say the least, prophetic. Because not only did Members of Congress find it impossible to swallow, but my mail and the mail of every Member with whom I talked ran tremendously against the compulsions of the program. And I want to tell you with all honesty that Farmers Union members showed very little more interest in the proposals than did their Farm Bureau friends down the road.

So by May of this year the GTA Digest was able to say, without shedding a visible tear, that the alternative is continuation of this year's program, and added simply, "It makes good sense."

Statements like this could be made because we farmers are, at least in small measure, learning to curtail production, and to make some adjustment to the realities of life. And we are demonstrating that we can do it if we are handed a workable combination of incentives and supports which we can buy of our own free will.

Perhaps the lessons of deals which developed when the House considered the administration bill should not quickly be forgotten. When it came before us after months of deliberation in committee, and when its sponsors accepted amendment after amendment simply to garner votes, the product was a measure which bore little resemblance to the bill they started with. Areas that were considered feed grain deficit areas were granted exemption from strict compliance features; producers having 40 acres or less of feed grain base were granted special treatment; then, to top it all off came the cynical offer to permit cottongrowers to plant feed grain when a cotton crop failed. When we were all through it was evident that some 13 Midwest States would bear the brunt of reduction in production, along with a phasing out of payments for retired acres.

Not only was it evident that the result would be discrimination against farmers of this area, but it would not produce the desired result in the way of a farm program. It seems to me that total participation as well as cross compliance are essential for an effective program.

At the same time we all know that as far as wheat is concerned, the United States is the only country in the world which is curtailing its production. We know, too, that it is Hard Winter wheat which is responsible for virtually all of the surplus, that most of the Government holdings are less than the best in quality, and that yields in recent years have increased sharply due to better varieties and methods. It, of course, was demonstrated sharply in the feed grains last year—and undoubtedly will this year—when fertilizer sales jumped upward to offset in some degree the decline in acreage.

What I've been trying to say is that your chances of being right when you attempt to draft farm legislation are next to nothing—at least, in the minds of some of our friends. If my friend Bill over here thinks I'm right, then the chances are my friend Tom over there will violently disagree. So I suggest, among other things, a bit of patience by all of us.

So with all that, I propose that the following be the basic ingredients of a farm program which I believe will work, which will be acceptable, and which will be good for the Nation, and which I would hope would be necessary only so long as we do not have the markets for the tremendous production and handling capabilities of American agriculture:

First. All farmers participate in a land retirement program. If a farmer refuses to take land out on a voluntary basis, he forfeits any and all payments and supports that come from the Federal Government.

Second. In dealing with land retirement we have in mind that each farm has individual characteristics adapted to different types of family-farm operation and that instead of dealing with separate commodities as we now are doing, we deal with total cultivated acres on each individual farm, requiring a certain percentage of reduction.

Third. The payment could be a modest one per acre if the farmer wishes to receive cash, and if the farmer operates a livestock farm where all of his feed is used on the farm, make a liberal payment out of surplus feed to replace the feed that he would have raised on his own acres. The requirement in this case would, of course, be that these commodities be not thrown back into the competitive market.

Fourth. Supports should be adjustable to meet requirements either of surplus or of deficit. I am sure we have all seen examples of supports set at such a level that surplus results; on the other hand, low supports can reduce surpluses but sharply reduce farm income as well. But an adjustable system without a vast army of policemen to enforce it should certainly be possible. You would have the wholesome attitude of voluntary participation which could be stimulated tremendously under a tillable acre approach. It would provide some flexibility of operation that could accommodate the individual characteristics of every farm in the country.

Fifth. Commodity Credit surpluses should not be dumped as permitted under the present program. We should revert to the previous level at 105 percent of supports—higher would be better.

Sixth. I recommend an on-the-farm storage program, liberalized over the present procedure and made more acceptable, reducing the redtape involved, where the farmer by signing proper agreements with the local ASC committee would build storage on the farm which could be amortized out of storage fees. This facility when fully amortized by fees collected becomes the property of the farmer but would be available for surplus grain on the farm at no cost to the Government. This could be a long-range program that would not violently disrupt commercial facilities but would progressively move toward a proper location of the stored grain; right on the farm where in many cases the farmer would buy it back at a later date. I have no objections to a reasonable commercial storage participation, but we have seen the extremes come about which is not good even for the grain trade.

Part of the acceptable and essential business of assuring a prosperous agriculture is undoubtedly a good system of farmer cooperatives. I don't suppose there is really any difference of opinion here, although the argument waxes heavy on equality, on taxes, on allegations of competitive advantage. I can recall that in my days in the Minnesota Legislature we did many things to encourage marketing cooperatives as part of the continuing task of assuring the farmer adequate access to markets and some measure of control over his markets.

I think most of us can agree that there is room in our great economy for both the cooperative method and private industry; that competition between them must be fair; that the middle ground requires that there be no monopoly on either side. It is out of this philosophy, of course, that the battle has been waged over the taxation of cooperatives, and out of it has come a proposal which would tax cooperative dividends—wholly satisfying neither side and therefore a compromise which is rather typical of the legislative process.

You will recall, of course, that President Kennedy has urged such a tax. He said in his tax message last year:

"Contrary to the intention of Congress substantial income from certain cooperative enterprises, reflecting business operations, is not being taxed either to the cooperative organization itself or its members. This situation must be corrected in a manner that is fair and just to both the cooperatives and competing businesses."

Of course, here too we remain in a state of uncertainty, because the proposed tax on cooperative dividends has become an incidental item in a protracted argument over the general tax bill—a bill which has already suffered defeat of withholding on dividends and interest, a bill which is getting extensive argument in the Senate while we wait to see what the President is going to ask for in the way of tax reductions—a bill which could yet wind up in the wastebasket. Whatever happens, it is apparent that if a tax bill is enacted, it will include a revision of the tax treatment of cooperatives.

I want to discuss foreign trade in a minute, but first a comment or two about this amazing soybean industry which we are celebrating tonight. When you stop to think of it, it's as glamorous as any other of the new ventures which spring up, whether it be television or space flight or whatever. Because here is a billion-dollar product which has sprung up in a quarter of a century, and which is a tremendous item in our foreign trade. We supply 75 percent of the soybean, soy oil, and cotton oil in world trade, so it is certainly a mighty factor. And I understand that 40 percent of the product of this Honeymead plant in Mankato goes abroad.

I voted for the Trade Extension Act a few weeks ago, but I did so with some hesitation because I am not at all sure that the United States will do such a good job of trading abroad that our farmers won't be left holding the sack. GTA Digest, for example, said just 5 months ago, with reference to negotiations of the last year and a half with Common Market countries, that "U.S. agriculture came out on the short end of the stick."

Yet, we have no choice but to gamble that we'll come out all right. Because, after all, one-fourth of our agricultural products are exported; American farmers have a market in Western Europe of nearly $3 billion—wheat, soybeans, and soy oil, dairy products, meats, cotton, and many other products; during the past decade Japan has bought more of our farm products than any other country; last year alone, for example, Japan bought $100 million worth of soybeans from the United States.

So we must protect what we have, develop marketing and trading arrangements with these good customers of ours, bargain to the best of our ability so that we don't run into the equivalent of a customs union in the Common Market which could shut us out. We must get our production and our costs in such shape that we can deal, and work toward a selling job that will give us an expanding market rather than one that might well decline.

The choices are not easy. We could develop domestic programs designed to achieve a higher unit price for our farm products, by curtailing production, and in the process flirt with the possibility of losing foreign markets because we would be unable to compete. Or we can let costs and prices drop for competitive purposes, making it easier to sell abroad, but endangering the income of our farmers—which certainly none of us want to do. Let's hope the happy medium will be our answer.

But let's not forget that virtually every other country in the world, from our Canadian neighbor to the primitive farms of Asia, is expanding production and encouraging farmers to raise more, while we alone are fighting to cut back. Let's not forget that some of our best friends are free to sell vast quantities of wheat to Red China—a market which we cannot touch. Let's keep in mind, too, that the loss of our foreign markets for farm products could cut our farm income by 40 percent and be disastrous to our entire economy.

So the great international game is full of hazards, aggravated, I must confess, by our domestic tendency to be careless with our own monetary policies, to be always willing to give until it hurts—and too often until it hurts us—and affected by the fact, which we must never forget, that every last one of these nations is developing its plans for their own sake, just as we must never forget our own interest.

And our own interest demands that we step up our own selling abroad, particularly of our agricultural products, in spite of the handicaps which confront us. Food for Peace, through Government channels, is most helpful in disposing of some of our surpluses, but if we leave it to Government to function for us in the world market, we are courting disaster. Here is indeed a selling job such as some of you in this room are familiar with and doing well at. But let's pool all the best brains in all branches of marketing so that we can bring out the best ideas for the good of all, so that we can really dig into our surplus problem, so that we can make our food and our influence felt with the needy of the world.

I want to add another point: I said earlier that we might find ourselves out-traded in the quest for markets under trade agreements. I suggest that those in positions of power whose responsibility the negotiations will be, make full use of the skills and the knowledge of men in the business of marketing so that we can really progress.

This leads me to my last two points which are not too unrelated. Certainly I know we all agree that our great nation must be strong—economically, spiritually, militarily—yet peaceful in our aims and determined to prove our honorable intentions even to those who suspect us. To be these things, our agriculture must be healthy, our industry must be successful, our economic and fiscal structure in such fine shape that we can hold our heads high and serve both ourselves and the world. Therein lies our self-interest.

And similarly, I do not believe we need to be ashamed of the fact that every last one of us, as individuals, as companies, as organizations, are devoted to our own interest. We want success, we want progress for ourselves, whatever our occupation. Our problem always is to make that self-interest a mutual one in that we allow ourselves the luxury of believing that the other fellow has rights too; that it is possible to work together for the common goals which I have enumerated, while defending our own rights and positions.

I found in my tour of duty as head of the REA that it is possible by patience and reason, by convincing people that each point of view is deserving of consideration, that partnership is possible even between competitors. Despite the antagonisms, I found that utilities, REA cooperatives, municipalities, public-power groups could be brought together if an atmosphere of confidence could be developed, if it became possible to convince men that reason should prevail. We found it possible to provide the people with service, to reduce power costs, to reduce the burden on Government. I must confess, however, that this atmosphere could be developed only if those in positions of power were willing to be the umpires rather than the dictators.

So my plea tonight is that we think in terms of developing an atmosphere and an attitude of confidence, based on these things which we all are for, so that we can sit around together and consider how best to improve America, how best to assure that we perform wisely and well in the world in which we must lead, how best to serve agriculture in which we all are interested, and how best to reduce some of the suspicions and animosities which make progress so difficult.

This atmosphere of teamwork and dedication to common goals will put us in the position to meet the challenge which should be facing American agriculture today—that of finding and selling the markets to feed the hungry people in other nations of the world. The result then has to be a strong, prosperous agriculture in a greater, more prosperous America.

Ins and Outs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is great concern among those who live by grace of the New Frontier to assure that they are always on the right—or perhaps I should say correct—side of the line that marks the New Frontier ins and outs. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has done great service for those who must watch their step along these lines by devoting a part of his August 2 newsletter to an in-and-out guide of the New Frontier. The New York Herald Tribune, having learned the importance of knowing the ins and outs of the New Frontier, reprinted the gentleman's sage advice and, since those most interested in staying on the "in" side might not be on the gentleman's mailing list or might not be readers of the Herald Tribune, I am placing this handy guide in the RECORD to help separate the ins and outs.

THE INS AND OUTS OF THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.)

(This is the newsletter sent to his constituents today by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of Morristown, N.J.)

On the New Frontier you are either in or out.

Some of the people who are in are Robert Frost, Pablo Casals, and Harry Truman. Roger Blough was out but he is now in. Senator SMATHERS was in but he may now be out. Bobby is so in he is way out. Teddy will soon be in, they hope.

Pool parties in Bobby's backyard are in, as are many of the guests. Harvard professors are in. Princeton professors are out. MIT, Minnesota, and Dartmouth are in. Rutgers, Columbia, Purdue, and Cornell are out.

Twisting on the New Frontier is obviously in, the mashed potato is out. Antiques are in, modern out.

Everyone thinks the ADA is in but it is really out. Needless to say, the AMA is out.

The white tie is out. At the Justice Department shirtsleeves are in.

Talk about the stock market is out. Africa is in. Spain is out. So are France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Peru. Italy is in. Chiang Kai-shek is so far out that he is in. The United Nations is in.

Chester Bowles was in. Now he is out.

Testifying before congressional committees is out.

Pat Brown thinks he is in. Secretary Freeman has a feeling he is out.

It is in to refer to the New Frontier hospitalization bill as medicare. No one knows yet whether a tax cut is in or out. It is out to watch the "Ev and Charlie Show." It is in to make fun of it.

The Washington Post is so far in that it is almost out. The New York Herald Tribune is coming back in. To be mentioned in Reston's column is in but the New York Times may be on the way out.

Senators who want to be in are out. Only their votes are in. Southern Democrats are in. Doris Fleeson is out. Roscoe Drummond doesn't care whether he is in or out, so he is in.

Drew Pearson is out. But a Drew Pearson column is in.

Membership in the Metropolitan Club is out. The Capitol Hill Club can never be in. Neither can Richard Nixon, Barry Goldwater, or Nelson Rockefeller.

To be seen with one of the astronauts is in. Traveling with J.F.K. on the Presidential plane the *Caroline*, is in. It is better than a junket.

Nehru is in. Souvanna Phouma is in. So are two-button suits.

Touch football is going out but Bobby hasn't been told yet. Water skiing is in, for the summer. Golf is an enigma.

LYNDON JOHNSON is out. He always was. Texas is out.

Billie Sol almost got in. Now even mention of him is out.

Remarking that the New Deal was grand is out.

The phrase "one term" is out. Because of Adlai Stevenson, New York is out.

Newport, Hyannis Port, Squaw Island, and Palm Beach are in. Glen Ora is going out fast. Pecos, Newark, and Gettysburg are out.

The fireside chat is out. The press conference is in. Reporters are in. Publishers are out. No exceptions.

Television is out, except when J.F.K. is on.

Sinatra is out for all time. Peter Lawford took care of that. Morton Downey may be taking his place.

Among Republicans it is fashionable to be out. Among Democrats it is fatal, unless they live south of the Mason-Dixon line.

Superpatriots are out.

Congress is out.

The watchword: Sophistication.

(With apologies to "The In and the Out Book," Viking, 1959, which you should read. If it is not in, it ought to be.)

Susquehanna River in Pittston Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, a historian of my congressional district, has written a very interesting and informative series of articles on the early history of the Susquehanna River, especially in the Pittston area. This series has been appearing each week in the Pittston Sunday Dispatch and as part of my remarks today I include the latest installment of last Sunday, August 5, 1962.

The article follows:

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN PITTSTON REGION—FLOODS, ICE GORGES HIT REGION MANY TIMES; ONE PULLED DOWN THREE BRIDGES

(By Charles A. McCarthy)

Because of its topography, Pittston has generally been spared from the devastating aftermath of floods which ravaged the Susquehanna River since the earliest days of the settlement.

Constructed on high ground, Pittston has never suffered the tremendous property damage and loss of lives which other less fortunate communities have had to endure.

There have been instances of inconvenience in the lives of some Pittstonians, such as the period following the flood which occurred on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1875, when the three Pittston bridges were swept away: the Lackawanna and Bloomsburg Railroad bridge (D.L. & W.) at Pittston Junction; and the Ferry and Water Street bridges in Pittston.

Generally speaking, the city's losses in flood times have been rather slim as compared to neighboring areas.

West Pittston Borough suffered from several of the inundations on the Susquehanna River. A large segment of Duryea Borough was damaged by the roaring waters of the Lackawanna River in June 1942, and after the Hurricane Diane in 1955.

Among the more important flood or high-water conditions which occurred in this section of Wyoming Valley were: February 25, 1772; 1783, a very high flood after a most severe winter inundated the entire valley causing inhabitants to flee to the mountains, from which point many watched as their homesteads were washed away; March 15, 1784, when 15 buildings in Pittston were swept away in an ice flood which buried inhabitants in their homes; October 5, 1786, the Great Pumpkin Flood.

PUMPKIN FLOOD

The pumpkin flood of 1786 was one of the Susquehanna River's rarest sights. Freshets caused an overflow to lowlands where farmers had planted pumpkins. Thousands of these were carried off by the rushing waters, which rose 6 feet in 24 hours. Accredited reports state the river was covered from bank to bank with pumpkins.

The Blanchard cabin, erected prior to the Revolutionary War by Jeremiah Blanchard, at the present site of 1650 River Road, in the Port Blanchard section of Jenkins Township, was washed down the river to Monockonock Island during the flood.

Later, the Blanchard cabin was retrieved and was removed to its original site where it was used as a dwelling for a short period, being later owned by John and Sarah Blanchard.

KILLED BY INDIAN

In its early days, the Blanchard cabin was occupied by an elderly couple, relatives of the Blanchards. They befriended a young Indian boy by taking him in to live with them. Later, he killed them both.

Floods also occurred on April 1807, May 14, 1833, and March 13, 1846.

CARRIES AWAY BRIDGES

The 1846 flood was a great and disasterous one. It carried away bridges constructed over the river, below Pittston.

In September 1860 there was a destructive flood, caused by continual heavy rains in the early portion of the month, which accounted for loss of lives and much property damage, in many parts of Wyoming Valley.

In the spring of 1861, occurred the highest ice flood in 50 years. It caused immense damage.

On St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1865, occurred the greatest flood to ravage this region up to that time. Places presumed to be safe for refuge were inundated. Other floods occurred on May 10, 1867, and on May 10, 1869.

The flood of St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1875, which resulted when an ice gorge at Ransom gave way, is reported to have caused the highest recording ever reached at the river-measuring station, 35.6 feet.

SUDDEN AND SEVERE

The 1875 flood was as sudden as it was severe. Coxton Yards of the Lehigh Valley Railroad, and the adjacent village, were completely covered with ice. Over 500 railroad cars in Coxton Yards had to be dug out by pick and axe. The Lackawanna and Bloomsburg Railroad bridge at Pittston Junction was lifted from its moorings and carried downstream.

When the wreckage of the railroad bridge hit the Ferry Bridge it lifted it from its piers as a tenpin is bowled over by the pin in front of it. The double amount of wreckage traveled down the turbulent stream where it folded under the Water Street Bridge which it lifted from its piers. The wreckage of the three bridges was later found on the riverbank, 3 miles north of Wilkes-Barre.

All that remained of the Water Street Bridge after the storm was one span on the east side of the bridge and the pier which supported it.

DESCRIBES IT

In recalling the 1875 flood an oldtimer said: "The ice broke up with a noise resembling the roar of artillery. Huge pieces of ice rose high above the riverbank. Yet, as destructive and terrible as it was, the sight was as grand as it was terrible." Not in the memory of the oldest inhabitant had such an appalling sight occurred. Communication between Pittston and the west side of the river was maintained by steamers, flats, and rowboats. There was lively competition for this business, with the fare charged being 10 cents each way.

On April 1, the traditional moving day, some residents moved their belongings across the river on the ice.

Additional floods took place on January 24, 1891, and on March 11, 1893, when an ice blockade occurred.

In the flood of 1893, West Pittston suffered much damage. Susquehanna Avenue was flooded from York Avenue to Montgomery Avenue. Huge cakes of ice were carried as far as Wyoming Avenue. Fifteen minutes after the ice blockade had broken, the water began to recede. In 1 hour the water was 3 feet below the top of the river bank.

LIKE ESKIMO VILLAGE

During this period West Pittston looked like an Eskimo village. Susquehanna Avenue was filled with huge cakes of ice, and the region from York Avenue to Exeter Avenue was completely blocked. The Eagle Hose Co. steamer, was pressed into service pumping water out of the cellers along Susquehanna Avenue where the water reached even to the first floor of some homes. The town was in darkness, as the electric wires had been broken by the heavy ice and sleet. It is stated that in West Pittston this flood reached a point 1 inch higher than the flood of 1865 and 6 inches higher than the 1875 flood.

An ice gorge took place on March 3, 1895, a flood on April 1, 1896, an ice gorge on January 7, 1899, an ice gorge on December 15, 1901, and a flood on March 2, 1902.

On March 9, 1904, West Pittston again was hit by flood waters. It is reported the water reached as far as Linden Street, and caused grave concern to the inhabitants. Many regarded this as the biggest flood in the borough's history, up to that time.

Other floods took place on March 3, 1910, March 28, 1913, March 29, 1914, March 1916, and in the spring of 1920. In addition floods were reported in October 1927, April 1929, July 1935, and on Saint Patrick's Day, March 17, 1936.

The 1936 flood inundated anthracite mines in this region throwing several thousand men out of work. The State administration, under Gov. George H. Earle, was prompt in sending in pumps to dewater the mines.

The Pacific Northwest Regional Power Preference Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a telegram and a letter from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. The regional power preference like that proposed in H.R. 11264 and H.R. 11265, threatens to cut off Federal power vitally needed to pump water to large water-deficient areas in the Western States. Southern California now depends on power from Hoover and Parker Dams to supply water for domestic irrigation and industrial uses. The water needs of 8 million people in southern California are served by the Metropolitan Water District. The district pays $7 million a year for Federal power to pump Colorado River water over the mountains and into the southern California coastal plain.

Our population, increasing at the rate of 1,500 a day, needs water which can be made available by using Federal power from the Colorado River project, from the California Central Valley project, and from the Columbia River projects. The Northwest regional power preference bill, as well as the amendments proposed by Senator GOLDWATER and Congressman GUBSER, would isolate southern California from all Federal power. Therefore, the Metropolitan Water District in a telegram and a letter sent to the California Senators, Senators ENGLE and KUCHEL, and to Members of the congressional delegation from southern California, has urged us on behalf of the board of directors of the district to assist to our utmost in defeating this proposed legislation. I have responded to their call and pledged to do everything in my power to carry out the wishes of this great public agency and the millions they serve and we represent in Congress. The telegram and letter are as follows:

METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT,
July 25, 1962.

Hon. JAMES B. UTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully wish to inform you board of directors of Metropolitan Water District of Southern California went on record yesterday in opposition to S. 3153, H.R. 11264 and H.R. 11265, the Pacific Northwest regional power preference bills. Board is deeply concerned that such legislation would establish precedent which could result in eventual loss of hydroelectric power to district from Colorado River facilities such as Hoover Dam and from other facilities to be built on the Colorado River and in other areas. This power urgently needed to pump water over Tehachapis from northern and central California to MWD areas in southern California. Hoover energy alone helps pump 1 billion gallons a day of supplemental water for 8 million people within district's boundaries on southern California coastal plain. Strongly urge you exert every effort to prevent passage of this proposed legislation.

JOSEPH JENSEN,
Chairman, Board of Directors, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 30, 1962.

Hon. JAMES B. UTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UTT: You will perhaps remember that we sent you a telegram on July 25 informing you that the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California had gone on record opposing S. 3153 and H.R. 11264 and H.R. 11265, the Pacific Northwest regional power preference bills. The purpose of this letter is to explain more fully the reason why the board took this stand.

It seems to come as a surprise to most people to learn how great an amount of electrical power the Metropolitan Water District requires to transport water from the

Colorado River to the coastal plain of southern California. The amount is simply enormous—enough to meet all the needs of a city the size of Pittsburgh, Pa. Our expenditures for electrical energy are currently running to approximately $7 million a year.

We obtain this power from several sources. We buy 36 percent of all the power generated at Hoover Dam; our contract with the Federal Government to purchase this energy whether we used it or not was a key element in assuring the construction of Hoover. We also have the right to, and are using, one-half of the power generated at Parker Dam on the Colorado River, 150 miles below Hoover; Parker Dam was constructed by the Federal Government with funds provided by the Metropolitan Water District. Finally, because there is not enough energy available to use from these two Federal facilities to serve our needs, we buy power from the Southern California Edison Co.

Now then, as you know, we have contracted with the State of California to purchase 1,500,000 acre-feet of so-called Feather River water. This is roughly 25 percent greater than the quantity we are now getting from the Colorado. This Feather River supply will have to be boosted a total height of more than 3,000 feet to surmount the Tehachapis. What we pay for this water—and, in any even, the cost will be high—will be determined to a large degree by the cost of the power for these pumps.

At first glance, it might seem, therefore, that we should favor the idea underlying these bills of bringing relatively cheap Federal hydroelectric power from the Pacific Northwest where it is presently in surplus to areas such as California and that we should perhaps be willing to take a chance on how long it might remain in surplus.

To our view, however, this no longer is the pivotal consideration, if it ever was. All our information from Washington, D.C., indicates that many, if not all, of the areas of origin of Federal hydroelectric power will be seeking amendments to this proposed legislation giving regional preference to their utilities, private as well as public, over contractors located outside that region. You are aware, of course, that virtually no hydroelectric energy—which is much less expensive than that derived from other sources—is generated in southern California.

We, therefore, believe that these bills endanger our present supply of power from at least Hoover Dam and jeopardize our hopes for a share of the energy to be produced at Glen Canyon Dam even though hydrologically the pumping plants for our aqueduct are within the Colorado River Basin. We believe further that their passage could result in restricting or oven cutting off entirely Federal hydroelectric power generated in central and northern California and needed to pump water through the State aqueduct to southern California.

It is conceded that these strong possibilities we are pointing out would lie some years away. However, in planning and building and keeping in operation a water supply system such as our Colorado River aqueduct and the State's California aqueduct, we must always be looking far, far ahead and making the most accurate assessment we can of future risks. Forty years passed, for example, between the time of the first field studies for the Colorado River aqueduct and the day it was in operation to its full designed capacity. Upon examining this proposed regional preference legislation from this standpoint, we are convinced that it is sharply adverse to the long-range welfare of the people of the Metropolitan Water District. It would, to our mind, set a precedent that could cost our taxpayers and water users very heavily in years ahead.

I write this letter at the direction of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District and, in so doing, I again urge you, on behalf of the board, to assist to your utmost in defeating this proposed legislation.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH JENSEN, *Chairman.*

A Proposed Constitutional Amendment To Restore the True Intention of the Framers of the Bill of Rights Regarding the Establishment of a State Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution that is designed to restore to the Constitution the true intention of the framers of the Bill of Rights with regard to the establishment of a state religion. This proposed amendment would be completely unnecessary if the Supreme Court had only adhered to the philosophy of the Founding Fathers, instead of being beguiled and confused by slogans such as "a wall of separation between church and state."

Nothing could have been further from the minds of the godly statesmen of the 18th century than the setting up of a godless state, and I am sure that they would be horrified and scandalized if they could see how grossly their intentions have been twisted in recent years. Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, the Protestant Episcopal bishop of California, has discerningly said that the actual effect of the Court's decision in the New York State regent's prayer case was to establish a state religion, "namely, that of secularism." His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman has asserted:

> The Supreme Court's decision to declare unconstitutional a simple and voluntary expression of dependence on God by our public school children is a tragic misreading of the prayerfully weighed words of our Founding Fathers, and strikes at the very heart of the godly tradition in which America's children have for so long been nurtured.

Now can the recent Court decision be reconciled with the language of article III of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 which stated:

> Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

This was drafted at the same time that our Founding Fathers were gathered in Philadelphia and, in fact, represented a statutory bill of rights for residents of the Northwest Territory of the United States.

When practically every other provision of the Constitution is being interpreted "liberally" by the Court with the result that many of our freedoms are being turned into licenses, the one provision that is receiving a rigid and stultifying interpretation "according to the letter" is that relating to the freedom of religion. The epistle to the Corinthians in which it was said "not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, and the spirit giveth life" is still sound today and is the basis of a canon of constitutional construction that certainly should be applied to the first amendment—that each clause of the Constitution must be construed according to the spirit of the entire document.

If the Constitution prohibits the Congress from establishing a state religion—and properly so—by what right and authority does the Court now do so, as Cardinal Spellman and Bishop Pike have suggested? In setting a precedent by which future courts may bar any mention of the Almighty from our public schools and facilities, the Court is, in effects, establishing a state religion, for secularism is a creed espousing material and temporal values.

Mr. Speaker, my proposed amendment simply reaffirms and strengthens the original meaning of the first amendment in language that will clearly guide any present or future Court. This is precisely the reason why my resolution is designed specifically to amend the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to read as follows:

> Congress may not make any law establishing secularism or any religious denomination or sect, or prohibiting the free exercise of religion; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

By eliminating the broad phrase "respecting the establishment of religion" my proposed amendment more clearly gives effect to the intention of the Founding Fathers to prohibit the establishment of a state church, while at the same time permitting the Congress to implement that intention by legislation should the need to do so ever arise. This the Congress could not do if the phrase were given a literal construction, because any law on the subject could be construed as a law "respecting the establishment of a religion."

Just as I deplore those who would destroy the Supreme Court because of this decision, so, too, do I hold no brief for those who regard the proposal of a constitutional amendment as a disparagement of the Court. In establishing the system of checks and balances our Founding Fathers saw clearly the need for orderly public veto over the judicial as well as the legislative and executive branches. To completely isolate one from the pulse of society would be to destroy the delicate balance of that system.

Yet, I do not offer my amendment in order to override the recent decision in the New York State regents prayer case alone. Rather, I do so because I fear the future judicial pronouncements emanating from it. Under similar misinterpretations of the intent of the first amendment's establishment clause, I fear for the future legality of such traditions as baccalaureate services in public schools and tax exemption for religious properties.

Indeed, I fear for the very survival of the spiritual and moral values which set our and other nations so far apart from the sterile materialism of our Communist enemies. While our Constitution properly forbids the promotion of any one form of worship, it likewise was never meant to preside over the decline of religion, for as Moses warned the people of Israel in the ancient Book of Deuteronomy:

> Beware lest you say in your heart my power and the might of my hand hath gotten me this wealth. And if you forget the Lord your God I solemnly warn you this day that you shall surely perish. Like the nations that the Lord made to perish before you, you shall surely perish.—Deuteronomy 8: 11-20.

New Haven Railroad's First Half Deficit Was Smaller Than in 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, it has been a year since the New Haven Railroad went into bankruptcy and its operations were assigned to a three-man board of trustees. The fate of this key facility serving such a highly industrialized, urban, and suburban section of the country, is being watched by all of us who are seeking answers to the problems of mass transportation.

The Federal Government is deeply involved in the affairs of the New Haven, as the guarantor of millions of dollars of loans authorized for the railroad.

It is with great gratification that we read the trustees' latest financial report in which they indicate that further borrowings under this Federal authority may not be needed.

The trustees, Mr. Richard J. Smith, Mr. William J. Kirk, and Mr. Harry W. Dorigan, are to be commended for their excellent administration. I know every Member will be pleased at the signs of hope they offer for the future of the railroad and will wish them continued success.

So that all Members may see the details of this success, I submit the following account of their achievement which appeared in the Wall Street Journal:

New Haven Railroad's First Half Deficit Was Smaller Than in 1961—Trustees Say Concern May Avoid New Borrowing; Gains Are Laid to Lower Operating Expenses

New York.—The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad may be able to avoid once-expected extra borrowings because of financial improvements in the first half of this year.

The road, which relies heavily on commuter traffic for business, had a half year deficit of $6,843,721, but this was $4,933,342 less than for the 1961 period, which saw the New Haven undergo reorganization proceedings under the bankruptcy act.

After R. J. Smith, W. J. Kirk, and H. W. Dorigan became trustees of the carrier a year ago today, they borrowed $5 million through a trustee certificate issue to take care of overdue obligations and for working capital.

They borrowed another $3 million last December and then estimated an additional $4.5 million would have to be borrowed before the carrier reached a cash break-even point. "It now appears," said the trustees, "that such * * * borrowings will not be necessary to provide operating funds."

The New Haven's improvement was "primarily accomplished by reductions in operating expenses," the trustees said. Operating revenues increased by $886,839, while operating expenses in the first half were chopped by $3,248,514 from the 1961 period.

The trustees said they were checking the excess of cash outflow over cash inflow. In the first 6 months this year, cash loss was $210,000, compared with a cash loss of $5,873,000 in the last 5 months of 1961. During the 1961 period the highest cash loss was in August, when outflow exceeded inflow by $3,271,000. This was due, the trustees said, "primarily to payment of pressing obligations such as payrolls and taxes left unpaid by the previous management."

But the trustees cautioned: "Additional cash losses will occur during the coming months, but with the repeal of the 10-percent Federal excise tax on passenger tickets, effective November 15, and the increasing cumulative effect of economy measures, continuing cash attrition should be halted before the end of the year." Cash as of June 30 was $6,629,000, up from $3,849,385 on July 7 last year, when the management filed with the Federal district court in New Haven for reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. But at the end of 1961 the cash on hand was $6,901,206, or more than on June 30, 1962.

The trustees hedged a bit on the prospect of not needing new borrowings. They said: "An unforeseen catastrophe, such as a major strike or the need for some extraordinary expenditure to provide necessary additional facilities might, however, involve a new loan."

The Venezuelan Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in Congress persist in refusing to capitalize on the natural gambling spirit of the American people and while we stubbornly continue to ignore the tremendous revenue-producing features of a national lottery in the United States, most of the countries throughout the world continue to treat and respect gambling as an instinctive and universal human trait which brings pleasure to the people and financial benefits to government treasuries.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the Members of this House some interesting facts and figures which I have gathered from some of these countries where the wheels of fortune spin on behalf of the public welfare.

VENEZUELA

This small South American nation, with a population of less than 7 million, last year took in over $48 million, of which over $30 million was given out in prizes leaving about $19 million as revenue for the treasury.

Venezuela uses this income from gambling wisely. The great bulk of this revenue was used for the benefit of hospitals and schools, and the remainder was devoted to other government purposes.

Mr. Speaker, with our taxes rapidly rising and with the need for new sources of revenue to meet our public demands becoming more pressing, is there a more painless or sensible way of raising Government revenue than a national lottery? Venezuela does not think so.

Who Conserves Our Resources?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the word "conservation" has many connotations, and takes on different forms for many people, but certainly few will disagree with the dictionary definition. It says, "Official maintenance and supervision of our natural resources."

Just who—the Government or private enterprise—should conserve our natural resources hits at the very basis of our problems of providing for the future. So, whatever connotations or personal ideas we may have for the academicians to mull over, the fact remains that the problems of providing the most for the greatest number of people for the longest period of time is everyone's concern.

Dr. Ruth Shallcross Maynard is assistant professor of economics at Lake Erie College, Painesville, Ohio, and has written an article on this subject. Lake Erie is a very fine college for which I have the honor to serve as a trustee and it is in my neighboring congressional district. Dr. Maynard is a learned scholar in her professional field of economics and is well qualified to discuss the subject, "Who Conserves Our Resources?"

Because it so well answers the question paramount in the minds of those of us interested in doing what we can to assure the most for the future, I have asked permission to have her article inserted in the Congressional Record for my colleagues to read. It appeared initially in the July issue of the Freeman, a publication of the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y. The article follows:

Who Conserves Our Resources?

(By Ruth Shallcross Maynard)

"Who should conserve our resources?" If a poll were taken, a large majority probably would answer: "Our Federal and State governments." And if one were to ask why this view is so widely held, the would find among other reasons the following:

(1) that the free market is chaotic, gives profits to the few, and is unmindful of the great waste of our diminishing limited resources;

(2) that people's rights are above private or special interests and only the Government can properly serve the public interest;

(3) that Government has access to more funds;

(4) that Government has the power and facilities to obtain all the necessary data and to do the research needed for the best scientific decisions on resource conservation;

(5) that the price system does not operate in the interests of conservation because of the unrestrained pursuit of self-interest;

(6) that the concentration of power in some corporations further threatens our dwindling resources and must be regulated by Government.

REFUTING THE REASONS

These reasons, of course, do not indicate how a Government agency would go about attempting a solution to the conservation problems—this is always just assumed—but consider them briefly:

(1a) The free market is anything but chaotic. Competing natural market forces reflect in prices the wishes of both buyers and sellers—millions of individuals, separately accountable and responsible for their own actions in their own field of economic activity. All persons seek their own advantage when allowed a choice, but in the free market a producer cannot profit unless he pleases consumers better than his competitor does.

(2a) Can there be people's rights superior to the rights of individuals? All individuals have special and private interests and rights. Therefore, the people cannot have rights except individually; and the right of life carries with it the right to maintain it by private and special means.

(3a) The Government has no funds that have not been taken from the people by force, whereas many a large private undertaking has come forth from voluntarily contributed funds. In fact, the entire industrial development in this country has been a continuous example of this voluntary way of creating the facilities for production by giving the consumer what he wants at the price he is willing to pay in competition.

(4a) Offhand it would seem that a government might have access to more data about scarce resources than would a private enterpriser. But government cannot bring forth the detailed information so vital to sound decision. The kind of detailed knowledge needed simply isn't given to anyone in its totality, as Hayek has pointed out. "Knowledge of the circumstances of which we must make use never exists in concentrated or integrated form," he states, "but solely as dispersed bits of incomplete and frequently contradictory knowledge which all the separate individuals possess." If the price of a given resource continues upward, this tells producers all they need to know about its increasing scarcity and signals them to conserve it, to use it sparingly and for the most valuable products. Advocates of Government planning never seem to grasp how this works, for they are constantly tampering with market forces, distorting the delicate price signals that could otherwise guide them.

(5a) The role that prices play in the free economy is so little understood that many people believe government must set prices lest they reflect only the "selfish interests" of the producers. The price system not only tells producers and consumers when scarcity of a product exists (prices rise) or when it has become more plentiful (prices drop); it also supplies the incentive to act in the interests of conservation by seeking a substitute for the high-priced scarce material.

(6a) If concentration of power in corporations is too great to be permitted, what about the ultimate concentration of power in a government institution beyond the regulation of market forces? Goverment is unaccountable in the sense that it is not obliged to please consumers in order to stay in business. If it does not show a profit, its losses can be covered by tax money.

WHEN GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

The foregoing arguments, however, do not touch upon the basic problem involved in the conservation of resources. Let us assume that Congress passes a conservation law setting up the Federal Bureau of Conservation. Tax money must then be appropriated for this Bureau. The Director, a political appointee, must find a building and hire a staff large enough to justify his salary. To investigate and collect data on what is being done is a time and tax-consuming job.

The Government system is based on arbitrary decisions of man over man, with strong probability of political influence; the free market system is influenced by nonpolitical and nonpersonal forces. There is no other alternative. The first system leads to static conditions which cannot meet the changing needs and desires of consumers, the people most involved and presumably those whom a conservation agency ought to protect. The business way encourages search for substitutes when price rises indicate growing scarcity. This not only aids conservation but also affords the consuming public more reasonably priced alternatives in times of scarcity.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISERS CONSERVE WHAT IS WORTH SAVING

Until someone discovers that a resource has a specific use, it has no value for which it should be conserved. Private enterprisers are constantly trying to find new materials and new uses for known resources, always looking ahead to see which ones will be available and how efficiently they can be utilized. Pick up any trade journal and note the articles on how to cut costs, utilize waste materials, be more efficient. Because the Government told them to? No. The hope of profits acts as a powerful compulsion to be efficient, to improve, to conserve.

In the lumber and pulp-paper industries, uses have been found for virtually all of a tree, including the bark, branches, and sawdust which were formerly wasted. The waste legnin, after removal of the carbohydrates, has been the concern of many a pulp company as well as scientists at the Institute of Paper Chemistry, who have yet to find a use that will meet adequately the competitive market test of consumer choice.

When wood became scarce in Wisconsin, the trees-for-tomorrow program was instigated, encouraging farmers to grow trees as an added cash crop. As salt cake from Saskatchewan grew scarce, the southern kraft-pulp mills learned how to reclaim it and cut the amount needed per ton of pulp by two-thirds or more. Could such a conservation measure have been forced by Government decree? It is most doubtful.

INDIVIDUAL IMPROVEMENT

Improvement of the well-being of individuals, rather than conservation, is the chief goal in the utilization of resources. Absolute conservation could lead to the absurdity of not utilizing our resources at all, and thus conserving to no purpose—no freedom and no improvement of our lives. J. S. Mill has expressed it thus: "The only unfailing and permanent source of improvement is liberty, since by it there are as many possible independent centers of improvement as there are individuals."

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WASTE?

The real waste in resources comes from Government policies. It is seen especially in wartime, but more and more in peacetime programs. The Government farm program has encouraged waste of land, seeds, fertilizers, labor, and capital by subsidizing the production of surpluses to be stored in bins that dot the countryside. The foreign aid program has wasted various resources, sending them to countries where little if any use has been or could be made of them.

Rising taxes also promote waste. The corporate income tax of 52 percent of earnings, for example, encourages industrialists to engage in questionable and wasteful projects which appear justified only when purchased with a 48-cent dollar. This is not in the interests of conservation.

A private individual stands to lose personally if he wastes resources in his field of economic activity, and has a built-in motivation for attempting to correct his mistakes as soon as they are reflected in rising costs or decreasing demand. A Government agent, however, risks no personal loss when he misuses resources, he cannot recognize mistakes by rising costs when prices are fixed arbitrarily, nor is he motivated to correct his mistakes even when recognized.

National Chiropractic Association Sponsors Chiropractic Day, September 18, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of my colleagues in Congress to a special observance which will occur in America next month. For in September, the chiropractic profession—the Nation's second largest profession of healing—will observe its annual Chiropractic Day.

On that day—September 18, 1962—chiropractors throughout the United States, Canada, and many foreign countries, will celebrate the 67th anniversary of the discovery of chiropractic.

In connection with this observance, I wish to submit for the RECORD a statement by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, director of industrial relations, National Chiropractic Association, Washington, D.C.:

STATEMENT BY DR. EMMETT J. MURPHY

Throughout the Nation and the world, chiropractors will hold observance of Chiropractic Day on September 18, with the fullest understanding that because of the freedom enjoyed in the Western World, a new profession can gain public acceptance on its merits as has the profession of chiropractic in a short 67 years.

A fresh concept in the art of healing based upon the neurological, physical, and mechanical approach, was given to the world 67 years ago.

The progress of chiropractic was forcefully illustrated a few years ago when the profession became the subject of an objective factfinding study conducted by the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D.C., a nationally known nonprofit research organization.

This study has been compiled under the title of "The Present-Day Doctor of Chiropractic" and it represents the latest facts of the profession as gathered by Dr. Dewey Anderson (A.B., M.A., Ph. D., Leland Stanford University).

I think that a statement from this scientific study of our profession is particularly pertinent as an explanation of our contribution to the general health and welfare of all Americans. This is the statement from the "Present-Day Doctor of Chiropractic":

"In these modern days of our high-speed nerve-exhausting living, chiropractic is fast becoming an indispensable element in helping people maintain good health."

Dr. Anderson correctly appraises chiropractic in the light of certain concepts which are regarded as well accepted by the public at large.

This rapid growth of chiropractic—and its far-reaching effects on our national well-being—is dramatized by Dr. Anderson himself. In one phase of his study of chiropractic, he said:

"From a handful of patients somewhat more than a half a century ago who came to Dr. Daniel David Palmer (chiropractic's discoverer) and got relief, those being cared for by today's chiropractors number many millions. And every year the number swells as chiropractors become more proficient and as their satisfied and healthy patients spread the word. Here is the best and final test of an emerging profession seriously serving the public."

The rapid acceptance of this science of healing in the past 67 years leads us to inquire of the standards in use today. And extremely exacting standards they are found to be.

Chiropractic colleges are required to give 4,000 academic hours in a standard 4-year course to obtain accredited ratings. A basic course of 4,400 hours is recommended. Up to 2 years of preprofessional (college) education is required by 26 State chiropractic laws of licensure.

The following salient facts concerning public acceptance of chiropractic need to be considered:

1. Chiropractic is the second largest healing profession in America. It is classified as one of the four major healing professions, along with medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, by the Executive Office of the President of the United States, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.
2. More than 600 insurance companies recognize claims for services rendered by the chiropractors.
3. The U.S. Civil Service Commission recognizes certificates of illness for leave purposes signed by doctors of chiropractic, which means that all Federal agencies are directed to recognize such certificates.
4. Chiropractic care for veterans has been endorsed by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans.
5. Major unions of Federal employees have endorsed legislation to widen the use of chiropractic in Federal compensation work.
6. Scores of employers provide regular chiropractic treatment for their employees.
7. The Railroad Retirement Board accepts statements of sickness signed by chiropractors.
8. Physicians in West Germany (a country noted for thoroughness in research) have been investigating chiropractic and are giving it warm acceptance.
9. The Kerr-Mills Act providing medical assistance to the aged passed by the last U.S. Congress makes provision for payments to doctors of chiropractic.

The remarkable effectiveness of chiropractic methods in health care has won for chiropractic a permanent place in the family of health sciences, and in the hearts and homes of suffering humanity.

The Soviet Union Resumes Atmospheric Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker I read with profound regret the grim news that the Soviet Union has once again resumed nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

It is now nearly a year since the dialog of terror was begun again, with the breaking of the test moratorium by the Soviet Union. It is difficult to believe the world, through testing, has moved closer to disarmament and peace.

It is estimated that the latest Soviet nuclear explosion was in the 40-megaton range, a size calculated to appall anyone who entertains doubts about the massive power of the Soviet Union. In this respect, the Soviets have failed. No one seems to care very much.

A year ago the Soviet resumption of testing was greeted with shock and violent protest in this country and throughout the world. Today I hear very little protest in the United States. The newspaper editorials for the most part seem content to observe smugly that the tests are being kept secret from the Russian people.

It appears that in the space of a few months, conditioned by our own testing, we have become insensible to what we once branded as a crime against humanity. The terror bombs cease to hold any terror for us. We have stopped trying to think about the unthinkable prospect before us, the annihilation of the human race. We have become the victims of our own propaganda.

Many like to think this round of testing is the last round, and greet the latest news with a sense of relief. Each series is the last series and each war is the last war.

The widespread apathy among the American people toward Soviet testing and our own is an ominous as the tests themselves. It is as dangerous for our survival.

Continued testing by either side brings us closer to material and spiritual disaster.

An Open Letter to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to one of my constitutents, Mr. E. D. Gordon, of Rockford, Ill., for his thoughtfulness in bringing to my attention the following timely and thought-provoking article from Economic News, which is in the form of an open letter to President Kennedy.

I am terribly impressed with its clear and concise analysis with its inherent warning as to the utter folly and dire consequences of pursuing the false ideologies such as those proposed by the Keynesian inflationists.

Mr. Speaker, I highly commend the message in the following article to the entire membership of the House:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A little more than a year ago we wrote to you an open letter in which we said: "In your book, 'Profiles in Courage,' you reveal admiration of Senator Lamar's political courage. As one example you cite his stand in the mid-1870's on the question of more inflation as a supposed remedy for a depression versus deflation and restoration of a currency redeemable in gold. By an interesting coincidence, unless we are seriously mistaken, you are or soon will be in a situation similar to that in which Senator Lamar found himself."

Few people seemed to realize a year ago how soon the Nation might be confronted with the prospect of a severe recession. In view of recent developments in the financial markets, however, the significance of the sentences quoted above presumably will be more apparent.

We hope you will understand that this message is not a boastful "we told you so." The situation is far too serious, the threat to the very survival of our Nation is much too great for such considerations to be entertained. We do not exult in the serious losses already incurred by many, nor do we find satisfaction in the disasters that a depression would bring, regardless of how fully such developments confirm the usefulness of our earlier analyses. And we feel sure that you would not disparage these efforts to bring to your attention useful results of research that has extended over four decades. Therefore, we reproduce below some additional paragraphs from the earlier open letter to you.

"As was the situation in 1873, the United States is beginning to experience the aftermath of prolonged inflation begun in time of depression, greatly augmented. during World War II, and continued in postwar years. In Senator Lamar's day the proponents of still more inflation were clamoring for the 'easy money' way out of depression problems. Today the Keynesian economists are providing the rationalization for similar pleas that the Government attempt to restore prosperity by still more inflating.

"The panacea proposed by the Keynesians is a continuation of policies followed for two decades, policies directly responsible for the situation in which we now find ourselves. The monetizing of Government debt during World War II created a huge amount of inflationary purchasing media, much of which was hoarded at first by the early recipients, because the things they wanted to buy were not available.

"During the postwar years, the inflationary purchasing media have been dishoarded gradually, and some of the increasing private noncommercial debt has been monetized, thereby creating more inflationary purchasing media. Each successive postwar recession has been cut short by the continued dishoarding of inflationary purchase media created during World War II and by further inflation derived from monetizing Treasury deficits and increasing private noncommercial debt.

"In each instance, the short-run consequence, quick recovery to boom levels, has been what the Keynesians and many of the Nation's best informed economists have expected. However, the Keynesians have been blind to the longer run consequences, whereas many leading money-credit economists and our own organization have correctly foreseen those consequences, which now confront the Nation.

"The great inflation of the past two decades has shifted about $200 billion worth of assets from the Nation's thrifty citizens and from endowed institutions in addition to an incalculable but perhaps even larger amount from all whose incomes have been relatively fixed (such as retired individuals and teachers) to those who have benefited from inflation's progress. One of the chief beneficiaries has been the Government, whose tax revenues have increased greatly; other beneficiaries have been the holders of monopoly privileges including some elements of organized labor as well as numerous others.

"Thus have been fostered dreams of an affluent society able to afford global foreign aid, costly Government intervention in agriculture with accompanying waste of resources, and expansion of business enterprises without sufficient consideration of cost costs here compared with those abroad. * * * In these and other ways too numerous to list, economic growth has been retarded and the Nation's economy has been seriously distorted.

"Now the consequences of past money-credit follies confront us.

"Some Keynesian economists urge that the disciplinary warnings of the gold outflow be disregarded; a few even urge that gold be discarded from the Nation's money-credit system. They recommend more inflation by monetizing more Government debt. Although some Keynesians favor more spending, others favor tax reductions; but the basic notion is the same, i.e., that Government deficits should be monetized to restore prosperity.

"For the educated person who has not been trained as an economic scientist, the situation must indeed be puzzling. Among the Keynesians are some of the Nation's best known economists whose academic positions and professional offices seem almost to be a guarantee of their competence. How is one to decide when the doctors disagree, especially when one finds on the side of the inflationists several economists in one of the Nation's most venerable and respected universities as well as others in a leading scientific institution?

"No doubt, you will be subjected to great pressure to foster more inflation. In addition to the dedicated Keynesians convinced that their nostrum is a useful remedy, various pressure groups will clamor for what they think will promote their interest. Labor leaders who can see only the short-run benefits of more increases in wages instead of decreased wage rates in some industries, speculators in real estate and stocks (especially those speculating on thin margins), bankers whose investment-type assets are excessive and largely frozen, and others who hope to gain from more inflation or fear to lose if deflation occurs will join in the clamor. And adding their not inconsiderable bit will be many intellectuals whose education cultivated verbal facility but failed to make them wary of perpetual-motion schemes such as those proposed by the Keynesian inflationists.

"To resist the pressures that will be brought to bear on you will require political courage of a high order.

"We do not imply that on you rests the sole responsibility for choosing a wise course of action. Congress has a responsibility even greater than yours, because Congress makes the laws you are to enforce. And in the background, carrying the final and inescapable responsibility, stand the independent, informed minority of citizens who constitute the balance of political power in a republic such as the United States.

* * * * *

"The Institute's responsibility is to continue research such as that which has provided the scientific warranty for the assertions herein and to inform every citizen who will trouble to read what we publish. We propose to increase the number thus educated as rapidly as possible beyond the half-million present readers of our principal publications. Research and the widest possible dissemination of the results thereof comprise the extent of our responsibility. On thoughtful, informed citizens will rest the responsibility for indicating to professional politicans the direction chosen by the Nation's independent balance-of-power minority."

Turning now from our earlier letter, at this time we should emphasize that the Keynesian economists evidently have been seriously mistaken. Your Council of Economic Advisers predicted in their Annual Economic Report last January that the Nation would experience "strong and sustained expansion" of business activity in the months ahead. That has not occurred. Moreover, more than a decade ago, the Chairman of the Council participated in preparing recommendations to West Germany that fortunately were discarded in favor of a diametrically opposite course of action that accounted for the "miracle" of West Germany's recovery and economic growth.

The situation is similar to one that occurred in the practice of medicine. Decades after Dr. Semmelweiss' research had revealed the cause of puerperal fever, mothers were still dying in childbirth because of the delayed acceptance of the results of scientific inquiry. For the many families involved those were great personal tragedies, but they are insignificant in comparison to the consequences that must follow failure to apply scientific inquiry to economic problems. Even before the Great Depression of the 1930's the results of extensive scientific research were available. Many published articles not only correctly analyzed the situation before the panic of 1929 but also predicted the consequences of unsound fiscal and monetary panaceas intended to restore prosperity during the 1930's.

During and since World War II the worst economic blunders made during World War I and in the 1920's have been repeated, some on an even larger scale. The obvious consequences are numerous economic distortions that hinder economic growth and are reflected in the gold problem, excessive unemployment, and the recent panic in the stock markets. Again the Institute's continued research has revealed the nature and extent of the principal economic blunders.

To disregard the work of economic scientists and rely instead on the outmoded notion of Keynesian economists, regardless of how impressive their academic credentials may seem, would be to repeat the fatuous blundering of the 1930's that left nearly 10 million still unemployed in 1939. Such action would parallel that of the medical doctors who, in the pride of their academic and professional distinctions, refused to learn from the scientific inquiry that revealed the cause of puerperal fever. But in the present instance, instead of death for a relatively few individuals, the consequences could be catastrophic for millions of people and perhaps would imperil survival of our Nation, or survival of those aspects of our Nation that once made the United States the hope of the world.

Yours very truly,

American Institute for
Economic Research,
E. C. Harwood, *Director*.

Report on Blue Cross and Blue Shield in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, Ohio continues to make good records—this time in health care.

In this connection, I am pleased to call to the attention of the members of the House a part of Report No. 1 of Blue Cross and Blue Shield in Ohio.

The part of particular interest is as follows:

Ohioans Are Health Care Conscious

According to the 1960 Source Book of Health Insurance Data, practically every self-supporting person in the State had some form of health care coverage.

Actually, better than 86 percent of Ohio's 9,706,397 civilian residents—or a total of 8,456,000 men, women, and children—had adopted some type of voluntary budget plan whereby they could pay in advance for certain types of health care.

Ohio is well above the national average of 73 percent, standing fourth in this regard, and Ohioans are spending lots of dollars for health coverage.

The nearly 8½ million Ohioans who in 1960 had some form of health insurance (even more are covered today) spent a total of $438,620,000 in membership fees and premiums.

The source book further indicates that Ohioans are getting a varied return for their money. Their benefits totaled $353,539,000 for that year—or 81 percent of the total money charged for fees and premiums.

Pensions for World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. George Dreisbach, of Freeland, has sent me a letter together with a statement regarding pensions for veterans of World War I. As requested, I am submitting them for the Appendix of today's Record.

Letter and statement follow:

Freeland, Pa.,
August 6, 1962.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: I shall appreciate it very much if you will insert the inclosed statement in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

The armistice ending World War I was signed over 43 years ago, and if action is not taken soon on pensions and benefits for the veterans of that conflict, there will not be any of them left to legislate for.

Thanking you very much for this, and past favors, and with all good wishes, I remain, sincerely,

George Dreisbach.

Statement and Suggestion Regarding Pensions for World War I Veterans

To all Members of the Senate Committee on Finance; and to all Members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

When a civilian was summoned to appear before a draft board, his income, for instance, was not considered. He was inducted into the Army, at $30 per month. Whether soldiers served more than 90 days, or less than 90 days, all of them were in the same army, under the same flag, fighting for the same cause; and all of them took the same oath of allegiance to the United States of America. Therefore, all of them are veterans.

Grant each veteran a pension as an earned right, for military service, and base each pension only on length of service, and honorable discharge. Please keep in mind that the less-than-90-days-of-service veterans would have served 90 days, and more, if the war had continued beyond November 11, 1918.

Part of the titles of bills read: "To provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I." Yet the restrictions, the limitations, the conditions, imposed, prevents many veterans from getting pensions. May I offer this suggestion: Eliminate the restrictions, the limitations, the conditions, such as: the marital status; the incomes; the ages; of veterans; and add a clause covering the less-than-90-days-of-service veterans.

I think veterans should modify their request for pensions, and in this connection may I offer the following suggestion for your consideration:

Veterans with service-connected disabilities, $80 per month.

Veterans with 90 days, or more, of service, $60 per month.

Veterans with 89 days, or less, of service, $40 per month.

If any veteran of World War I is getting a pension, or benefits, under existing law, in excess of the above scale, no reduction shall be made in his pension or benefits.

Under this plan all veterans would get pensions. This is proper, just, fair, right. Keep in mind that many veterans are in, or getting near, the higher age brackets, and, to be frank about it, the death rate, in their ranks, will greatly reduce the financial outlay each year.

Example under the $75 per month plan: A veteran with 90 days or more of service has an income of $2,900 per year. His pension would amount to $900 per year, a total of $3,800 annually. Another veteran, in the same category, with an income of $3,100, would not get a pension; his income would stay at $3,100 annually. The less-than-90-days-of-service-veterans would not get pensions, either. The discrimination, the inconsistency, is obvious.

Respectfully submittee.

GEORGE DREISBACH.

Investors Union of America, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the well-known Washington newsletter, Human Events, of July 14.

It seems that at long last the investors and stockholders of our land are beginning to stir, and that they may throw off their lethargy and use their great strength to protect their own interest.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are 17,100,000 of these people and if they unite and organize, as they should, their voice will be heard and their power will be felt in the halls of Government.

This new union is called "Investors Union of America, Inc." and judging by the many letters of endorsement, extracts from which follow the article, it is evident that the new union is known all over our country and in many congressional districts.

New grassroots: A new organization is being readied this week that bears promise of transforming the political landscape of the country. The facts which suggest the reason for creating such an organization have been inspiring lively discussion among political pros and writers in Washington for some weeks. They are:

(1) The New York Stock Exchange announced after a census that about 17,100,000 Americans over 21 own stock in publicly held corporations—"nearly one of every six Americans is a shareowner."

(2) This statistic suggests the obvious reason why President Kennedy has lost the confidence so necessary to the healthy functioning of the economic body of the Nation.

(3) This statistic also—and significantly—compares closely with another: The total number of labor union members is approximately 16 million. Their bosses, notably Walter Reuther, have the ear of the President and their own men are installed in high positions in the Kennedy regime. J.F.K. clearly defers to their every wish.

(4) On June 27, Lyle Wilson, veteran columnist for the United Press International, articulated the prevailing conclusion in Washington, drawn from the above facts when he wrote: "There is no other multimillion category of voters [than the 17,100,000 individual investors] lying around loose for the conservative leaders to cultivate. * * * The Republican Party might improve its minority position in the United States if the party leadership had the wit and ability to rally the faceless millions of American stockholders."

Indeed, for some time before Wilson's remark, such a conclusion had been drawn by Steve Stahl, director of the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council and a contributor to Human Events, who began laying plans for "The Investors' Union of America, Inc.", a nonprofit organization which has applied for a charter from Oklahoma.

The principal objective of the union is to secure "a fair and reasonable return on the money invested by more than 17 million Americans in the tools of production," and the "primary purpose is the protection of small investors and particularly those who have retired or are nearing retirement."

Stahl comments: "These are the people who have been hurt the most by the present market decline resulting from the Government's unfriendly attitude toward business and the free market economy."

Characteristic are the first selections for the board of governors: Miss Martha Veal, retired schoolteacher; Tim Blaney, small farmer; H. Merle Woods, weekly newspaper publisher. No "economic royalists" here, nor representatives of big business. (For information write: Steve Stahl, Investors Union of America, Inc., 207 Commerce Exchange Building, Oklahoma City 2, Okla.)

The political potential of such a union, if it succeeds in assembling a substantial fraction of the 17,100,000 investors, impresses Capitol Hill. One of its first points of attack is, of course, the grossly unfair double taxation of investors—a challenge which chills the entrenched parasitic bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

Another thought arises among observers: If the AFL–CIO has its political action battalions in COPE (Committee on Political Education), why not a similar lever for the investors to insure the election of fiscally sound candidates in congressional elections?

In any case, many in the Nation's Capital wait to see how the new union goes at its task.

* * * * * * *

So far it is not known how many business leaders have accepted or, if any have, whether they know the proceeds will go to elect more Democrats to the next Congress.

Rocky on prayer: Did Nelson Rockefeller make a wrong political move last week at the annual Governors' conference? The New York Governor stood out against all the others as the only State executive who didn't support a resolution in favor of a constitutional amendment which would clarify the Supreme Court's recent decision by permitting "the free and voluntary participation in prayer in our public schools."

Few doubt that Nelson had an eye on the big liberal vote in the State, a vote he cultivated to a large extent in his 1958 gubernatorial campaign. But if he is opposed by strong candidate Mayor Robert F. Wagner (rather than weak candidate Averell Harriman, as he was the last time) he can hope for little liberal support.

He must therefore count on the large Roman Catholic and upstate Protestant vote, which is largely up in arms over the Warren Court's verdict. It is believed voters' memories will not be short on this burning issue and Nelson may suffer for abstaining on the resolution.

Doctor's strike: It is no secret that champions of the administration's medicare bill on Capitol Hill wince at the mention of Saskatchewan, the Canadian Province which has been the scene of a dramatic strike of doctors against a socialized medical program.

In the first days of the strike, an infant boy died of meningitis during a 90-mile race for medical attention. His father, Peter Derhousoss blames the Government (according to UPI): "If we could have gotten him to a doctor sooner, well. * * * I think the Government is more responsible than anything. There is no use having a scheme if you can't have doctors."

Capitol Hill observers attach considerable weight to the Virginian's words as he is not one to shoot from the hip. As BYRD himself put it: "I make this statement deliberately and out of deep concern."

BYRD said the record reveals Bell is "addicted to 'planned deficits.'" Before the Senate Finance Committee, stated BYRD, Bell admitted this year's deficit was "deliberately planned." The Budget Director, charged BYRD, regards the budget as a tool for "testing economic theories." (Human Events reported December 15, 1960, that Bell thought the budget was a device to achieve "social ends, not simply sound dollars.")

BYRD warned, however, that we are "faced with a fiscal situation which is deadly serious. It is a situation demanding fiscal guidance of strong men of the highest caliber who are dedicated to sound financing." Bell, continued BYRD, "seems to be a pleasant man. There is simply no evidence that he is a strong fiscal officer."

Trick to pass medicare: As has been repeatedly predicted by Human Events, the New Frontier has now come forward with (1) a compromise medicare bill and (2) a legislative tactic bespeaking desperation. They both came last week in the form of a rider which Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, seeks to attach to a welfare bill already passed by the House (H.R. 10606).

The compromise is designed to attract more voter support. Part of its bait is the inclusion of the 4 million elderly not covered by social security. The new proposal also authorizes the use of private groups, such as Blue Cross, to administer the plan and medical associations will be permitted to select the hospitals.

But the major objectionable feature, financing through social security—the principal political objective of the administration—remains intact. As Human Events has pointed out, President Kennedy will accept a compromise on any part of the bill except this method of financing.

A reason for further objections: The technique of bringing up the "compromise" as a rider—thus bypassing the Senate Finance Committee and avoiding a wait for the medicare bill to come from the House—smacks of White House high pressure.

Even Democrats who favor medicare look with distaste upon this procedure. Therefore, the welfare measure and its rider may be plagued by amendments to amendments, as was the ill-fated Freeman farm bill in the House.

The administration believes it has enough votes to pass the compromise proposal; nevertheless, conservatives on Capitol Hill say the bill can be defeated if the Senators hear from the country. Indications are the vote will be called for late in the week of July 9, therefore there is still time for constituents to wire both of their Senators urging a negative vote on Federal medicare.

PROGRESS REPORT: PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE

(These few quotations from hundreds of unsolicited letters received by the Investors Union of America during its first week as an organization prove moral soundness of American citizens)

"My husband and I are very much interested in the Investors Union. As retired teachers, we are facing the same problem of many other retired people in seeing our savings frittered away under the liberal tendencies of our Government administrators."—Cape May Court House, N.J.

"The idea of organizing small investors is excellent. I earn my livelihood as a truck driver, have six children and belong to a mutual fund, which qualifies me as a small investor."—Laconia, N.H.

"I never thought the day would arrive when I would join a 'union' * * * but this is it. Send me an application blank—in fact send several."—Louisville, Ky.

"I am a small investor, just a $6,000-a-year government employee. However, I have great interest in our free enterprise system which is being swiftly eroded by the tremendous growth of Government and public debt."—Garnerville, N.Y.

"The July 14 issue of Human Events indicates you have started a movement we hope to see grow to ultimate proportions of such enormity as to encompass more than the 17 million stockholders in the country. You are to be congratulated."—San Antonio, Tex.

"As a veteran newspaper executive, I'm a bit shy about propaganda groups, but I do believe that you have hit on a sound idea which appeals to me both as a person who has substantial investments and as an American who is getting fed up on what is being done to us."—Glendale, Calif.

"I am enclosing $20 as a contribution to the Investors Union of America. Please send printed material which I can use to interest new members."—Seattle, Wash.

"An organization whose principal purpose is the conservation of investments, should be welcomed by many people, investors of record such as those on the stock market as well as others."—Washington, D.C.

"At long last the unorganized average American should be heard through your organization. This plan will also benefit the retired people who have no protection or representation."—Oklahoma City, Okla.

"I have been angry—downright mad for so many years that it is hard to believe that investors can at last join forces and act in unison. Let us try. I'm waiting to learn what I can do."—Seattle, Wash.

"We are very glad to know about this and most heartily congratulate you for putting the idea into concrete action. It certainly is needed and without doubt can secure results."—Chicago, Ill.

"Your program is the first action program I have seen that makes real sense."—Portland, Oreg.

"My investment in the stock market is through a mutual fund and I am not anywhere near retirement age. But, I am just as interested as our senior citizens."—Phoenix, Ariz.

"I am a department head in a local high school. I am interested in doing all I can to further the conservative cause, but I am conservative, and I want to know the details about an organization before I lend it my support."—Long Beach, Calif.

"My son and I are interested in more information on the Investors Union. We read about your fine objective of securing a fair and reasonable return on the money invested by more than 17 million Americans in the tools of production."—Salt Lake City, Utah.

"At long last. Count me in. Will you send me a bill for my membership dues airmail? Wishing you every success."—Antigua, West Indies.

"As a voting citizen and a stockholder intensely interested in the socialistic trend of our present and past administrations, the idea of unified political force in the person of the stockholders of our nation has often intrigued me. I was subsequently quite pleased when I learned of the existence of your organization."—Solana Beach, Calif.

"It's about time someone did something about the downtrodden investors."—Dayton, Ohio.

"As a retiree and stockholder who was badly mauled by the stockmarket's recent collapse I am greatly interested in your movement."—Vero Beach, Fla.

"I think your organization has possibilities of doing a great deal of good so far as our free enterprise system is concerned and our free enterprise system is the backbone of America."—Huntington, W. Va.

"My husband is a stockbroker and I'm sure he and many of his fellow workers would be interested in promoting this new union."—San Gabriel, Calif.

"I am very much interested in the announcement of your organization to represent the investors of America, and consider it a most important development which is long overdue."—Logan, Utah.

"Congratulations on your worthy venture. Let us hope you can alert and enlighten many of the 17 million stockholders. You have alerted me, even though I'm not a stockholder."—New York, N.Y.

"Hallelujah! Reading about your organization in Human Events was certainly happy news."—Grosse Pointe, Mich.

"I hope that something effective will come out of this organization, to help eliminate the unfair taxing of dividends."—Phoenix, Ariz.

"I am delighted to hear of this organization and I am of the opinion that it will bear considerable political weight."—Roanoke, Va.

"Have just been reading about your plans to form an Investors Union. This certainly is a most constructive idea and there is no reason why it shouldn't be a tremendous success."—Bakersfield, Calif.

"I just read in Human Events about your new organization and it interests me very much. Neither my partner nor I own any stock but since we are in business for ourselves anything good for stockholders would be good for us."—Tilden, Tex.

"I am writing to congratulate you on this most useful idea and on your initiative in its organization. The political and economic possibilities for doing a great deal of good in work of this kind are tremendous."—New York, N.Y.

"Congratulations! Every thinking American should be elated at the formation of such a union. Such an organization has tremendous potential to counteract the cancerous growth of bureaucracy in our land."—Livonia, Mich.

"Congratulations on the establishment of the Investors Union of America. Such a union is long overdue."—Manitowoc, Wis.

"I am an accounting clerk and I do not have any funds invested in stocks, bonds, or other securities at this time, but I do believe that I have an investment in the future of our Nation. I have two small sons, and I hope that they may grow up and live under a free enterprise system."—Wichita Falls, Tex.

"The Investors Union could be a very potent political force—and I want to help to make it so, though I own no stocks or bonds."—New York, N.Y.

"I am happy to hear that you are beginning to get together the 17 million Americans who own stock in the various corporations of our great country. I think you have a very potent source of public opinion, and I believe it will become loud enough so that it cannot be ignored in Washington."—Long Beach, Calif.

"Certainly the potential here is greater than to be found among the principal labor unions, and I am hopeful that the need for organization will be recognized by the vast majority."—Philadelphia, Pa.

"Human Events says you are getting ready to supply a voice to all us small stockholders. I go for this. What is the dope?"—St. Petersburg, Fla.

"Please count me in on the Investors Union of America. After reading the account of your undertaking in the current issue of Human Events, I am convinced that this is a big step in the right direction."—Falls Church, Va.

"Count me in as a charter member of Investors Union. This is the organizing job America is most in need of today."—Dallas, Tex.

"I commend you for this action. I am happy that your organization has seen the potential for united effort toward conservatism. * * * It's time my voice, as an investor, is heard."—Topeka, Kans.

"I find a great deal of interest in this idea both here and among my associates in various parts of the country."—San Diego, Calif.

"I wish to congratulate you for putting a wonderful idea into operation. May I help in organizing a Pennsylvania office or charter of the union?"—Plymouth, Pa.

"Such an organization could be of great value and I would be interested in further information, both for myself and several customers."—Vero Beach, Fla.

"I have just read about your brilliant idea in the current issue of Human Events. More power to you."—Santa Barbara, Calif.

Gavin and U.S. Policy on France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Crosby S. Noyes, foreign correspondent of the Washington Star, wrote an excellent column on Gen. James M. Gavin which appeared in the Star on Friday, August 3, 1962. General Gavin has resigned as our Ambassador to France, a position which he has performed with distinction, and is returning to private life. I know we all wish him well as he has been truly one of America's most outstanding soldiers and public servants.

Mr. Noyes' column follows:

WATCHING THE WORLD—GAVIN AND U.S. POLICY ON FRANCE

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

PARIS.—President Kennedy will have no easy job in finding an Ambassador who will serve him better in Paris than James M. Gavin. Whatever differences may have existed between General Gavin and policymakers in Washington they did not compromise his effectiveness. After a rather slow start he has won many admirers here as an intelligent and conscientious Ambassador whose judgment about France has been uncommonly shrewd.

There also is considerable sympathy for his successor, whoever he may be. The problems that have grown up between France and the United States over the last 18 months have nothing to do with personalities. And despite the optimistic tone of General Gavin's letter of resignation, things are likely to get worse before they get better.

To an observer in Europe, it seems as though these problems have been caused at least in part by a change of attitude by the administration, itself. After starting off on a note of profuse affability toward Gen. Charles de Gaulle the tone of most administration leaders has become progressively colder, at times almost reaching the point of open hostility. And since this tone has been heartily reciprocated by the French it is not entirely surprising that Ambassador Gavin's job here has not been an easy one.

Nor is it simply a matter of diplomatic cordiality. With all due respect, it is not easy to accept Mr. Kennedy's judgment that the differences between France and the United States are really "at the margin of the international scene" while agreement at the center remains firm. Indeed, in many important areas the differences are great enough to strain the most settled alliance.

THE CENTRAL CHALLENGE

It is hard, for instance, to get nearer to the center of things than President de Gaulle's direct challenge to the hegemony that the United States has enjoyed in Europe since the end of the war. In every vital field—from nuclear strategy to cold war diplomacy, from the organization of the free world to the problem of dealing with neutrals—General de Gaulle has strong and peculiar views of his own. These views are making themselves felt with increasing force in Europe—often inevitably in direct conflict with policy being promoted in Washington.

The problem on which most attention has been lavished—that of France's national nuclear deterrent—is closely tied up with these broader conflicts.

General de Gaulle is determined to have his bomb, mainly because he believes that it will increase the independence, stature and influence of France as a world power. Washington has steadfastly opposed the project, mainly because it will result in a further weakening of American control over the very central issue of peace and war.

GAVIN MISREPRESENTED

General Ravin has not been, as he is sometimes represented, champion of French nuclear power. He has not been blind to the important conflicts of interest in many areas of the international scene. And he has never believed that these conflicts could be resolved by buying off General de Gaulle with nuclear aid.

If there has been a difference between General Gavin and the policymakers in Washington it has been in his reading of the future of France and Europe. He has seen that General de Gaulle's ambitions—dismissed in some quarters as mere pretension—are well on their way to being fulfilled. He has seen, too, that they have become in a large measure national ambitions which are unlikely to lose their force with General de Gaulle's disappearance from the scene.

This has led logically to a suggestion that American policy toward France should be shaped to conform with what is going to happen, instead of what certain policy planners in Washington would like to see happen. In the case of a nuclear deterrent, it seemed reasonable to suppose that a weapons system built with American cooperation could be more easily integrated into the overall Western defense than one built in defiance of Canute-like protests from Washington.

This point of view may well have caused irritation in some quarters of the administration. At the same time there are signs that the sense of what General Gavin has been saying is making some headway. And it is hard to see how his successor can do better than to report the situation as it exists.

We Are Running Out of Money So We Are Now Sending Our Jobs Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, at one time we had $30 billion worth of gold in our Nation. Because of our giveaway program, we now have about $16 billion left. If the nations of the world called in the gold that is due them, the United States of America would be "broke" with not a dollar's worth of gold; in fact, we would owe $7 billion in gold that we do not have.

Running out of money, we are now in the process of giving away the jobs of American workers. Iron ore mines are closing, one by one, and our ore is coming in from Liberia, Africa, Venezuela, and Canada.

Our plywood plants have closed and our plywood is coming in from Japan.

Our mink farmers are losing money and closing out while furs are shipped in from Red China and Russia.

Our shoe factories are closing and we are importing shoes from Czechoslovakia and Italy.

Our steel mills are running at 50 percent of capacity, and our Government is buying steel from Germany.

Our fishermen on the Great Lakes are going broke and we are importing fish from Canada.

Our farmers are barely making a living, yet we import a billion pounds of meat from Australia, Argentina, and Canada.

Our dairy farmers are going out of business and we are importing millions of dollars of dairy products.

Our shipbuilding on the Great Lakes is merely hanging on, while our Government pays subsidies to foreign shippers. American shippers are going broke, while our Government gives and loans money to countries so that can subsidize foreign ships.

All of this is part of our foreign aid program where we have run out of money and now we are giving away the jobs of American workers.

This is the cost and the penalty that the American people are paying for giving their money in building factories all over the world except within the borders of our own Nation. Just how much more are the American people going to stand of this greatest and grandest giveaway of all time?

The American people are going to get unemployment compensation and dole. The American people are going to get retraining for other jobs already in surplus. The American people are going to get $200 to move out of town. While the American people are going to get this, our jobs are going to be given all over the world. The giveaway in America has been transferred from money to the giveaway of American jobs.

I have never voted for this type of giveaway just as I never voted for the money giveaway.

New Mexico Heritage and the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call attention to an article appearing Thursday, June 28, in a newspaper from Puerto Rico, the San Juan Star. It concerns the Peace Corps representative to the Dominican Republic, Andres Hernandez, a New Mexican of Spanish ancestry. It tells of a man of humble beginning who has dedicated his life to helping his fellow man, a man with a mission and an example for those who follow. I think it is indicative of the aims of the Peace Corps, when it chooses men like Andres Hernandez to lead its projects.

The article follows:

> There are a lot of people who are alive today and tolerably independent because of Andres Hernandez. He must be 60 now. And this is to say that he approaches an age for looking back. He has no wealth, and not much of a pension coming. He does have a wife—Navajo—and he has a son in college, back in the States, in whom he has appropriate pride. His home now, as it has been since he was a young man, is a few rooms wherever his work takes him. But he is seldom in it anyway. He is out by 6, often 5, and quits work only when exhaustion compels.
>
> He has the gift of helping people to help themselves. When they catch on and begin to have the momentum that comes from getting ahead, it has always been his habit to withdraw gradually and turn to helping others. This involves more ingenuity than the casual observer can possibly imagine, because he often has to bring his clients out of the most primitive situations and show them what available techniques can do for them.
>
> This involves the whole family, and usually the environment is rural. If productivity is raised, the most ought to be made of it, Andres feels, for getting on toward new levels. If the fields yield better, it ought to show in the house; the children ought to be better nourished and educated; and they ought to grow up literally into a new world.
>
> It has been a long time since Andres has been able to do what he most likes, which is to work with individual families. There are many of them and few to help. So it has become his special job to recruit younger people, and teach them what he feels and knows, watch them pick up knowledge, con-

quer discouragement, and accept the responsibility of their mission.

For Andres, it all began back before the Great Depression. As a young man in the late twenties he wanted to be a forester. He was a New Mexican of Spanish ancestry; and in that country the forest lands were always in sight, always abused by cattlemen and sheepmen, eroding, becoming every year a less valuable public property. Foresters, working against local sentiment, harassed guardians of a public resource, seemed to have the dedication he craved.

On the high lands in northwest New Mexico, there were settlers who had been deceived by a few good years, but when the droughts returned, had found themselves in a desert made worse because they had broken the land and allowed it to blow. Besides, there came the paralysis of depression, when credit was not to be found and no relief was in sight.

But the depression created its own cure. In Washington, there was set up something called the Resettlement Administration and presently it had a southwestern office. A regional director naturally knew about the distressed farmers out on the high plains, and he borrowed Andres to see what could be done for them. Andres said, after looking into it, that there was nothing to do but give them a new start. But where? He had an idea. Down along the Rio Grande, there were rich flats grown to scrub. Using big machinery, they could be cleared and water from the river could be diverted.

The regional director approved, Washington approved, and Andres was given the job. The reconditioning took some time, and meanwhile, the families involved were taken care of where they were; but when the engineers were finished, Andres shepherded his charges into the river lands, and helped them learn irrigation farming—quite different from the dry-land cultivation they were used to. He himself learned as he went, always consulting books and experts and feeling his way. The best lesson was this—that someone could always be found who knew and some agency that would help—with a grant, a loan, with intervention higher up, or with counsel.

His families in business and on their own, there was another project for him to do, then another, and so it went. He changed agencies, as the Government reorganized itself; but he could always find people to be rehabilitated and some agency anxious to help.

When the Peace Corps first began to be talked about by Kennedy, he regarded it as hopelessly unpractical, just the wrong way to go about the job he knew so well. But when the Democrats won, it did seem to him that foreign aid would now become what he had been hoping it would. He went to Washington to see. But the same people seemed to be running it with the same ineptness as before, and he gave up the idea. But when, somewhat later, the Alliance for Progress was announced, he tried again.

He was a man of experience in Latin America, a gifted teacher and leader, as many old associates were ready to testify. So, after investigating and hesitating, the AID offered him a post in Iran. He went to the Peace Corps reluctantly; but they were new; and their bureaucracy was not yet hardened and suspicious. They sent him to Santo Domingo.

And there he is now, a man with a mission, and if anything good is done in that confused country with American funds, Andres Hernandez will very likely be the one who has persuaded someone to do it that way. They probably will not want to; but he will gently insist; if necessary, he will go over their heads. In his regard, they are unimportant. It is the people who need help that he is investing the rest of his life in. When the medals are given out, Andres ought to have one. But it is not often that they go to the quiet heroes. And those of us who know him have none to award. Still, he lives in a thousand renewed lives; and that seems to be all he wants.

Whose history does this remind you of? Yes, it reminds me of the same one.

VA's Chief: He Does Business With 22 Million Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Sunday Star of August 5, 1962, carried a very interesting feature article on Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., head of the Veterans' Administration, written by Mr. Emerson Beauchamp, a contributing writer for the Star. The article takes us through a day in the life of the VA's chief executive and I am sure it is agreed that Mr. Gleason's schedule, like many in Washington, is a vigorous one but rewarding in the sense of important accomplishments.

The article follows:

VA's Chief: He Does Business With 22 Million Veterans

(By Emerson Beauchamp)

The biggest businessman in the country is pro-Kennedy. The President gave him his job.

He is John S. Gleason, Jr., head of the Federal Government's largest independent agency, the Veterans' Administration.

As Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Gleason is boss of:

1. The largest medical program in the country, with 171 hospitals and 92 clinics.

2. The third largest life insurance program, with 6 million policyholders carrying $40 billion in coverage.

3. An educational program which has helped put 10.2 million veterans through school; a compensation and pension program that pays out $3.5 billion a year, and home, farm and business loans which have totaled $53 billion.

All told, Mr. Gleason and his 170,000 employees do business with 22.3 million veterans and their dependents—45 percent of the Nation's population.

HE'S AN ELBOW-GRABBER

The VA Chief, a Chicago banker on leave, is 47 years old. Short and stocky, he has white hair with only a few streaks of black left, a ruddy face and the bearing of a general, which he is. When he reads, he wears halfmoon-shaped glasses over a pair of piercing eyes. When he talks at close range, he's an arm puncher and an elbow grabber.

Spending a day with him is a grueling experience. The pace is swift and the timing tends to be split-second.

One recent day, Mr. Gleason left his house in nearby Maryland at 8:15 a.m., bounded into his air-conditioned, chauffeur-driven Cadillac and unfolded a morning paper as the car slipped out of the neighborhood and into the rush-hour traffic on East-West Highway.

The chauffeur, a good one, fought the battle of Sixteenth Street skillfully, and at 8:45 the Cadillac rolled up in front of the VA building at Vermont Avenue and H Street NW.

Mr. Gleason walked swiftly inside, took the elevator to the 10th floor, and pushed open an unmarked door. He nodded to his two secretaries and marched into his office, a large, softly lighted and carpeted room with a sweeping penthouse view of Lafayette Park, the White House, and the Washington Monument.

COFFEE FIRST, THEN WORK

Sitting down in the deep leather chair behind his glass-topped desk, he swung around, punched an intercom button and asked for a cup of coffee. Then he went to work.

On the desk was a folder full of photoreproductions of letters received the day before from Members of Congress and the White House. The originals had gone to the appropriate VA sections, where replies would be prepared for the Administrator's signature.

"I have intercom buttons for all 21 section heads," Mr. Gleason explained. "I call a few every morning as I go through the congressional mail. Nobody knows whether or not he's going to be called." In other words, it keeps the boys on the ball.

He proceeded to punch buttons and ask questions. A Senator was putting in a good word for a constituent to fill a rumored VA vacancy in his State. Another Senator was relaying a complaint about the treatment a veteran had received at a field office. The White House had a query with a deadline 3 days hence for a reply.

At 9 o'clock, four top aids came in for a daily briefing. The day's topics included a proposed land swap with a city where the VA wants to build a hospital, the burial contracts the VA makes with undertakers and the reaction of a newspaper on the matter of a hospital the VA wants to close.

In between, there was more intercom button pushing: A call to the information director to tell him not to mail out an unflattering picture ("I look like I'm crocked"), a half-serious opinion from the general counsel that the prayer that opens the Administrator's weekly staff meeting was legal, a query to a section chief about an official in the field who had attacked a veterans' organization ("Is he cracking up down there?").

At 10 o'clock, since it was Wednesday, it was time for the hour-long weekly staff meeting. Mr. Gleason and the four aids trooped into a conference room and sat down at a big table with the heads of the 21 VA sections. Some of them had things to talk about, others kept silent. The agenda included legislation to give a pension to World War I veterans, VA research on lung cancer ("I see everybody's stopped smoking," Mr. Gleason remarked), plans for new hospitals, and drug purchases (the VA is the world's biggest buyer).

A BRIEFING SESSION

Promptly at 11, Mr. Gleason was back in his office to receive a model-and-blueprint briefing on another new hospital. Then he hopped once more into the elevator and went down to meet the waiting Cadillac for a trip to Capitol Hill and one of his frequent meetings with Chairman Teague of the House Veterans Affairs Committee at his office in the Old House Office Building.

The conference broke up shortly after 12, just in time for a 12:15 luncheon date with Representative Mack, Democrat, of Illinois. Lunch wasn't over until nearly 1:30, and another congressional appointment was scheduled at 2, but Mr. Gleason headed back to his office anyway. "Time for a couple of phone calls," he explained.

At 1:55 Mr. Gleason jumped back into the Cadillac and rode off to see Representative Fogarty, Democrat, of Rhode Island, in the new House Office Building.

By 3 o'clock Mr. Gleason was back in his office, buzzing for the next caller on his schedule, a VA chaplain. At 3:30 Mr. Gleason buzzed his secretary and called, "How about the mail?" Right on schedule.

The 9 a.m. delegation reappeared and the mail signing began. The Administrator, all business now, scanned some letters, read others more carefully and asked a question from time to time between signatures.

BOSS OF 85TH DIVISION

Mr. Gleason had a 4:30 appointment with a White House aid, but he was told that this man had been delayed at the Capitol. So when mail signing ended at 4:25, the group moved into an adjoining room to watch the last 5 minutes of the President's press conference on TV. Then it was time to be off to the White House.

After that, Mr. Gleason went back to his office and mopped up odds and ends until his wife, Mary Jane, arrived from home to join him at a Disabled American Veterans reception that evening.

Every 2 weeks the schedule gets a little more frenetic when Mr. Gleason becomes Maj. Gen. Gleason, commander of the 85th Infantry Division, Army Reserve, in Illinois. ("When the President asked me if I wanted this job I told him I did, provided I didn't have to give up my Army command.")

Every other Tuesday night, Mr. Gleason boards a plane for Chicago at 5:30 p.m., has dinner aboard, and arrives in Chicago in time to be met by a staff car and to attend drill with one of his division's units. He spends Wednesday on VA business (the VA's Hines Hospital, one of the largest, and electronic data processing headquarters are in Chicago) and holds a Wednesday night meeting with his division headquarters staff. He's back on a plane at 11 o'clock, arriving in Washington about 2 a.m. Thursday.

HIS "FRONTIER" CREDENTIALS

Mr. Gleason is on leave from the First National Bank of Chicago where he has been a vice president since 1955. A native of Chicago, he started at the bank as a messenger after attending the University of Notre Dame and the Harvard Graduate School of Business. His father was a vice president of the same bank.

He interrupted his banking career in 1940 to enlist in the Army as a private and finished the war as a lieutenant colonel after combat duty in the Pacific.

Mr. Gleason was national commander of the American Legion in 1957–58. He was head of veterans' affairs for the Kennedy presidential campaign in 1960.

Despite his banker background, Mr. Gleason's New Frontier credentials are formidable. He's young as bureaucrats go, he went to Harvard and he's hooked on touch football, which he plays in the backyard with his six sons (6 to 18 years) when the weather's suitable.

The Improved Philippine War Damage Claims Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 9 of this year I regretted that I had no alternative but to join my colleagues in defeating H.R. 8617 which aimed at completing payments due on outstanding war damage claims in the Philippines. I opposed H.R. 8617 not because it would have benefited some Filipinos, but rather because it was a weak bill and did not include sufficient safeguards against large windfall profits accruing to undeserving claimants.

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, which initiated the payment of these war claims, contained very specific requirements that the funds we provided would either compensate those who had already rehabilitated their damaged property or else—when such previous investment was not feasible—those who committed themselves to reinvesting the amount they received in such a way as to benefit the Philippine economy. Section 104(c) of the 1946 act reads:

> All of the provisions of this title shall be subject to the requirement that, to the fullest extent practicable, the Commission shall require that the lost or damaged property be rebuilt, replaced, or repaired before payments of money are actually made to claimants under this title: *Provided,* That if the Commission determines it is impossible for any reason beyond the control of the claimant, or is impractical to rebuild, replace, or repair the lost or damaged property, the Commission may make payment to the claimant without making said requirement; *Provided, however,* That as a condition to the making of such payment, the Commission shall require that the whole of such payment shall be reinvested in such manner as will further the rehabilitation or economic development of the Philippines; *And provided further,* That nothing in this subsection shall preclude the partial payment of claims as the rebuilding, replacing, or repairing of the property progresses.

The basic weakness of H.R. 8617 was that it waived this requirement, except for those now living outside the Philippines. By not assuring that the funds actually were related to the development of the Philippine economy, the way was left open for certain interests to obtain windfall cash payments.

The new Philippine war claims bill, H.R. 11721, corrects this deficiency and requires that "all payments under this act in amounts over 25,000 pesos—about $6,400—or equivalent value in dollars shall be subject to the provisions of section 104(c) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946." This amendment assures that the larger claimants have invested or will invest sums equal to the amount they will receive under this act in the rehabilitation and economic development of the islands.

Another way that the bill has been strengthened has been by a reduction in the time allowed the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission for the completion of the payments. In the earlier debate some of the Members feared that its affairs might drag on indefinitely. H.R. 11721 requires that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission wind up its operations under this legislation within 2 years and 60 days after final passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Foreign Affairs Committee took the trouble to bring out an improved bill during this session, particularly since some misunderstandings resulted from our earlier action. Passage of H.R. 11721 gives us an opportunity to demonstrate to the Filipinos that our previous defeat of H.R. 8617 was in no way a manifestation of any ill-will or lack of appreciation of our just debt to them. Because this new bill answers the reservations I held concerning the poorly conceived H.R. 8617, I am happy to add my support to H.R. 11721.

Consumers in the Free Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include for the benefit of the Members of this body an editorial, "Consumers in the Free Market," appearing in the Federation News of August 4, 1962, edited by my good friend, Irwin E. Klass and published in Illinois by the Chicago Federation of Labor and Industrial Union Council.

I am sure every consumer at times feels more like a victim than a victor in the so-called free market. The philosophy of "caveat emptor" has not yet been extinguished and until such time as it is there will be the necessity to protect the consumer's interest by rules and regulations.

CONSUMERS IN THE FREE MARKET

We have been bombarded lately by parcels of literature pointing to the free, untrammeled market as the way to the good life. The theme of these works is "individualism." The sovereign in this kingdom is the consumer, whose taste and judgment is supposed to rule the productive system.

The theory goes something like this: the economic system is designed to meet people's needs. Demands for goods and services encouraged their production. The consumer makes a choice from competing products on the basis of price and quality. If an industry is very profitable it will attract labor and investment. Competition will then bring the price down.

The State is supposed to keep out of this tussle.

One sympathetic book reviewer, writing in the Wall Street Journal, says the "consumer is anything but passive, wooden, susceptible to the commands and wiles of the hidden persuaders and wastemakers. * * * The consumer is the director of production, deciding what shall be made and who shall make it, designating which corporations shall survive and which shall perish."

Feel strong, fellow consumer? We don't. This theory is based on complete rejection of any action by the state to regulate the economy, except to act as some kind of an umpire in the competitive struggle to satisfy consumer demand, without the referee's authority to throw violators of the rules out of the game. Chastisement must be exercised with caution, in the form of speeches on business ethics, but let the law do nothing to hamper what's called the dynamics of economic growth, namely, big and bigger business.

In what stage in history did we have "perfect" competition? And why should all forms of direct or indirect intervention in the economic process be labeled by economists as the "nemesis of productivity and freedom"?

Yes—consumers have some power of choice, but do they have the knowledge to distinguish between the pill that cures and the prescription that maims? The tragic story of the drug that mutilates the unborn results from an attempt by a firm to get its product in use ahead of the competition without proper testing. Only the "intrusion" of a skilled and knowledgeable doctor in a Government agency brought the terrible story to public attention. There's a frantic search for and count of pills, with no penalties to the firm that channeled its product into the market.

The consumer is king? Not yet. We'll feel that our choices are meaningful after the newly formed President's Consumers' Advisory Council has been tested in action. Will this unit be drowned before it grows to maturity by the flood of attacks from spokesmen for the "free" market—where the consumer reigns—provided he doesn't ask too many questions?

Netherlands, Indonesia Agree To End West New Guinea Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent news of the Netherlands-Indonesian preliminary agreement which amicably resolves the West New Guinea controversy heartens all peace-loving peoples in the world and reaffirms the valuable role played by the United Nations as an agency for the peaceful settlement of disputes. The following article from the Washington Post summarizes this important agreement:

NETHERLANDS, INDONESIA AGREE TO END WEST NEW GUINEA FIGHT

(By Warren Unna)

The Netherlands and Indonesia have reached a preliminary agreement on a peacefull settlement of their long-festering dispute over West New Guinea, Acting U.N. Secretary General U Thant announced last night at the United Nations.

The agreement, and the end of the threat of a serious war between the two nations, granted Indonesia her desire to take over administration of West New Guinea from the Dutch and the Netherlands her desire to give West New Guinea's 700,000 Papuans a chance to decide some day on their own whom they want to belong to.

The agreement also marked a personal triumph for Ellsworth Bunker, former U.S. Ambassador to India. Bunker served as special moderator for U Thant in the dispute.

PERSUADED RIVALS TO TALK

Bunker first persuaded Indonesia and the Netherlands to sit down and talk things out last March; watched them quickly disperse and step up military skirmishes against each other; and then got them back into the serious negotiations which began July 12 and finally reached an amicable climax yesterday.

The agreement, the outgrowth of a formula originally proposed by Bunker, provides that:

U.N. administrators, perhaps 80 to 100, will begin replacing the Dutch as soon as the agreement is formally signed.

Indonesian administrators will begin replacing those from the United Nations next May 1.

In 1969, the Indonesians, under tight U.N. supervision, will give West New Guinea's Papuan population a plebiscite in which they will be allowed to decide whether they want to stay with the Netherlands, join Indonesia, or become independent.

The agreement also paves the way for a resumption of the long-broken diplomatic relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands and for the working out of future currency problems, credits and outside financial assistance to a territory which now sops up some $30 million a year in Dutch administrative funds.

INDONESIA FIRST TO AGREE

Under the original Bunker formula, there was to be a 12-month transition from Dutch to U.N. administration; a 12-month transition from U.N. to Indonesian administration; and a plebiscite within a reasonable time—perhaps 5 to 10 years.

The Indonesians agreed to the Bunker formula when it was first put forth last March. The Dutch, thwarted by domestic political opposition, didn't come around until last month. Then Indonesia raised the ante and demanded that the Indonesian flag be hoisted over West New Guinea "by the time the cock crows next January 1."

The Dutch then compromised on the length of the transition periods while the Indonesians compromised on their original demand that the U.N. role—both as transition administrators and plebiscite supervisors—be only a symbolic one.

Indonesian Foreign Minister Subandrio, who took part in the final sessions at their hideaway site on a Middleburg, Va., estate, flew up to the United Nations headquarters yesterday afternoon for a talk with U Thant and then departed for Djakarta to report back to Indonesian President Sukarno.

Netherlands Ambassador to the United States J. T. van Roijen conferred with Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday afternoon and is preparing to fly back to the Netherlands today to brief his government.

SIGNING IN 2 WEEKS

Van Roijen and Indonesian Ambassador to the Soviet Union Adam Malik, his country's chief negotiator in the discussions, are expected to get together again to work out financial and technical details before Subandrio returns to the United Nations for the formal signing, perhaps in another 2 weeks.

For Indonesia, the ousting of the Dutch from West New Guinea brings a victory to President Sukarno, who had used the issue as a rallying cry as his country struggled with its many political and economic difficulties.

For the Netherlands, the settlement brings a chance to resume profitable economic relations with their old East Indies colony, and perhaps compensation for the estimated $1 billion in Dutch assets which Sukarno's government seized.

For the United States and the United Nations, the settlement avoids a military skirmish which might eventually have drawn in both the United States and the Soviet Union.

Spain's Struggle Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the mid-1930's Spain was in political, economic, and social turmoil. In this confusion a leftwing, Communist-oriented group under the name Popular Front came into power early in 1936. This popular front government seemed determined to rule Spain with an iron hand, and in many of its moves, aims, and tactics the people detected the hands of Moscow-trained and Kremlin-oriented communism. In the course of a few months many churches, seminaries, monastic establishments and other public institutions were set on fire. General and partial strikes were rampant, and a veritable chaos broke loose. The country was in a serious crisis while Communist elements were working feverishly for securing a firm foothold there. Great numbers of the people, and certain key leaders became aware of the serious situation, and began their fight against their government, which turned out to be their long and successful fight against the agents of communism.

This historic and epoch-making revolt, this beginning of the Spanish Civil War in July of 1936, was the first real fight of a people in Western Europe against communism. This was not just a civil war in which Spaniards fighting Spaniards, but it was an ideological war in which great world forces were arrayed against each other. Today, 26 years after the beginning of that fight, and on the 23d year after its successful conclusion, we salute the freedom-loving and gallant people of Spain.

Long Historic Friendship Between American and Spanish Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, ancient Spain, occupied for 800 years by the Moors, was a land where Moslem and Jewish philosophers transmitted to Christian Europe the heritage of the ancient world. The cities of Granada, Cordoba, and Seville are known today as symbols of the intellectual and cultural heritage of their country. The Christian reconquest of Spain at the turn of the 16th century marked the start of an era in which the Spanish nation played a remarkably important part in the growth of Christian belief. The attachment to catholicism provided the basis for the historic unity of a great nation. This was also the era of discovery and exploration, in which Spain became known as the discoverer of new worlds, the ruler of an imperial domain the like of which the world had never seen, the symbol of a civilization which at one time was a world civilization. The exploits of Spain's explorers, like the philosophical and religious contributions of its thinkers, demonstrated the greatness of Spain to the world. Art and architecture unmatched anywhere contributed to the splendor of Spanish culture during the Middle Ages.

Spain was among the first of the European states to develop a modern army and administrative system. During the last two centuries, it has been a land in flux, a land in which abrupt changes in governments and forms of government contrasted with the historic continuity of the Spanish nation. This process reached a tragic climax during the thirties, when internal differences resulted in civil war. The Spanish Civil War of 26 years ago marked the first great setback to international communism.

In recent years, relations between Spain and the United States have been based on close cooperation between the two Governments. Negotiations between representatives of the two countries resulted in arrangements, concluded in 1953, for the building of U.S. Air Force and naval bases on Spanish soil, for the granting of economic aid to Spain, and for the modernization of the Spanish armed forces with American help. The American policy of seeking close relations with our Spanish ally is not a question of party politics. When Secretary of State Dean Rusk, speaking during a recent visit to Madrid, praised the Spanish Government for its efforts in defense of the Western alliance, he was reaffirming a policy which had been stated many times by the late John Foster Dulles. We are now in a period in which both Spain and the United States are deeply engaged in rising to the challenges of the modern world. The historic friendship between the Spanish and American peoples will ease the burden facing both nations.

The Facts and Fannie Mae

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, for 7 years the Special Subcommittee on Government Information has been criticizing unjustifiable restrictions on Government information. For 7 years newspapermen, scientists, Members of Congress, and Government employees have brought their complaints about excessive secrecy to the subcommittee. During that period the subcommittee has reported its successes and failures regularly to the House Government Operations Committee under the guidance of Chairman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois. Our reports have criticized continuing restrictions and complimented those Government officials who cut down excessive secrecy.

Too often, those in the press who brought us complaints about restrictions did nothing to record the actions of the Government officials who put into practice a belief that the people have a right to know the facts of Government. News stories, after all, are made up of controversy—the bad is criticized, the good ignored. Such is not the case, however, with David Kraslow, an award-winning member of the Knight newspapers Washington staff.

Reporter Kraslow was refused the facts about foreclosure fees paid to local lawyers by the Federal National Mortgage Association. He demanded to know the legal authority for the refusal, and he went over the head of FNMA to Dr. Robert Weaver, the Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which is the parent organization of FNMA. He also informed the subcommittee of his problems, but before the subcommittee could act Dr. Weaver acted.

The moment he learned of the refusal, Dr. Weaver reversed the lower level decision. He ordered the facts spread on the record. Dr. Weaver's action is symptomatic of the top-level attitude in Washington today—an attitude that public business is the public's business. Unfortunately, it seems difficult for that attitude to trickle down through the middle Government levels. Dave Kraslow's insistence on going to the top, and his decision to write the story of Dr. Weaver's decision, are the kind of actions which will speed the trickle. Following is Dave Kraslow's story.

A MATTER OF PUBLIC BUSINESS

J. Stanley Baughman is an important official. He is President and a member of the Board of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Fannie Mae, as the FNMA is known, is a big business. It handles billions of dollars' worth of mortgages, the bulk of them on FHA and VA-financed homes.

Fannie Mae is not a private business. It is a Corporation of the U.S. Government. This makes Fannie Mae public business.

These are not profound observations, but somehow they seem beyond the grasp of Mr. Baughman.

He believes the public is not entitled to know how much Fannie Mae pays individual lawyers to process mortgage foreclosures on Government-financed homes.

"That is a private matter," says this public official.

The Miami Herald asked Baughman for the names of the attorneys now representing Fannie Mae in Miami on foreclosures and for the amounts paid them since their appointments.

Baughman identified the lawyers and gave the dates of their appointments, but would not budge on disclosing the fees.

Fannie Mae employs private attorneys on its foreclosure cases throughout the country. They are selected, usually in automatic rotation, from an approved list in Fannie Mae headquarters.

This is a little known area of political patronage. The list changes with each administration.

When Baughman was asked to cite the legal grounds on which he based his refusal, he referred the reporter to Fannie Mae's full-time legal advisers.

One of them said the refusal was based on a criminal statute and on "general policy" of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. (Other authorities later said the cited law was designed to prevent disclosure by Government employees of income tax returns and trade secrets.)

The HHFA is Fannie Mae's parent organization. It is headed by Dr. Robert Weaver, who also is Chairman of the Board of Fannie Mae.

Weaver differs with Baughman on the distinction between private and public business. Fortunately, Weaver is Baughman's boss.

The reporter's appeal to Weaver's office brought quick results. The requested information was ordered released.

"There's no reason in the world why it shouldn't be available to the public," a spokesman for Weaver said.

And that is the story behind the publication of the following information:

Henry Arrington, appointed by Fannie Mae on May 5, 1961, received $3,550 in fees during the fiscal year ending June 30.

The law firm of Pallott, Marks, Lundeen, Pappell & Horwich, appointed May 5, 1961, received $8,340.

Arthur Maseey, July 27, 1961, $8,191.48.

Marvin S. Cassel, May 11, 1961, $9,800.

Leon Levin, May 10, 1961, $11,950.

Julius I. Friedman, August 24, 1961, $7,010.

Ernest N. Stamey, May 21, 1962, no fees received during the remaining 6 weeks of the fiscal year.

The standard Fannie Mae fee in Miami for a routine court foreclosure is $250.

There were 15,500 Fannie Mae foreclosures in the Nation in fiscal 1962 and the legal fees totaled more than $1,400,000.

Of that, $317,489.47 went to Florida lawyers. This was the highest amount of all States.

Thank you, Dr. Weaver.

Aid to Depressed Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Grace S. Cesario, of Derby, Conn., one of my constituents, has written a letter to the Ladies' Home Journal which the Journal has considered important enough to print. I agree with the judgment of the editors of this national magazine, and I wish to include herewith Mrs. Cesario's letter because it states succinctly and graphically the problem which a great number of our American families face in financing a college education for their children.

JUNE 5, 1962.

"OUR READERS WRITE US,"
Ladies' Home Journal,
Curtis Publishing Co.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR EDITOR: Sidney Margolius' "The Cheapest Way To Go to College" in the June Journal states that three groups—girls, minorities, and low-income families—are threatened with being barred from a college education. I think Mr. Margolius has overlooked the group that is threatened more than any other—the middle income group.

It has become the same with higher education as with medical care; you can get the best if you're either very rich or very poor. It's the in-betweens who must settle for second- or third-best, or nothing at all.

These families have incomes too high to qualify for scholarships based on need; yet they are not high enough to accommodate the phenomenal costs of a college education. My husband and I have a combined income before taxes of $12,000, and are paying $145 per month (it was $175 until last February) to cover tuition, board, and room for our son under an installment loan from a Boston bank. This does not include transportation costs, laundry, or spending money for him.

Last year we applied for a loan under the National Defense Act, and after laying our souls open to inspection (it felt like applying for relief) we were granted $200. This year we're not going to apply at all; it isn't worth it when the total cost is $2,500 per year.

Another point to keep in mind is this: Many of us in our forties and fifties are also burdened with the support of aging parents who worked for the most part before the advent of social security benefits; thus we're in the middle of an economic bind with the money running out both ends.

There is a form of practical assistance which is both workable and based on ratio to income. Under its provisions, parents who are putting children through college would be given an additional income tax exemption to cover costs of tuition. There are several such proposals now before the House Ways and Means Committee, but nothing seems to come of them.

Why not?

Mrs. James Cesario.
(Mrs. J. C.)

Derby, Conn.

Col. Marvin L. Jacobs, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, Col. Marvin L. Jacobs, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, who served as district engineer at Memphis for 3 years beginning August 1, 1959, retired from military service on July 31.

Colonel Jacobs, who was born March 15, 1915, at Hagerstown, Md., entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., in June of 1936, graduating in the class of 1940. He was commissioned in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and served his first assignment at Fort Belvoir, Va. During World War II he served in the European theater of operations where he was wounded and for which he received the Purple Heart. In 1945, he attended the Army's Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. His next assignment was as executive officer and later training publications officer at Manhattan Engineer District, Sandia Base, N. Mex. He received his master's degree in civil engineering at the University of Illinois in 1949. Colonel Jacobs served in the Canal Zone, first as executive officer to the assistant engineer of maintenance, and then as military assistant to the Governor of the Canal Zone. From 1952 to 1955, he served as professor of military science and tactics at Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute, Ind. In 1955 he was assigned as an engineer brigade commander in Japan, and in 1957 as strategic planner on the Pacific Joint Staff in Hawaii. He began his last military assignment in 1959 as district engineer, U.S. Army Engineer District, Memphis.

It was as district engineer at Memphis that I met Colonel Jacobs and came to recognize him as one of the finest officers and gentlemen it has ever been my pleasure to know. I worked closely with him in the development of flood control and drainage improvement work along the Mississippi River and along the West Tennessee tributaries. I saw him in action in his own office, in public hearings before the Mississippi River Commission and in meetings with groups concerned with and interested in flood control and drainage matters, and I speak from my own knowledge and observation when I say that Colonel Jacobs did an outstanding service to his country, the U.S. Army and the Corps of Engineers during his tenure as district engineer at Memphis, where his stature as an engineer, his purposefulness, his sincerity, and his integrity won a host of friends for the Corps of Engineers, as well as highest respect for their work. The fact that he will remain in Memphis as director of development for Memphis State University is further testimony to his qualities of character and person. I pay tribute, too, to Colonel Jacobs' wonderful family—his wife, the former Mary Ryerson of Highland Park, N.Y.; his daughter, Miss Anne Jacobs; and his fine young son, Roy.

Colonel Jacobs' retirement is a loss to the military service he served so long and so faithfully, and he well merits the Army's Certificate of Appreciation and the Commendation Ribbon presented to him on his retirement by Maj. Gen. Ellsworth I. Davis, president of the Mississippi River Commission and division engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, Lower Mississippi Valley, Vicksburg, Miss.

On May 18 there appeared an editorial in the Commercial Appeal, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, the following editorial:

Jacobs and Growing MSU

Facing the necessities of the present and looking ahead to the problems of future expansion, Memphis State University President C. C. Humphreys has created a new position: director of development.

It is pleasing to note that the man chosen to fill this job from the start is Col. Marvin L. Jacobs. Colonel Jacobs, district engineer for the U.S. Army Engineer district, Memphis, already is a highly respected figure in the community. We are happy that in his retirement from the Army he will remain here to contribute further to the mushrooming growth of MSU.

Only 47, his outlook is youthfully vigorous and progressive. But as background he has many years of valuable experience in the administration of project developments. This is experience which should redound to the benefit of MSU in the busy years ahead.

Paul Flowers is an outstanding columnist of the Commercial Appeal. We in the Midsouth look forward to reading his column every day. He has done and is continuing to do an outstanding job in writing such a fine column. His August 3 column on Colonel Jacobs follows:

Paul Flowers' Greenhouse

Here are tardy, but none the less sincere, words of hail and farewell to Col. Marvin L. Jacobs, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, retired as of July 31, now professor.

As he has commanded operations designed to guide and keep the Mississippi in paths of righteousness (no floods and an always 9-foot channel for great cargoes), now he turns to another challenging task, that of guiding young human minds into constructive channels.

Colonel-Professor Jacobs' new job is the bigger one. Mighty as the river is, the human intellect is mightier, and one brain—remember Eads—can harness nature's wildest power for the use and benefit of mankind.

May you always have plenty of water under your bottom in this second career, Marvin; may reference points and lines always be precise; may your charts be accurate and your computations to the last final decimal up to infinity.

May you leave your imprint on the human heart and spirit even as you have on the Father of Waters.

Tribute to an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, so often the newspapers fail to note the good works of this Congress and are eager to print criticism.

I was most heartened this past Sunday, August 5, 1962, in reading the fine editorial of the Tablet, praising a great man, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and including therein the House resolution expressing the thanks and the appreciation of the Congress and the American people to General MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial entitled "Tribute to an American":

Tribute to an American

There has never been any doubt in the mind of the average citizen of either Gen. Douglas MacArthur's great achievements or of the debt the Nation owes to him.

Yet, as far as the official record is concerned, it was only last week that the hero of war and postwar periods in the Far East was taken off what some have called a Government blacklist. The official record had this distinguished military leader listed ever since 1951 as an officer removed from all command for alleged insubordination. President Truman had relieved him from active command because he sought to win the Korean war by direct attack on the Chinese Reds who were killing his—our—soldiers. The brilliant general was called home and a committee of Congress held an investigation but came to no final conclusion. Yet the stigma against his name remained.

Ever since, General MacArthur has lived in retirement. Many of those who served under him, distinguished leaders as well as the patriotic press have not forgotten his remarkable acts of personal bravery and skillful command and have felt that the Nation should be reminded in a formal way of those contributions. It had been a delicate subject to raise with some because of the old political controversy. But Representative L. Mendel Rivers, of South Carolina, never gave up. He succeeded a few years ago in getting a resolution before a committee of Congress but could not get it to the floor for action. This time, however, he was successful. Chairman Carl Vinson, of the House Armed Services Committee, and Speaker John McCormack, gave permission to have the resolution brought up. Passed unanimously, it reads as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives* (*the Senate concurring*), That the thanks and appreciation of the Congress and the American people are hereby tendered to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur in recognition of his outstanding devotion to the American people, his brilliant leadership during and following World War II, and the unsurpassed affection held for him by the people of the Republic of the Philippines which has done so much to strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of that nation and the people of the United States."

In the formal report of the House Armed Services Committee submitted by Representative Rivers to the House, a detailed account of General MacArthur's record was given from the time he graduated from West Point in 1903 at the head of his class, paying an eloquent tribute to his character and achievements.

Congress does well in revealing, officially, what Douglas MacArthur did for his country. His record is one of devotion to America a record that will not die nor fade away.

Frank Xavier Veit, Alameda County, Calif., Superior Court Chief Clerk Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding public servant, Mr. Frank Xavier Veit, of Alameda County, Calif., recently retired as chief clerk of the superior courts of the county.

Mr. Veit has an outstanding record of nearly 36 years of service in the public interest including a distinguished tour of duty with the Army in France during World War I. Frank Veit was the recipient of numerous congratulatory messages and comments.

Since I feel we too often take for granted the loyal service of public employees, I am pleased to insert in the Congressional Record articles exemplary of the recognition being extended to this faithful county employee.

[From the International Molders' and Allied Workers' Journal, May 1962]

WEST COAST MEMBER RETIRES FROM COUNTY POSITION

(By Edward F. Wulf, editor)

Those of you who are ardent readers of the Journal will recall that back in 1957 a couple of articles appeared in our publication written by that genius with a pen—Frank X. Veit, member of local union No. 164, San Francisco, Calif.

In particular, his stirring article in Februrary 1957, "Thoughts on Labor, 1861–1957," is unsurpassed for its truth and straightforwardness. His comments on the phony stand by the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act are worth repeating. In it he said, "The right to join or not to join a labor union is not the real issue. They (sponsors and advocates of Taft-Hartley) wish participation of the nonmembers equally with the membership of organized labor in the benefits, working conditions, wages and other compensations established by the membership of labor unions through collective bargaining, without the nonmembers sharing equally with the members in maintaining the obligations and burdens which are necessary to maintain labor unions. In this way, they feel that eventually, enough of the people will quit the unions to cause them to disintegrate.

"In numbers there is strength and security. * * * Without 100 percent organization in a plant, there is no real effective collective bargaining power. There is a fundamental and sound principle of law that says, 'all laws must be equally applicable and obligatory upon all, and he that takes the benefit shall bear the burden.' In accordance with that fundamental and sound principle of law, it follows with, 'no person has the right to participate in the benefits, working conditions, wages and compensation established by collective bargaining, without also participation equally in the obligations as a member of a labor union.'"

We only wish more workers in America had the same vision Frank Veit has carried with him down through the years.

Brother Veit was born in Erie, Pa., and went to work when he was only 10 years old. He educated himself by putting in many hours of study each day following many hours of manual labor and, in a few years, the "book learning" he gained through his thirst for knowledge paid off in a job that kept him in the Alameda County (Calif.) courthouse for 35 years. We're getting a little ahead of our story, so let's go back a bit.

At the age of 16, Frank arrived in Newark, Calif., and went to work as an apprentice in the Wedgewood Stove Foundry. He became a journeyman molder and in February 1913, was initiated into Local Union No. 164, I.M. & A.W.U., San Francisco, Calif. He worked at the trade for 18 years before taking a county civil service examination for court clerk.

It was while both were employed by the Wedgewood Stove Foundry that our International President William A. Lazzerini became acquainted with Brother Veit—an acquaintanceship which has been long and sincere.

As a delegate from his local union he attended the convention of the international union, held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1923; he represented our union several times at the stove and heater conferences, and he served his local union in many other capacities during his 18 years of active service. We say "active service" because his membership in the I.M. & A.W.U. is still very "active," with more than 49 years of active dues-paying membership. He could have drawn a life membership card 4 years ago but preferred to continue paying his monthly dues.

On December 13, 1926, with pen in hand, Brother Veit took up the duties of county court clerk of Alameda County, Calif. He became its chief court clerk in 1946. Through these years, it is reported, Frank Veit has inscribed the fullest, smooth minutes on record in Alameda County. They include court adjournments on memorable occasions such as the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, on April 12, 1945, and the appointment of Earl Warren as Justice of the Supreme Court, on October 5, 1953, by President Dwight Eisenhower.

Brother Veit's many records include the county's longest civil trial, the longest will in local history, and the court's most unique will—a block of pavement upon which an architect scrawled his testament in builder's chalk when he was suddenly stricken by a heart attack.

During the First World War, Brother Veit served in the field artillery, in France. Being a charter member of Washington Township Post 195, American Legion, he has served in various State and local positions. For 39 years he has been post adjutant-finance officer.

Frank has reached the compulsory retirement age, 70, and must lay down his pen, as far as the courthouse in Alameda County is concerned. But we hope he never loses the art of conveying his thoughts to our readers through the pages of the Journal. His approach to and his personal convictions on the needs of labor are echoed by each one who has distinguished himself as a union member and has his fellow worker's needs at heart. Brother Veit's ability to capture these thoughts and put them on paper is something which everyone would like to be capable of doing.

Frank, a bachelor, makes his home with his sister, Mrs. Josephine Doorley, in Newark, Calif. We wish him many years of happy retirement and good health. Keep the letters and articles coming, Frank. We know now that you are retired, you'll have more time to correspond.

SUPERIOR COURT, STATE OF
CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA,
Oakland, March 29, 1962.

Mr. FRANK X. VEIT,
Deputy County Clerk,
Courthouse, Oakland, Calif.

DEAR FRANK: The judges of the superior court of Alameda County wish to congratulate you upon your retirement after 36 years of faithful service to the county and its citizens.

You have served for a longer time than any of us and your conduct and zeal have not only been exemplary but have served as an inspiration to all who are, like you, devoted to the service of the public. We will indeed miss your wisdom and counsel and we join in wishing you many happy years of the leisure which you so well deserve.

Cordially yours,

Folger Emerson, Presiding Superior Court Judge; Superior Court Judges: S. Victor Wagler, A. J. Woolsey, Charles Wade Snook, Donald K. Quayle, Thomas J. Ledvich, Cecil Mosbacher (Lady Judge), Marvin Sherwin, Richard H. Chamberlain, Allen G. Norris, Thomas W. Caldecott, William J. McGuiness, Monroe Friedman, Leonard Dieden, Lewis E. Lercara, John J. Purchio, Lyle E. Cook, Redmond C. Staats, Jr.

[From the Oakland Tribune, Apr. 1, 1962]

FRANK VEIT, CHIEF COURT CLERK, ENDS 35 YEARS IN COUNTY JOB

(By Havelock Hunter)

Frank Xavier Veit's courthouse friends swear that he was born with a fountain pen in his hand.

They point to the rack upon rack of superior court minutes in the clerk's office as evidence that Veit started writing at an early age in the modern era of the court.

Even his chief, County Clerk Jack G. Blue, attested at Veit's retirement dinner Friday that the veteran chief clerk had posted minutes of all 18 departments. Veit reached the compulsory retirement of 70 last month.

Veit himself protested that he laid down a foundry puddler's ladle to take up pen and ink duties with the county on December 13, 1926.

MOMENTS OF HISTORY

And since that date Veit has been inscribing the fullest smooth minutes on record in Alameda County. They even include adjournments of court at great moments of history: Such as the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, the death of Judge Leon Gray on December 6, 1948, the appointment by President Dwight Eisenhower of Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court on October 5, 1953.

Veit clerked for Judge Gray for 12 years and for Judge Thomas J. Ledwich, retiring himself this year, for 7 years. And Veit kept up the records for other noted jurists: John J. Allen, J. D. Murphey, T. W. Harris and Frank Ogden.

WILL IN PAVEMENT

Veit's records are many, including the county's longest civil trial, a 2-month condemnation hearing on the Ocean Shore Railway ,the right-of-way which ran from San Francisco to Santa Cruz.

And Veit produced a stepladder for his judge for the longest will in local history, a continuous scroll 9 feet, 7 inches long. And he carted into court the most unique will: A block of pavement upon which an architect, stricken by a heart attack on the street, scrawled his testament in builder's chalk.

Veit also received for probate a will which was torn in half. He entered the two halves as separate documents and the court ordered them reassembled for court ruling.

During his off-duty hours Veit, a bachelor living at 36946 Magnolia Street, Newark, combed his court records for cryptic and fitting surnames of litigants to explain, for his own amusement, the reason for divorces: "Early love. Argue long. Loose reason. Goodby."

MOVE RECALLED

Veit spanned the court's transition in the 1930's from the old courthouse on Broadway to the new one on Lake Merritt's shore. He clerked for the first official session in the new building. He became chief court clerk in 1946.

A native of Erie, Pa., Frank went to work at the age of 10. He educated himself by studying after work, and he was 16 when he arrived in Newark to work as an apprentice in the Wedgewood stove foundry. He became a journeyman molder and an officer in his union in his 18 years at the craft before he took the county civil service examinations.

During World I he served in France in the Field Artillery. He became a charter member of Washington Township Post 195, American Legion, and has served in various State and local positions. For 39 years he has served as post adjutant-finance officer.

Veit lives in Newark with his sister, Mrs. Josephine Doorley, a member of the county library staff.

United Nations Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, by unanimous consent, a letter which I have received from Ambassador James Wadsworth, whose opinions I hold in high respect, regarding the possible purchase of United Nations bonds by the United States.

Ambassador Wadsworth's dedicated service to this country has covered many years, including the years of 1953 to 1960 when he served as Deputy U.S. Representative to the United Nations. Following his distinguished service in this capacity, Ambassador Wadsworth was appointed the permanent U.S. Representative to the United States. Having been appointed by President Eisenhower to serve as a U.S. delegate to the 14th General Assembly of the United Nations in 1959 myself, I had the pleasure of serving with Ambassador Wadsworth, and know personally of his dedicated service and high qualifications.

As I believe that Ambassador Wadsworth's views should be of interest to all Americans, I am placing his letter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that it might be called to the attention of the Congress and the American people.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 7, 1962.

The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: My concern for the United Nations and for its bipartisan support in our country prompts this letter. I have just returned from a brief vacation and am disturbed to learn of the opposition to the U.N. loan in the House. As my absence made it impossible for me to testify before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to reaffirm several of the points I made before the Foreign Relations Committee.

First, the financial plan approved by the General Assembly attacks directly the major elements of the financial crisis of the U.N.

Second, the plan is designed to reinforce the sound principle of collective responsibility of the entire membership for all operations voted by a two-thirds majority of the members.

Third, the $200 million which the bond issue seeks to raise is needed to restore sound planning and responsible financial management for a reasonable period ahead.

Fourth, the successful execution of the plan will lead to a reduction in the abnormally large share of peacekeeping operations which has been borne by the United States and which is unhealthy for both the U.N. and the United States.

I can assure you from my recent travels around this country that there is great and widespread support for the U.N. and its peace forces. Such organizations as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL–CIO, the American Legion, the National Council of the Churches of Christ, B'nai B'rith, the Catholic Association for International Peace and many others are on record in favor of this loan to the United Nations. Despite the favorable advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, the United Nations needs the money now. I therefore hope that you will be able to contribute to its overwhelming approval by the House.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. WADSWORTH.

The Kefauver Drug Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the June 1962 edition of Pulp and Paper Worker a monthly newspaper published by the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers. The article, by Cynthia A. Jessup, is particularly timely as it analyzes the Kefauver drug proposals. Recent events have borne out Miss Jessup's conclusion that "it is time that the victims—the consumer—took the reins in hand through passage of adequate and swift legislation."

The article follows:

THE DRUG INDUSTRY

(By Cynthia A. Jessup)

(Miss Jessup, research assistant of the Research and Education Department, received her B.S. degree from Ithaca College.)

Since early 1961 concern over the conduct of the drug industry has been spreading throughout the Nation. At that time Senator ESTES KEFAUVER led a full investigation of the industry, consequently introducing a bill intended to correct many abuses. The move prompted one drug executive to predict that the long reign of comparative freedom enjoyed by manufacturers was over. The past year has shown the prediction to be quite accurate although just how permanently interrupted it will be only time, and the passage or defeat of proposed measures, will determine.

While drug companies were violently shaken by the threat of KEFAUVER's proposals (which have yet to pass through Congress), several direct rulings by the Food and Drug Administration had a more immediate impact. The drug manufacturers were ordered to follow a policy of full disclosure on each drug label and in the promotional literature sent to doctors. This included side effects and a batch control number in case of contamination. Color additives in cosmetics were barred. In addition, the FDA began to test many more drugs than previously. The annual average cleared by the Agency now stands at approximately 400.

PRICES FIXED

The Kefauver investigations also resulted in a Federal indictment of three major pharmaceutical firms and their top officers for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The companies, American Cyanamid, Bristol-Myers, and Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., had monopolized the market in broad spectrum antibiotics (highly effective drugs widely relied upon by many doctors) for over 10 years, pushing prices on these items to fantastic proportions. Sales on these three drugs rose steadily from $86 million in 1954 to over $165 million by 1959.

Another indictment was issued against Northern Pharmaceutical Association in California for price fixing. The association was fined $40,000 and the officers responsible were fined $1,000.

When the AMA rushed to the defense of the drug industry, the Kefauver subcommittee pointed out that the medical organization could not be expected to be impartial since much of their revenue came from drug advertising. In 1955 the advertising brought $4,184,000 to AMA pockets. By 1960 this figure rose to half the income of the organization at $7,997,000.

These figures take on added meaning when it is noted that the AMA relieved their own council on drugs of any direct responsibility over drug ads and abandoned their seal of approval in 1955. Their listing of "new and official drugs," which they began publishing in 1956, is of dubious value since over 20 percent of the drugs listed have been shown incapable of sustaining their sponsors' claims.

The necessity for action in the drug field was emphasized by President Kennedy's consumers' protection message in March. The President called attention to the inadequacy of existing drug laws and the inefficiency of the administrative program established to enforce the laws. He stressed the necessity for fast and drastic improvement in the areas of safety, efficacy, and the use of drugs today.

Brought together for purposes of comparison, the Kefauver bill, the ruling of the FDA, and the administration's proposals are quite uniform in their aims. The Kefauver bill made an additional request for a drug patent limitation of 3 years as opposed to the present one of 14 years. After the 3 years, the company would be forced to license the drug, for a royalty, to other companies. This amendment was ruled out by Congress last month, permitting the continuation of patent monopolies.

Other proposals would enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to withdraw approval of any drug which cannot prove sufficient safety or efficacy. Manufacturers would be required to report on such standards and to maintain facilities and controls insuring the reliability of their product. Antibiotics would be tested batch by batch. Simple names would be given all drugs. Enforcible steps would be provided against the illegal sale of habit-forming barbiturates and amphetamines. Cosmetics would have to be proved safe and useful before marketing. More efficient inspection of drug, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices would be made. The FTC would be authorized to see that the promotional material directed to doctors is clear and complete.

The reaction of the drug industry is, of course, one of indignation and protestation. They claim that costs would be prohibitive. Research would be stifled. Improvement in drugs would halt. Officials cried that it is degrading to the profession and implies a lack of faith in the companies' honesty and reliability. It means the Government would once again be interfering in the business of big business.

The question is, Is such interference justified? Is it really interference or just assuring the public that in the future the cure won't be worse than the disease? Let us look at the record.

As with many other areas of business, the drug industry has been left to its own devices for many years, guided by its own professional organizations and ethical standards. The effect of such control was clearly demonstrated in the scandals over price fixing. It is shown monthly in the reports issued by the FDA on actions taken against pharmaceutical companies, druggists, and distributors of drugs. The practices which have been revealed in these reports could hardly be called ethical.

Price rigging of drugs is inexcusable. Medicine being something we must have, we are left with no choice but to pay the price demanded. Going without because of expense may prove more expensive in the long run. While no one can object to profits, unreasonable profits gained at the expense of our health cannot be justified.

To illustrate: Tetracycline, one of the "miracle" drugs, costs the druggist 30 cents apiece, the consumer—50 cents. The company produces it for 3 cents. Tranquilizers sell for 10 cents to the customer, 6.5 cents to the druggist, and cost 0.7 cent to make.

A drug official remarked that many drugs entering the market today are "potentially dangerous" and reduce medications from "prescription status to candy-bar status."

The Labor Review has stated that often drugs are designed for sales appeal more than medical value. Such accusations put doubts on the value of drug companies' research which they claim takes such a large part of their profits. It has been discovered that in 1958 the amount actually spent on research came to 6.3 percent of the dollar.

In October of 1961 the FDA discovered a mild tranquilizer sold by 1 firm for over a year had been the cause of 11 illnesses and 3 deaths. Another firm collected reports on the adverse effects of one of its drugs for over 5 years before notifying the FDA. The drug had caused 54 cases of hepatitis and jaundice, 15 of which resulted in death. In both cases the drugs were recalled from the market by the FDA and their application for reissue was denied.

Such cases are only a sampling of those uncovered by the limited staff and budget of the FDA. One wonders how many others go undetected.

WHAT PRICE BEAUTY

Cosmetics pose a special problem. Most are sold over the counter without prescription or restrictions. In hair preparations, color additives were allowed until it was discovered that the simple warnings and the suggested patch test before use were inadequate. Some women suffered severe burns; some were even blinded.

In the happy pursuit of the elusive "fountain of youth" women are inclined to try many strange things. Recently the FDA seized 95 jars of a youth-regaining "Imperial Bee Cream With Royal Jelly," charging the company with making unsubstantiated claims. No one has yet proven royal jelly is of use for anything but bees. In some cases, the use of estrogens in youth preparations is dangerous, particularly if they contain hormones.

The need for safeguards against the illegal resale of doctor's samples and counterfeit drugs is very great. The consumer is helpless to know what he is buying in medicines. Often instructions are missing, the contents and warnings changed or eliminated. Even experts have trouble telling counterfeit drugs from the originals; a customer would have no chance at all.

It is not enough to wring our hands and moan over the necessity for stronger laws and improved enforcement. As a nation with the highest standard of living in the world, with more potentially available to everyone, we have allowed flagrant disregard for our very well-being to become an integral part of our society. This, in a time when our prestige is on trial before the world, is a disgrace.

In the days of early trade guilds anyone caught cheating the people was publicly denounced and disgraced. Today we meekly and naively pay out more and more for a product which gives less satisfaction and often endangers our health. While the drug industry protests that their costs will rise beyond reason, the record shows that 1961 brought the highest profits in history. Even with the drop in antibiotic prices as a result of the price scandals, sales reached $3,330 million. Estimates for 1962 are even better with a promise somewhere in the neighborhood of $3,500 million.

It is hard, too, to believe that any industry would be hampered in research and competition by honesty. It is more plausible that such rulings would give us an expanding competition in which human lives were no longer gambled.

It has yet to be explained what any drug manufacturer has to fear if he is doing an honest job. A show of faith is fine, but blind faith is foolish. No faith is deserved by an industry which fixes prices. It is not due when the newspapers carry daily items of illness or death from laxity, carelessness or deliberate cheating in providing medicines for the public. Obviously the record of the drug industry speaks for itself.

If, after all the years of freedom from outside influence, the drug manufacturers cannot control their greed for profits at any cost, it is time that the victims—the consumer—took the reins in hand through passage of adequate and swift legislation.

Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Joseph F. Barr, the able and beloved national executive director of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, sent me the following note calling to my attention a most interesting article on a most fascinating American.

Mr. Barr is so right in suggesting that this article be brought to the attention of my colleagues in this House. Under leave extended to me I submit the note from Mr. Barr and the intriguing article on Judah Touro.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1962.

Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALPERN: This article on Judah Touro came across my desk the other day. Having been in both Newport, R.I., and New Orleans, La., and having seen the living exhibits mentioned in this article, I think it would be of extreme interest to insert this into the RECORD. Nothing that I can add to what is said here about Judah Touro could possibly exceed in interest the simple statements in this article.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH F. BARR,
National Executive Director.

JUDAH TOURO

Judah Touro was born of Orthodox Jewish parents, on or about June 17, 1775, the day of the Battle of Bunker Hill, at Newport, R.I. His parents and forefathers originally came from Spain, from which they emigrated to the West Indies, and thence to Newport. For his 50th birthday, June 17, 1825, Judah Touro gave to the United States Bunker Hill Monument for which he paid more than half, the balance being subscribed for and paid by the schoolchildren of United States.

Judah Touro was brought up in the banking business, at Newport, and was associated with an uncle, Moses Michael Hays. Mr. Hays had an excellent reputation as an international banker, both in the United States and several countries in Europe, and he was the founder of the Massachusetts Bank, probably the first bank in Massachusetts and the forerunner of the First National Bank of Boston, the present largest bank in New England. Moses Michael Hays was very active in Freemasonry, and at one time was the grand master of Masons in Massachusetts, probably the only Jew to hold that office. There is, today, a Masonic lodge in Boston with the identical name. Mr. Hays had a daughter, of whom Judah Touro was very fond and wished to marry. The uncle, Mr. Hays, objected to this, and as a result Judah Touro went to New Orleans, La.

At both Newport, R.I., and New Orleans, La., there are streets named Touro Street. Further, at Newport, there is also a Touro Park. These named places did not happen as accidents, but were due to the philanthropical and charitable actions of Judah Touro.

At New Orleans, Judah Touro frequently responded to public auctions. One day a client of his called at his office to see Mr. Touro, and the clerk said that Mr. Touro was out. As the client stated that it was very important that he see him, the clerk then went into Mr. Touro's private office, where he found an advertisement of a church to be sold at auction. Whereupon, the clerk then advised the client to go to the scene of the auction, where he would probably find Mr. Touro. Just as the client arrived at the auction, he overheard the minister say to Judah Touro, "I'm glad you bought it Judah, it will be in good hands." After which he heard Mr. Touro say, "Come to my office later, and I shall give you a deed to the church," which was done within a few days.

There are a number of other details, which I do not remember about Judah Touro, but more information can be obtained at the Newport Historical Society, Newport, R.I., and probably from the New Orleans Historical Society.

The synagogue at Newport, which had been attended by several generations of the Touro families as well as others, is one of the oldest synagogues in the United States, and has been used daily, until about 12 to 15 years ago, at which time it became a national shrine, open several days each week. This building was originally built, not parallel with the street or sidewalks, but is located on an angle, facing exactly east to west, and contains a secret exit, underneath the "Bimah" as a reminder of the escape hatches in synagogues in Spain, during the bad times there. This "Touro" synagogue was visited by George Washington and other officers during the Revolutionary War. I understand that the building is still used for religious services, at certain times, and there still is a rabbi associated with it.

Summarizing all of the above, there is no question that Judah Touro was a patriot, that he was charitable, philanthropic, of an excellent family, and subject matter of a love affair, all of which should make excellent material for a movie picture or television program, and as such would provide some excellent legitimate and satisfying propaganda on behalf of Jewish people throughout the United States.

Tuesday, Purple Heart Day, Honors Vets Who Shed Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Anthony Cama, of Lynn, Mass., which appeared in the Lynn Sunday Post, on August 5, 1962:

TUESDAY, PURPLE HEART DAY, HONORS VETS WHO SHED BLOOD

(By Anthony Cama)

The purple dye of the ancients was procured at a great cost from shellfish (purpura) in the land of the Tyrian people. It was considered to be as valuable as gold or jewels. This made the purple dye a color used only by imperial or royal ranks, and thus was created the phrase "born to the purple." In the Roman Catholic Church "promotion to the purple" signifies elevation to the high state of a cardinal.

This writing's purpose is to explain the Purple Heart, which 180 years ago was selected and awarded by Gen. George Washington to honor the brave soldiers who fought under his command in the Revolutionary War. It also was intended to bestow upon the rank and file of soldiers regal recognition for outstanding dedication and supreme sacrifice in battle.

In 1932 the award, discontinued after the Revolution, was revived by the then President Hoover and his chief of staff, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and it is accorded only to war wounded or dead. This purple decoration is now, as in Washington's time, a sign of the U.S. Government's recognition of the valor and sacrifice of our fighting men and expresses, in a necessarily incomplete way, the gratitude felt by all citizens toward those who have suffered and died in wars fought by this Nation.

This article is a humble tribute to the hundreds of thousands of U.S. war dead, the servicemen who died of wounds, and the wounded who lived with their shattered bodies until death released them and the ones who are living today trying their best to adjust themselves to the peaceful civilian life of the country they fought to defend and preserve.

This writing is not an attempt, however, to number all of the recipients of the Purple Heart award. It is intended to reach the reading public of the Lynn Sunday Post and return again and again the price tag which is and shall forever be attached to that glorious star spangled banner waving above one of the greatest and most wonderful forms of democratic government the world has ever known.

Since nearly all Congressional Medal of Honor winners are also holders of the Purple Heart, because of wounds received, the writer quotes some remarks from an article by Luther Skaggs, president of the Congressional Medal or Honor society. Skaggs, minus his left leg, lives in Washington, D.C., with his wife, Rose, serves the CMH society without pay, and works as a budget analyst with the Defense Supply Agency.

"Today there are 293 living Americans, 46 of whom served in World War I, who hold this treasured decoration" he wrote, "More than half of the 644 Medal of Honor winners of World War II and the Korean conflict received their awards posthumously. They came from all walks of life. They had one thing in common. They loved their country.

"Courage is not restricted to those who have been honored for deeds performed in the field of battle. In all of America's wars many men have fallen, unseen, and unsung, with no one to witness their courage. So, too, there are countless unsung heroes in civilian life."

It is for the future citizens, both men and women, to remember that the Purple Heart has been bestowed on men and women of all races, colors and creeds. In this vast rich land of hope and dignity of human right the blood which has poured upon this soil and upon many parts of foreign countries was not created by God to be any better than any other mortal's blood. The Purple Heart awards have not shown any discrimination.

We must never forget the sacrifice and the sufferings of those who shed their blood that this land of ours would stay free. The Governor's proclamation designating "Purple Heart Day" as Tuesday, August 7, is highly commendable, and this writer is proud of the fact that the government of this State has deemed it important enough to bring it to the attention of our people.

Here are some of the Medal of Honor winners and holders of the Purple Heart award:

Robert Eugene Bush, a native of Tacoma, Wash., in the Navy as a medical corpsman in World War II; Eli Whitely of Texas, in the Army in World War II; William R. Lawley, Jr., a native of Alabama, in the Army Air Forces as a B–17 bomber pilot; Robert S. Kennemore, born in Greenville, S.C., in the Marines; Lloyd L. Burke, a native of Ticknor, Ark., in the infantry in Korea; Gino J. Merli, born in Scranton, Pa., a machine gunner; Donald M. Call, New York City born, in France; Edward V. Rickenbacker, born in Columbus, Ohio, World War I airman; Benjamin Kaufman of Buffalo, N.Y., infantry in Argonne forest; Hershel W. Williams, a native of West Virginia, Marine Corps, World War II; Harold Consalves, USMCR, Alameda, Calif.; and Capt. Sam Glenn Fuqua, Navy, Laddonia, Mo.; Gunnery Sgt. John Basilone, USMC of Raritan, N.J., in World War II. Sherrod Skinner, USMC of Detroit, Mich.; Staff Sgt. Arthur De Franzo, USA, of Saugus, Mass., killed in action and Joseph Vittori, USMC, of Beverly, Mass., killed in action in Korea.

This writing is also dedicated to the thousands who fell in battle, shattered, smashed, burned beyond recovery and to those entombed in the hulks of the gutted, twisted steel walls of the ships disappearing forever into the ocean depths. For these "lost" ones of the unspeakable conditions of war the Purple Heart is forever theirs. It is for us, the living; it is for the youth surging forward into the wonderful future, a young manhood free and strong only because "many were the purple hearts and the mute tombstones that formed the wall of shelter and protection against the onslaughts of the enemy."

When, on Tuesday, we may see that glorious banner of our country waving proud and free, in dignity and honor for this Nation of ours, somewhere in that spangled standard of stars and stripes there is a most precious shade of purple. It shall be there indelible, forever a mark of supreme sacrifice for the men who went forth to war ready to fight and to die; ready to shed their blood that this God-blessed country of ours stay free.

In these crucial days of ominous threats and the nightmarish clouds of nuclear bomb attacks it is for us, both the young and the old, to stand together, firm, indivisible, a determined American family. Let us, the adults, show our respect for "Purple Heart Day," that youth may be inspired by our respect and example. And let us obey the call of the Governor, who says: "Now, therefore, I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urge all our citizens to observe this day by displaying the American flag and by taking part in ceremonies which do honor to the veterans of the Order of the Purple Heart."

Sugar Import-Export

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have been very disturbed as have so many other Members over the continuing problems that beset the sugar import-export and subsidy policies of our Nation.

We have had conflicting reports and much discussion pro and con on this subject for many years.

We must admit that at best our present act is only a stopgap until we can resolve this problem on a more realistic basis. Keeping in mind our own interest as well as the problems of the sugar-exporting countries we find ourselves ofttimes on the horns of a dilemma.

The whole problem can stand more discussion. I was extremely pleased, lately, when I received a copy of an address delivered by the Costa Rican Ambassador, Dr. Gonzalo J. Facio on July 3, 1962, to the Council of the OAS.

The address touches upon other phases of the relationship of the sugar-exporting nations with the economics of trade, both with each other as well as with the United States.

I believe this address is a real contribution to a better understanding of our mutual problems and with the unanimous permission of the House, I present it as it was delivered by the Ambassador Dr. Gonzalo J. Facio:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE AMBASSADOR, REPRESENTATIVE OF COSTA RICA, DR. GONZALO J. FACIO

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago, when I resumed my work in the council, I proclaimed my Government's faith, and my own, in the Alliance for Progress.

I maintained that if President Kennedy's broad concept of this Alliance were carried out with boldness and enthusiasm, it would constitute the best reply that the Americas could give to the Communist challenge.

But I conveyed a warning that the high hopes engendered by the Alliance in the impoverished masses of Latin America demanded immediate practical achievements to alleviate, speedily and directly, the difficult economic situation that most of our countries are facing.

FAIR AND STABLE PRICES

Of all the measures proposed and accepted at Punta del Este, none can meet this objective as effectively as the stabilization, at a fair price, of the agricultural and mineral products that the Latin American countries export to the industrialized nations. When better prices are paid for our basic products, private enterprises will flourish, salaries will go higher, fiscal revenue will increase, and the state will be in a position to finance, with its own resources, a considerable part of the essential works that are needed to reform its economic and social structure.

On the other hand, when the product of the national effort consisting of primary export articles, is not purchased at a fair price, economic stagnation and social injustice are unavoidable consequences.

This is precisely what has happened in Latin America. To give an idea of the serious consequences that low prices produce on the economy of the Latin American nations, it will suffice to mention the following data: In 1950 Latin American exports reached a total value of $4.311 billion. In 1960 the same exports, almost doubled in volume, amounted to only $3.268 billion.

Our countries, therefore, through a decline in the prices of their export products, have lost an annual income that now reaches $1 billion per year, which is a far larger amount than they have received in loans and aid during the same period. And at the same time that this phenomenon was taking place, the prices of industrial goods that Latin America must import have been continually rising.

Naturally, this formidable imbalance in international trade has caused serious economic crises in all the Latin American countries. If it is not corrected within a short time, with titanic decision, it threatens to wipe out all the plans for economic and social development that our countries are carrying out, notwithstanding the encouragement they may receive through other measures contemplated in the Charter of Punta del Este.

TRADITION OF AVARICE

Man lived in a world of scarcity for thousands of years, because he had no other energy for the process of production than the muscular strength of man or beast. Consequently, for thousands of years the human brain was geared to a presumption of poverty, to the advisability of holding on to the point of greed, to the need for exploiting fellow creatures.

But the immense development of modern technology has put an end to the curse of scarcity. Machinery and chemical products work without error and without pause to create abundance. Nevertheless, man remains tied to the old routine of voracious appropriation of the scarce fruit.

Internally, the industrial nations have been obliged to adapt their system for the distribution of wealth to their new system of mass production. They had to learn, through economic crises, that modern industry could not subsist if the consuming power of their own peoples was not increased steadily. But they have not freed themselves of the old prejudices in the international field.

Henry Ford was the first to break the barrier of avarice, which recommends selling as high as possible and paying the lowest possible salaries. He raised the wages of his workers and lowered the price of his automobiles. The result was excellent. Ford increased his sales at an incredible rate and increased his profits. He proved that wealth is like a good seed. If it is hoarded, if it is not distributed by sowing, there is no harvest and scarcity follows. On the other hand, if it is scattered over the fields, the earth will generously multiply it in fruits that produce abundance.

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE NEW DEAL

The lesson taught by Ford, nevertheless, was not applied in its entirety. The great economic crisis of 1929 was caused principally by a continual increase in the industrial production, which was not matched by the increases in wages or in the prices of agricultural products.

The Keynes formula, with which President Roosevelt met the crisis, consisted of raising and stabilizing the prices of agricultural products and increasing industrial wages. The New Deal programs, instead of bringing ruin to the urban population and to the industrialists, as its opponents claimed, actually enabled the United States to overcome its most serious crisis and made the entire Nation more prosperous.

The prosperous countries have in fact stabilized their industrial products, such as steel, automobiles, and machinery, at prices that represent a high standard of living for their workers. Agricultural products are not excluded from that protection. Wheat and sugar have good systems for the stabilization of their prices at a high level. Only the poor nations are obliged to sell the product of their labor at the price they can obtain in the "free market." This is the main reason why they are poor.

The time has come for the world economy to demand that the industrialized nations, which have already broken the barrier of avarice in their domestic economy, resolve to break it in the world economy. The underdeveloped nations constitute the proletariat of the world today, and agricultural and mineral exports their wages. Only by having their wages raised will the developing nations be able to purchase the surplus industrial products that the prosperous nations must sell in our markets in ever-increasing amounts. Otherwise, economic crises will recur through a lack of equity in international trade—economic crises such as those that were formerly produced by a lack of equity in the distribution of national income.

TITLE IV OF THE CHARTER OF PUNTA DEL ESTE

All these ideas regarding the need and advisability of fair and stable remunerations for exporters of basic products, were stated very clearly in title IV of the Charter of Punta del Este.

The measures recommended therein are in the process of being studied and "implemented." President Kennedy stressed the importance of the Alliance for Progress and gave it his enthusiastic support in his speech of March 13, 1962, on the occasion of the first anniversary of its proclamation.

INCONSISTENT ATTITUDE IN THE MATTER OF SUGAR

For these reasons, we who believe in the Alliance for Progress and in the sincerity and statesmanlike vision of President Kennedy are surprised at the stand taken by the present administration regarding the importation of sugar into the U.S. market.

We realize that this is a highly complicated matter. We sympathize with the Government's eagerness to solve the problems of domestic and international policy raised by the distribution of import quotas for sugar at a price equal to that paid to local producers and hence higher than that of the world market. But we cannot help but regret that the solution decided upon implies lowering the price of the only article of Latin American export that is not on the wane in the U.S. market.

I do not wish at this time to enter into a discussion as to the economic soundness, either from a domestic or an international standpoint, of the system for fixing import quotas on sugar, and the distribution of these among the various producing countries, at a price equal to that paid to U.S. producers. Neither do I wish to discuss the question of the sovereign right of the U.S. Government to decide whether this system is to be maintained, changed, or eliminated.

What I do take the liberty of discussing with all due respect to the Government of this great Nation, which has given so much evidence of its determination to cooperate in the economic and social development of our countries, is the time it has chosen to try out a new system, the direct result of which can only be, I repeat, to reduce the price of the one basic export commodity that the Latin American countries have been selling at adequate prices in the U.S. market.

We should make it clear that the exporting countries of Latin America are not asking the U.S. Government to make an added sacrifice in order to remunerate them adequately for the sugar they supply. The system of quotas and of so-called premium prices was established in 1934. It was one of the measures, to which I previously referred, taken by the government of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to cope with the economic crisis that began in 1929. Through that system, domestic producers were guaranteed a stable price, which was to cover their production costs and give them a reasonable profit.

Since those domestic producers were unable to satisfy fully the market needs of the United States, other countries were granted a quota to export to that nation, at the U.S. market price, the amounts necessary to meet the local demand. The largest quota was given to Cuba.

When Cuba fell into the hands of the bloody Communist dictatorship that today oppresses it and it became impossible for that sister country to continue supplying the sugar needed by U.S. consumers, other Latin American countries made an effort to fill the void.

Thus, owing to circumstances that all of us deplore, a more equitable distribution was made among all Latin American producers of the quotas to export sugar for the U.S. market.

In that new assignment of quotas, the Government of the United States has always retained a considerable reserve. This has been distributed among the other countries on a temporary basis only, in order that, at the happy moment of Cuba's liberation, the United States might be in a position to reallocate a considerable quota to that country, as an aid to its economic recovery from the ravages of the Castro regime.

But the sugar program presented to Congress by the administration implied reducing not only the prices paid to Latin American countries now supplying sugar to the U.S. market, but also those of Cuba's potential quota. The new formula approved by Congress does not go so far. It does, however, limit the program to a period of 2½ years; it reduces the quotas of the Latin American countries; and, what is even worse, it progressively reduces prices by 10, 20, and 30 percent.

THE RESOLUTION UNDER DISCUSSION

These, Mr. Chairman, are some of the reasons that prompted my delegation to take part in drawing up the draft resolution now being discussed. Its aim is entirely clear. It asks the Council of the Organization of American States to resolve that the Committee on Basic Products of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, with the immediacy that the situation requires, study the negative effects that this new sugar program of the United States is bound to have on the economies of the sugar-exporting countries of Latin America. The resolution also asks that the Committee, on the basis of its studies and taking into special account the agreements contained in title IV of the Charter of Punta del Este, recommend the measures that should be adopted to prevent or compensate for this new deterioration of the terms of trade of our countries.

POLITICAL DAMAGE

However serious the economic damage to the producing countries of lower prices for sugar exported to the United States, this, unfortunately, is not the worst harm that will come from the new U.S. sugar program.

Much more serious are the political repercussions that the administration's stand, and even that of the Congress, will have upon our countries. Because our countries are so involved in their desperate struggle to escape from misery, and because they have not yet felt the benefits to be gained from the Alliance for Progress, it will be impossible for them to understand how the promoters of this great Alliance can reduce the prices of sugar—an action that for thousands of Latin Americans means such painful and real deprivations as a few cents less in each day's wage, one less opportunity to renovate the hovels in which they live, less money to improve their lands or to buy the farm equipment they so greatly long for.

The enemies of the Alliance for Progress must therefore be rejoicing. The proposed new U.S. sugar program has provided them with abundant material for their underhanded work. It is to be hoped that, if our draft resolution is approved, the Committee on Basic Products will find fitting solutions to the problem that has been created. May these solutions be quickly effective, so that the faith that our countries have lost in the agreements of Punta del Este will be fully restored.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Address by Henry T. Bodman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a longtime friend, and one of the foremost banking experts in the Nation, Mr. Henry T. Bodman, president of the National Bank of Detroit, recently addressed a Kiwanis Club picnic in Rochester, Mich.

What Mr. Bodman had to say about our economy and the position of the dollar abroad, based upon visits to some 40 commercial and central banks in Europe, is of considerable significance to our future.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am including Mr. Bodman's remarks, and his analysis of the problems we will face as trade and competition increase between Europe and the United States, which appeared in a recent edition of Enbeedee magazine:

ADDRESS BY HENRY T. BODMAN

I have just returned from a 7-week business trip to Europe during which Gerry O'Neill and I visited with officials of some 40 commercial and central banks—central banks correspond to our U.S. Federal Reserve Banks—in Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and England.

On all sides we saw evidence of the great prosperity being enjoyed in Europe which was apparent in many new buildings, new plants and new enthusiasm in the people we talked to.

Just to give you a few figures on this prosperity—since 1953 the gross national product in Germany is up 70 percent, in Italy 60 percent, and in France 45 percent. This compares to an increase of about 25 percent for the United Kingdom and the United States.

Industrial production, another measure of economic activity, in the same period is up 80 percent in the Common Market against 30 percent in the United Kingdom and 20 percent in the United States.

Although you might expect that a large part of these dramatic percentage gains are due to the low base from which Europe started following the devastation during the war, the recorded gains are even more impressive when it is realized that economic activity in Western Europe had attained prewar levels by 1950.

HIGH RATE OF INVESTMENT

The high rate of output in Europe has been brought about by the tremendous investment in new plant and equipment in the period 1953 to 1961. The annual rate of capital investment in this period increased almost 100 percent in Germany, 80 percent in Italy, and 60 percent in France. In the United States the comparable figure is only about 17 percent.

This high rate of investment has brought about some of the most remarkable employment records ever known. Even in Italy, where unemployment has traditionally been very high, particularly in the southern part of the country, this spectacular economic expansion has reduced unemployment from 17 percent of the working force to 11 percent between 1954 and 1960.

In West Germany and France today unemployment averages about 1 to 2 percent whereas in the United States we have 4 million unemployed or about 5½ percent of our labor force.

With the advent of freer trade and the installation of the most modern plant and equipment in Western Europe and Japan, and now that their immediate postwar demands are largely filled, the United States can expect the keenest kind of foreign competition from the other major production centers of the world.

We get some idea of the size of Europe's industrial plant when we contemplate that about as many cars are being built in Western Europe as in the United States.

Under these circumstances, we have the problem of keeping ourselves on a competitive basis—that is, our costs have to be competitive in world markets. Generally we have been and are still competitive in most markets since our balance of trade—that is the amount by which our exports exceed our imports—is favorable. Last year our surplus on trade account was $5.4 billion.

Unfortunately, however, it is not favorable enough to offset certain other foreign expenditures such as foreign aid, and the cost of supporting our military forces abroad.

UNITED STATES SPENDING MORE ABROAD THAN WE ARE EARNING

Since 1957 we have spent abroad $14 billion more than we have earned abroad. This deficit has been met by a loss of $6 billion of gold and by an increase of $8 billion in foreign holdings of short-term claims on our gold.

Today net short-term claims on U.S. gold amount to about $18 billion which is more than our entire gold stock, $11 billion of which is required by law as backing for our Federal Reserve currency and liabilities.

Since the war it has been the policy of both administrations to fight economic recessions in this country with easy money policies. But in the next recession we will face the dilemma of continuing the easy money policy or of having to maintain an interest rate structure high enough to induce foreign holders not to demand gold in settlement of their dollar claims.

The attitude of foreign bankers and businessmen is the determining factor here. After all, since it is their money, it is going to be their decision as to whether they will hold their dollar claims or whether they will convert those claims into gold.

In discussing the gold and the balance-of-payments problem with our banker friends, we always got down to the question of our Federal budget and of deficit financing.

FOREIGN BANKERS CONCERNED ABOUT U.S. BUDGET

It was clear that the foreign bankers are vitally concerned as to whether we will make a determined effort to balance our budget, because they know that deficit financing sooner or later leads to a reduction in the value of the currency—in this case, the dollar.

In summary, we learned that because we are so much more involved in world trade than ever before, and because the dollar has assumed the position of a key world currency, we must protect its integrity in the eyes of foreigners—and we can only do this through sound domestic policies which will enable us to compete on equal terms with the other great manufacturing areas of the world.

While some of these problems may seem a little remote to us in Detroit, we are living in a time when our local businesses here are as much in competition with Milan, Paris or Frankfurt as they are in competition with firms in New York or California.

This means that our costs and methods must be competitive, and these costs must be low enough to enable us to earn good profits if we are to have sufficient capital with which to maintain our industrial plant on a competitively efficient basis. Most of the funds for new capital investment come from retained earnings so profits are essential to our success as a trading nation.

Our banker friends abroad are watching us and they are concerned about how we are going to handle our domestic fiscal and monetary problems. They have their claims on us, and their eyes on us, and they are going to be the ones who count when it comes to a decision on whether we are doing a good job of protecting the value of our currency.

The Developing Dialog on Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee has been considering the question of a tax cut, prompted no doubt by a desire to create a rapid economic growth, it seems to me that the following article by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier is important and timely. This is a speech which was delivered by Dr. Saulnier as a commencement address at the Babson Institute of Business Administration.

Dr. Saulnier was Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers from

1956 to 1961 under President Eisenhower and has served this country in many other capacities as an adviser on economic affairs.

[From Tax Review, July 1962]

THE DEVELOPING DIALOG ON ECONOMIC GROWTH

(By Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City)

The question of the adequacy or inadequacy of our rate of economic growth is not a new subject. There was a lively discussion of it in 1959 and 1960, especially in the latter year, but for some months now it has had relatively little public attention. The reason for this is that we have been in a phase of recovery and expansion, and it is only natural that under such conditions interest in the growth question should tend to recede.

Suddenly all this has changed. There is now a fairly wide recognition of the fact that the expansion has not been a vigorous one. Not only has it failed by a wide margin to come up to the Federal Government's expectations, but it has been barely up to the standard of the last two recoveries. This was evident as early as last fall and winter but for a variety of reasons the mood of determined optimism persisted. The spell was broken by the stock market. The danger now is that we develop an excessive pessimism and in an effort to stimulate the economy rush into ill-considered measures which in the end may prove to do more harm than good.

In any case, the debate is on, and it promises to be an interesting discourse. Indeed, we are entering into what may well be the most searching reexamination of economic beliefs that our country has ever experienced. We will be talking about some very critical questions of economic policy. Parmount among these is the question of taxes and of fiscal responsibility. Specifically, would it help, in seeking to spruce up the economy, to cut taxes when our balance of international payments is showing a substantial and continuing deficit, when we are losing gold with almost no interruption, and when the Federal budget is already deep in the red? This is, indeed, a very intricate technical question. To draw again on the current idiom, it is a very sophisticated question. But not so sophisticated that it is exempt from commonsense consideration.

And there are other questions that will be dealt with in this dialog just as important and just as intricate. They are questions that go to the bottom of our understanding of what makes our enterprise economy work. More than that, if we think about them deeply enough, as we must, we shall see that they go to the roots of our economic and political philosophy.

NEED STRATEGY FOR UNITED STATES TODAY

How can we put the question to which the dialog will be directed? I think we can put it this way: what strategy of public policy will serve us best in achieving a better economic performance within the framework of our preferred and traditional institutions?

When we consider this question we must realize that we do not have an entirely free hand in shaping a strategy for improving our economic performance. No government ever has an entirely free hand in such matters, any more than a business enterprise has a free hand in selecting a strategy for improving its own performance. What we need is a strategy that makes sense for us, here and now, not for somebody else, somewhere else in the world, or even for ourselves at some other time. And the strategy we choose must be consistent with the constraints on policy that inhere in our present posture. Let me briefly describe the major constraints, as I see them.

Chief among them is the limitation that is imposed on us by our international financial position. We must accommodate ourselves to the fact that we have a chronic balance-of-payments problem. It is not a short-term problem caused by special nonrecurring circumstances, nor is it a problem that can be easily or quickly corrected. It is anything but that. The deficit has totaled more than $14 billion in the last 4 years; efforts to correct it were well underway in 1959 and were intensified in 1960, but it has continued.

The first question to ask about any proposal for accelerating growth is what effect it will have on our balance of payments. There are good economic reasons for this, but there are political reasons that are even more important. All the elements of our national strength—financial, economic, military, and moral—together constitute the foundation on which the structure of the free world is built. Our leadership responsibilities in the free world derive from this fact. In the unwelcome but nevertheless continuing struggle with the Communist bloc, which is a struggle for no less than man's freedom, a weakening of our national strength and of our international financial prestige would erode the foundation of our international leadership.

MUST MAINTAIN VIGOR ABROAD

I have had occasion recently to see something of the Soviet world and I believe we are winning the struggle against totalitarianism. But if we are to consolidate and extend our successes we must preserve and strengthen our international economic posture. Anything else is unthinkable. It would be the worst kind of folly for us to try to solve our domestic economic problems by means that would weaken our international financial and economic position and prestige.

You will hear some sensible words on this subject, of course; but you will also hear some things that make little if any sense, ranging all the way from assertions that there really isn't any balance-of-payments problem at all, which is totally incorrect, to statements that a given policy will help reduce the deficit when, on examination, it will be seen that the result is just as likely, or even more likely, to be the opposite. You must insist on verifiable facts, whenever these can be had, and keep your logic straight. And whatever else you do, don't make up your mind on the basis of assertions that some things are myths and other things are realities. Let me give you one piece of advice, if I may. You will learn that one man's myth is another man's reality. If your thinking on a problem leads you to a truth that is new, don't reject it because it is jarring to your preconceptions. Equally, if it leads you to a truth that is as old as the hills don't dismiss it on the ground that it is old fashioned and, for this reason, is probably a myth.

As long as a balance-of-payments deficit persists we shall be hampered in dealing with the problem of achieved adequate economic growth at home. A balance-of-payments deficit can prevent us from following an aggressive policy of credit ease when such a policy is called for. It is doing that right now, in my judgment. Blocking full use of credit policy, a balance-of-payments deficit invites a heavier reliance on fiscal policy for countering recessionary tendencies than would otherwise be contemplated. Unfortunately, it also enhances the hazards involved in budgetary deficits. In short, when it comes to the strategy of economic policy, a chronic balance-of-payments deficit is nothing less than a total nuisance. Top priority in our national economic strategy must be given to its elimination.

The second current constraint on public policy derives from the fact that our Federal Government's budget is even now running a heavy deficit. In the first 10 months of the current fiscal year, that is, in the 10 months through April 1962, there was a deficit of $9.7 billion in the conventional budget. This compares with a deficit of $6 billion in the comparable period of fiscal 1961. In the first 9 months of fiscal 1962 there was a deficit, seasonally adjusted, of $6.2 billion in the cash budget. There are, to my knowledge, no published official estimates of Federal income and product accounts for 1962, but these were running deficits of $3.1 and $2.0 billion on a seasonally adjusted annual rate basis in the third and fourth quarters respectively, of the calendar year 1961.

DEFICIT PILED ON DEFICIT

In fact, our current budgetary deficit is a very large one, and has persisted throughout the current cycle. Should it be even larger? It is one thing to consider the impact of a deficit that follows a surplus. It is another thing to appraise the economic effects, domestic and international, of piling one deficit on another.

A budget deficit in recession and a surplus in recovery can be called a countercyclical fiscal policy. But a deficit every year, in good times and in bad, is not a policy; it is a failure of policy. It is not a strategy; it is a simple case of fiscal inadequacy and it requires correction.

There are certain additional standards that must be met by public policy. It goes without saying that the only acceptable economic policy is one that is good for all Americans. Beyond that, an acceptable policy must be one that makes sense for the long run as well as for the short run. And most important of all, the only acceptable strategy of economic policy is one that will strengthen the free, democratic institutions of our country, including the institutions of free private enterprise. There is nothing but misery in store for Americans if we try to solve our economic problems by methods which in the long run will shrink and weaken our enterprise system.

Let me turn now to some of the principal substantive points in the dialog.

BUDGET ROLE IN GROWTH

First, let us consider the belief that increases in Federal spending and deficits in the Federal budget will promote economic growth.

What recent history tells us about the effect of increases in Federal spending is not very favorable to the view that an economy such as ours can spend itself into prosperity via the Federal budget. In the first 10 months of the fiscal year 1962 net budget expenditures were $6.1 billion higher than in the comparable 10 months of the previous fiscal year. If questioned on this point in advance of the events, most people would have said that the result of such an increase in spending, coming at an early stage in the cycle, would be a recovery far more rapid than would be expected on normal cyclical grounds. But that isn't what happened. Federal spending increased, but it did not stimulate a faster than normal pickup. If it had, we wouldn't be talking about the merits of additional increases in spending or cuts in taxes, and consequent increases in budget deficits, as methods of stimulating an economy that threatens, as the saying goes, "to run out of gas." What this experience tells us is that if the environment is not favorable to an increase in private spending, an increase in Federal spending, even a large increase, is a well-nigh futile exercise. Something must be done to encourage private spending.

Recent experience has also dealt rather harshly with the theory that budgetary deficits will accelerate economic growth.

What are the facts in this case? In the first 4 months of this calendar year, the cash budget of the United States ran a deficit of close to $10 billion, on a seasonally adjusted annual rate basis. In the comparable 4 months of the 1958–59 recovery the Federal cash budget showed a surplus of $4.6 billion, on an annual rate basis. Yet the unemployment rate has actually been somewhat higher under the recent deficit than it was under the earlier surplus. There were clouds on the economic horizon in those months of surplus in 1960, but it must be conceded that the economic sky in 1962, under very large deficits, is far from entirely clear.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS VITAL

Recent experience certainly provides ground for skepticism as to the restorative and energizing qualities of Federal budgetary deficits, but nowadays there are special reasons for rejecting the deliberate use of them as an instrument for promoting economic growth. These reasons have to do with our balance of international payments. It is one thing to run a budgetary deficit when a recession automatically cuts revenues, or even to create a deficit through emergency tax cuts in order to prevent or reverse a recession. But it is a very different matter deliberately to deepen a deficit by tax reductions when the economy is still in an expansion phase. How could it do anything but undermine confidence here and abroad in the effectiveness of our national economic policies? And if it does this, is there not a chance that it will worsen our balance-of-payments situation?

We must make it quite clear to the world that we know how to run our financial affairs. The last thing we want to do is to give the impression that we suffer from a kind of fear of orthodoxy. It must be clear that we both understand the dynamics of our economy and that we are willing to let this understanding guide our policy. If there is a need to cut taxes in the expansion phase of a cycle, when we already have a large deficit, then there is equally a need to consider whether we are now spending too much money on programs that make no contribution whatever to our capacity for growth and to consider whether we are doing other things, entirely outside of the tax field, that are tending to suppress private investment spending. If this is what we are doing, and I think it is, then we cannot retrieve the situation with governmental red ink, and very few really sophisticated people will believe that we can.

GROWTH VIA WAGE INCREASES

Let me turn to a second point. It has not entered the dialog so far, but it is always in the wings, so to speak, and we may hear of it yet. It is the theory that economic growth can be accelerated by raising wages. It is the purchasing power theory of prosperity, that higher wage rates mean higher incomes, that higher incomes mean higher demand, and that higher demand, in turn, means higher production and higher rates of growth.

What does recent experience tell us about this? What it tells us is that since the end of World War II average hourly compensation in private nonagricultural industries, including supplements to wages and salaries, increased, on the average, by 5.1 percent a year. Yet the growth of our economy in this period is regarded by the advocates of still faster wage advances as being inadequate. Furthermore, while wages were rising 5 percent a year, on the average, the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar was reduced by roughly 25 percent.

It is hard to believe that anyone would wish deliberately to experiment further with this inflationary policy. Whatever other damage such an experiment might do, it would wreck our capacity to compete in world markets, and make well-night impossible the elimination of our international balance-of-payments deficit. I hope we can say that this bit of mythology is dead, not just for the moment, but for good.

The third and last of the points in the dialog on growth on which I want to comment briefly has to do with business profits.

No one would deny that the expansion of our base of physical capital is an essential condition for the achievement of rapid growth. If this is the case, then we must concede that we have done very badly in recent years. In a period in which spending on capital goods in foreign industrial economies, in terms of constant dollars, has been going ahead by leaps and bounds, capital goods spending in our own economy has actually failed to increase at all. In the years 1953–59 the constant dollar amount of capital goods spending rose anywhere from 30 to 80 percent in most Western European countries; in sharp contrast, there was actually a small decline in the United States. Spending on new plant and equipment in the second quarter of 1962 was not as large in dollar amount, at current prices, as it was in 1957, 5 years ago. Obviously, there is no dynamism here. We are not even holding our own.

PROFITS HAVE NOT GROWN

It would be a mistake to argue that the volume of capital goods spending depends exclusively on the level of corporate profits. But I think we could agree that profits are a major element, probably the major element, in determining the level of capital goods spending. Is it not important, then, that while wage payments, production, and sales have been rising, corporate profits have remained roughly unchanged? Corporate profits in 1961 were only very little larger, before taxes, than they were in 1955, 6 years earlier, and corporate profits after taxes were actually lower. And this is in current, not constant, dollars. In these years there was an increase of $3.2 billion in the dividends paid annually by corporations, but the amount of income retained by corporations fell by $3 billion or by about 25 percent. This is the point that must not be overlooked in the dialog on growth. We cannot get our economy moving as it should be moving unless we restore some dynamism to business profits.

If this profit deflation, and that is what it is, is to be corrected we must understand its causes. I have no wish to oversimplify this complex question, but if I were to state the cause in one sentence I would say that the squeeze on business profits results from the fact that, whereas price inflation has for the moment at least been largely checked, cost inflation continues.

How can we escape from this condition? An escape cannot be found in a resumption of price inflation. Few people would prescribe this. There are some still unreconciled to price stability as an essential condition to the achievement of sustainable economic growth, but inflation is such a thoroughly disreputable idea nowadays that the remaining inflationists are largely silent. They have been silenced, if not entirely persuaded, by the deficit in our balance of payments. Indeed, one of the great mass conversions of history has taken place on the question of inflation. And the steel industry episode of this spring showed that the executive branch of our Government, from the President on down, is unreservedly committed to a policy of price stability. Circumstances have checked price inflation, but we have not succeeded in stopping cost inflation and therein lies the rub or the squeeze, or whatever you want to call it.

There are a number of avenues by which we must approach the task of easing this squeeze. Individual businessmen will find that one way to do it is by practicing complete economy in managing the affairs of business. We shall also have to do that as a nation. We must remember that the cost of government—Federal, State, and local—is to a very large extent borne by American business as a business cost and it is a rising cost. I hope that the dialog on growth, in which we have all been invited to participate, will lead to a thorough reexamination of governmental expenditures at the State and local as well as Federal level, the elimination of those expenditures that are not essential, and the passing of these economies, dollar for dollar, as reductions in business taxes.

GUIDELINE CALLED INADEQUATE

There are other avenues to a solution of the problem of cost inflation. One of these is to stabilize, or better still to reduce unit production costs by achieving a better relationship between advances in wages and improvements in productivity.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers recently advanced a general guideline on this matter in which they stated that wage advances, on the average, should equal productivity improvements, on the average. I think we must conclude that this guideline is inadequate in the present situation. If we agree that there has been a lag in profits, then the guideline should provide for a catchup in profits. Wage increases that will use up labor's full proportionate amount of productivity improvements, which is what the guidelines call for, will leave profits where they are relative to everything else. But the point is that we need to improve the relative position of profits. Consequently, what would be best for our economy at this time would be wage advances that are actually less than the improvements in productivity. This would reverse the trend in cost-price relationships that has been suppressing business profits and stifling investment expenditures. It would give profits a chance to catch up. It would also provide opportunities for price reductions which would be enormously helpful in strengthening our international competitive capability, and thus in eliminating our balance-of-payments deficit. A revision of the guidelines to this end is urgently needed.

ONE OF SIX WORKS FOR GOVERNMENT

In addition to a redefinition of the wage guidelines, there are other things that government can do to help prevent cost inflation. For one thing the Federal Government is the largest single employer in the United States. Over 2 million persons are employed by the Federal Government in civilian jobs and around 6 million by State and local governments. About one out of every six persons in the United States employed in a nonfarm job is working for government. You can see from this that there is an enormous influence that could be brought to bear on the cost structure of our economy if Federal, State, and local governments were to adhere to wage and salary policies consistent with a proper guideline principle.

Second, the Federal Government is an enormous indirect user of labor services through the procurement of supplies and in its contracting for construction. It has been alleged time and again that the pace of cost advances in some regions, such as the west coast where Government procurement is the major element in the economy, is set by the wages paid by Government contractors and subcontractors. Would it not be possible for the Federal Government, through its procurement agencies, to exercise restraints on cost that are consistent with those it wishes to have exercised by the business community generally?

Third, consideration should be given to the impact on production costs of the determination of prevailing wages under the Davis-Bacon and Walsh-Healey Acts. Under these laws, the Federal Government sets what are in effect minimum wages for labor performed in a great variety of employments. And these minimum wages are well above the level of the minimum wage with which we are most familiar; namely, the minimum set under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Certainly the Federal Government should have its own guidelines in mind when it sets minimum wages to be adhered to by its contractors.

I have said little or nothing about tax cuts because these other matters are more basic. Let me comment on the current tax discussions very briefly.

We can dispose of the question of the "quickie" tax cut; that is, the temporary cut in individual income taxes very quickly. This is an antirecession measure. But so far as I know, no one is saying that we are in a recession already, and I am not prepared at this time to say that the outlook is so bleak that we need to have recourse to emergency tax cuts. We do need a basic restructuring of our tax system and it would be enormously helpful to reduce the tax load. But that is another matter. We should get started on it as soon as we can but we must do it within the framework of a fiscal policy that will give us a fair chance of balancing the budget over the cycle. Neither our domestic nor our international affairs will permit us to go for very long on a spree of higher spending, lower taxes, and bigger deficits. This would be a totally unworkable economic policy and it wouldn't even be good politics, believe me.

One last word on taxes. Of all the potentially mischievous ideas I have heard recently, none is more discouraging than the notion that tax cuts for business would make it possible to give larger wage increases. But to give wage increases on this basis would totally eliminate the beneficial effects of tax reform. If the dialog does nothing else, I hope it will expose and eliminate that idea before it goes any further.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as there has been considerable questioning as to the number of job opportunities on the Peace Corps for skilled craftsmen and other noncollege graduates, I would like to include an article from the United Association Journal on this subject:

THE PEACE CORPS

President John F. Kennedy, to departing Peace Corps men, the White House: "The great impression of what kind of country we have and what kind of people we are will depend on their judgment of you."

One day in March, a young United Association apprentice said goodby to his family and started on a journey which will take him from his Los Angeles home and friends on a strange and adventuresome trip to Bolivia. As the first United Association member to be accepted for the Peace Corps, 26-year-old Ray Morris faces a tough and exacting task.

"I was impressed by the Peace Corps idea when Mr. Kennedy first brought it up," says Morris. "But I never figured that noncollege people would be a part of it. Then I read in the union paper that the Peace Corps was considering sending building trades craftsmen overseas, and I applied. It's pretty wonderful. And when you come right down to it, I think we can do a lot to help the program. From what I understand, there's a lot of building from scratch needed, and we can work right with them."

In his Washington office of the Peace Corps, one block from the White House, Mr. Jules Pagano, Chief of the Technical and Labor Division of the Peace Corps, feels the same way. It was Mr. Pagano's appeal for Peace Corps recruits to General President Peter T. Schoemann, which started the fourth-year apprentice on his way.

"The Peace Corps has a big job to do," says Mr. Pagano, "and all of us have nothing but praise for the United Association's cooperation and help in this program. Being a Peace Corps man requires a lot of work, hard work. Skilled craftsmen such as Ray Morris, trained in the exacting standards of the United Association, are pretty hard to come by."

UNITED ASSOCIATION COOPERATION

"Mr. Schoemann, Mr. O'Neill, all of the officers of the United Association deserve a lot of praise for helping us on this program. The skills that young Morris learned in the United Association will be invaluable to our work. We're something new in foreign relations. We're trying to show the world America's true face. People like Ray Morris reflect that picture."

A tall, spare individual who minces no words, Mr. Pagano's dedication to the Peace Corps and its goals is evident. In relating how Apprentice Morris came into the program, he told of how Washington received the young man's application. Written into the section which asks the volunteers' preference of foreign assignment, Morris had written "Wherever Mr. Pagano says I should go."

"Isn't that the spirit?" commented Mr. Pagano. "He's ready to go anyplace we need him."

In Bolivia, Ray Morris will need all his skill and stamina. He will be living at the village level, working day to day with the people of that South American land, improving water supply and sanitation systems in a land which is a far cry from his California home. Six plumbers and pipefitters will be used by the Peace Corps on this Bolivian project, and young Morris' training will include an intensive study of the Bolivian language and culture.

Joseph A. Walsh, business manager of United Association Local 78, of which Ray Morris is a member, said the Peace Corps decision to recruit skilled U.S. workers with know-how and the ability to "show how" should pay off in grassroots good will for the United States and the cause for freedom abroad. "We're mighty proud that Ray was accepted for training," Mr. Walsh says, "and we think it shows that the Peace Corps is taking a practical approach to real foreign aid and is building from the ground up, where it counts, among the village working people."

Conditions which Brother Morris will face in his Bolivian assignment may roughly approximate those of Chile, another South American nation where Peace Corps Volunteer Tom Scanlon penned these words in a report:

"Oxen pull their plows [peasant farms] when workhorses would do twice as much in the same amount of time. Their trees are unpruned and the crops go unthinned and pastures aren't fenced off so that some sections can grow or even be improved while others are being used. The pigs, chickens, turkeys, and dogs run wild in the front yard, and flowers grow alongside vegetables in the garden. They have no idea of farm finances. They will raise a turkey or two and sell them for less money than they invested in labor and feed. In the rural areas of Chile, the average child has 4 years of schooling. A successful educational system in the rural areas would diminish every difficulty I have mentioned. If they were taught that an egg is more nutritious than a potato, though the same size, they might spare more chickens and use their land for green vegetables instead of putting them all in potatoes."

BOX SCORE

At present, some 984 Peace Corps volunteers are serving on oversea projects or are in training or scheduled for training. Oversea projects at this time include Chile, Colombia, Ghana, Nigeria, East Pakistan, West Pakistan, Philippines, St. Lucia (British West Indies), Tanganyika, India, Sierra Leone, Malaya, Thailand, Philippines (in training), Brazil (in training), El Salvador (in training), and Colombia (in training).

Although the Peace Corps needs a variety of skills, no work is more important than Brother Ray Morris' future task—helping through his United Association learned skills to improve the sanitation standards of Bolivia.

It is no accident that the newly emerging nations of the world have given high priority to their sanitation programs. The economic health of the nation is directly dependent on the physical health of its citizens. Many of these new countries have asked the Peace Corps for volunteers like Ray Morris, trained in the plumbing and pipefitting trades, to help with their new programs.

Peace Corps service makes a real "first" for the American union worker. Teachers and doctors can take advantage of exchange programs. Students can compete for scholarships abroad. With the establishment of the Peace Corps, the AFL–CIO has realized one of its international objectives—to provide manpower in key projects planned by the U.S. Government overseas. Organized labor has traditionally been a supporter of American policy on aid to underdeveloped areas. Peace Corps projects are part of this broad picture. Here is the opportunity for the American worker to share his specialized skills, providing a valid demonstration of organized labor in action.

IN 31 COUNTRIES

In Peace Corps projects now opening in 31 countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the United Association plumber and pipefitter can play a vital role.

A union craftsman teaching and training his coworkers is a man who is making a positive impact on the future economic development of these nations, and at the same time he encourages the growth of the labor movement abroad.

A typical Peace Corps request comes from a certain Latin American government which has an urgent need for trained sanitation journeymen to work throughout its country.

In this country, one out of every three babies die during the first year of life. The average lifespan is 50 years. Disease, infection, and pollution are rampant. The need for efficient water supplies and healthful equipment is urgent. Peace Corps sanitary engineers, journeymen, and apprentices will work with local counterparts to conduct the study, design, and construction of water supply and distribution systems for rural communities. Some 100 communities have already asked for help in this underdeveloped nation.

In Africa and Asia, similar projects will be underway. Housing and construction projects, to be partially staffed and supervised by Peace Corps volunteers, are now being planned in Somalia, Tunisia, Gabon, and Liberia. Plumbing and pipefitting will of course be an important part of this work. Community development projects in Colombia, Chile, Peru, and Thailand will also need technicians with a background in the plumbing and pipefitting industry.

Age is no bar to service in the Peace Corps. Jeanne Dumas of Reno, Nev., young in heart and spirit, is at 62 the oldest Peace Corps volunteer. She is now serving in East Pakistan. Retired United Association men may find a new life in Peace Corps work—bringing their years of experience and skill to an important endeavor.

In all Peace Corps projects, volunteers are provided with allowances for food, housing, transportation, medical care, clothing and other expenses. Oversea volunteers who are union members have withdrawal cards. A Peace Corps volunteer receives $75 a month for service, with a total of $1,800 at the end of a 2-year tour of duty. If married, both husband and wife must qualify for the same project and they may not have dependents under 18 years of age. A person must be 18 years old to qualify for the Peace Corps.

One of the Peace Corps most strongly emphasized points is that a person does not have to have a college background to apply and be assigned to a Peace Corps project. People with practical experience like Ray Morris are urgently needed, as much as those with academic qualifications. In some teaching assignments a degree is needed, in others it is not.

Until a few months ago, James Patrick McKay was a bricklayer in Hornell, N.Y. He wanted to share his knowledge with others in a personal and direct way to serve his country.

Today, Jim McKay is working in Lahore, Pakistan, helping to build a hospital. The average Pakistani bricklayer lays 225 bricks per day. Jim's average is 750. His energy and skill are being used to help his Pakistani coworkers improve their own speed and know-how.

PEACE CORPS TRAINING

People like Jim and United Association Apprentice Morris have to go through a grueling period of training before receiving an assignment to represent America abroad. The selection process continues through the entire training period.. Each program has its own selection board, made up of representatives from the Peace Corps, the embassy of the host nation and the training institution where the volunteers are receiving instruction. Prior to the last week of training, a résumé is prepared on each candidate. It includes information from the questionnaire, letters of reference, the Peace Corps entrance test, a full field investigation by the Civil Service Commission, ratings by supervisors in the training program and medical records.

On the basis of this entire record the selection board recommends to the Peace Corps those candidates it believes should be assigned to the specific oversea project. Some of those not selected may be invited for training on a later project more appropriate to their skills. It should be noted that volunteers are judged qualified or unqualified only with respect to the needs of a specific project.

In every project thus far, training has been divided into two phases—one in the United States, the other in the host country. The first phase is usually conducted in a college or university and lasts approximately 3 months. Ray Morris is receiving his training at the University of Oklahoma, in Norman, Okla. The curriculum or course of study includes the culture, people, and policies of the host nation; U.S. history, institutions, and values; international relations; such language training as is needed; physical training, health instruction, and refresher courses in the skills required for the project.

Additionally, the U.S. training may include attendance for a month at the Peace Corps training center in Puerto Rico. At the conclusion of this training, the volunteers selected usually receive a brief home leave, to reassemble at the gateway city and travel to the host country.

During their training, Peace Corps volunteers receive meals, housing, medical care, and all necessary training materials plus $2 a day for expense money. The Peace Corps pays for all official travel, both in the United States and abroad. Under present regulations, volunteers accumulate leave at the rate of 2½ calendar days for each month of satisfactory service. In addition to other alowances, volunteers receive a special allowance of $5 a day while on leave. A Peace Corps doctor is assigned to each nation where volunteers are working, to provide them with special periodical medical checks and care.

Created by Presidential order on March 1, 1961, with Sargent Shriver as Director, the Peace Corps has made great strides in its first year of operation. By June 30 of this year, some 2,300 volunteers will be in training or overseas working on projects.

Apprentice Ray Morris, of United Association Local 78, Los Angeles, is stepping into a big job. As a Peace Corps volunteer, he will gain invaluable knowledge to last through a lifetime, the respect of his fellow craftsmen of the union, and the admiration of his community for striving to meet the Peace Corps standards while advancing America's interests abroad.

The United Association is proud of this fine young brother, and wishes him a good journey and success in his mission of bringing his skill to others less fortunate and at the same time holding high the banner of the union movement.

"Already we have received urgent requests for plumbers and pipefitters, electricians, carpenters, and teachers for technical trade schools. Can we meet these requests? Only if the American labor movement can provide the skilled manpower from its ranks to serve abroad".—Robert Sargent Shriver, Director, Peace Corps.

PEACE CORPS HUMOR

Peace Corps Volunteer Roger Hord, a bricklayer, was working on the roof of a house where Pakistani Peace Corps men will live. He saw a group of men installing a pump in a yard across the way and came down to give them a hand. When he got finished, he found out he was in a jailyard—the workers were inmates. He did some fast explaining—in broken Bengali—and the guard let him out.

When East Pakistani volunteers arrived in Karachi, India, on their way to Dacca, they were met at the airport by the U.S. Ambassador. Bashir Ahmed, the Pakistani cameldriver and friend of Vice President JOHNSON, was on the same plane on his way from the United States. The cameldriver was traveling first class, the Peace Corps men were traveling tourist—no frills.

PLEASANT VIEW FROM CAPITOL HILL

Bipartisan support for the Peace Corps is indicated in comments made by Senators and Congressmen concerning the work of the Peace Corps:

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat: "Its nearly 1,000 volunteers are speaking the language of common concern to peoples all too unused to hearing it."

Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat: "Nothing has served better to carry the message of America's New Frontier to the world than the Peace Corps."

Congressman RICHARD BOLLING, Democrat: "My early hopes for the Peace Corps have been realized."

Congressman LAURENCE CURTIS, Republican: "I supported the Peace Corps from the start, and the rightness of the decision has been confirmed by its fine record of achievement."

Senator JACOB JAVITS, Republican: "I applaud the Peace Corps and all the corpsmen for this kind of dedicated national service."

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAM G. O'NEILL,
General Secretary-Treasurer, United Association of Journeymen & Apprentices of the Plumbing & Pipe Fitting Industry Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. O'NEILL: Again it is my pleasure to write to you concerning a new development that has grown out of our cooperation. In response to President Schoemann's request for members of your organization to consider Peace Corps service, one of your fine members from local 78 has applied. His name is Ray Morris, 3855 West 59th Place, Los Angeles 43, Calif. We have processed his full papers and find him to be the kind of person that we wish to have in the Peace Corps. We have invited him to join the Bolivian project which goes into training on April 1 at the University of Oklahoma.

Sincerely,

JULES PAGANO,
Office of Public Affairs.

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAM G. O'NEILL,
General Secretary-Treasurer, United Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. O'NEILL: Enclosed please find a map that you requested which outlines in black all of the countries where plumbers and pipefitters, who would be engaged in plumbing, pipefitting and refrigeration work will be utilized in Peace Corps projects.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

JULES PAGANO,
Office of Public Affairs, Chief, Professional, Labor and Technical Division.

More Navy Horseplay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we Members of the Congress owe a great debt of gratitude to reporters who work diligently to ferret out the facts and report them honestly and truthfully without fear or favor to our millions of constituents. Good reporting takes hard work, long hours, and great understanding. Many of them cannot be taken on junkets, *Sequoia* river cruises, or brainwashed. The American taxpayer is the great beneficiary of this type of reporting.

As a part of my remarks I am including a letter in answer to one addressed to Secretary McNamara, and written by H. J. Goldberg, rear admiral, U.S. Navy, Vice Chief of Naval Material. From the reply in behalf of Mr. McNamara's letter by Mr. Goldberg one can readily draw the conclusion that any task Mr. Goldberg is qualified to fulfill could and should readily be dispensed with. Therefore, I insert Mr. Goldberg's letter and in answer thereto, I am inserting a feature story from King Features Syndicate, 235 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y., released on Saturday, August 4. This story was written by one of our foremost reporters who reports all news fit to print with no whitewashing or slanting to please or appease anyone.

Mr. Ralph de Toledano did the reporting, headlined "The Navy Fools the Taxpayers." I recommend that you read Mr. Goldberg's letter and then read Mr. De Toledano's report, after which you may draw your own conclusions:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF NAVAL MATERIAL,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1962.

Mrs. M. K. M. MURPHY,
Rutherford, N.J.

DEAR MRS. MURPHY: I have your letter of June 21 to Secretary McNamara expressing your concern over Congressman EARL WILSON's charges regarding the procurement of military hardware.

I appreciate your having taken the time to write. It appears to me that you have been misinformed in this instance, and I am glad that you have given me the opportunity to tell you what I believe are the correct facts.

The Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Armed Services Committee recently investigated the charges made by Congressman WILSON with respect to the procurement of AN/PRC-41 radio sets by the Navy. It was brought out at this hearing that neither the Navy, the General Accounting Office, the Federal Bureau of Investigation nor the subcommittee itself had any evidence of wrongdoing by Navy personnel in connection with this matter. Although he was given an opportunity to testify in person, Congressman WILSON did not testify or otherwise give the committee any evidence to support his charges of wrongdoing.

I am enclosing a copy of the concluding statement made by Assistant Secretary of the Navy BeLieu at this hearing, summarizing the proposed procurement of the AN/PRC-41 radio sets. I hope that you will have the time to read it as I believe that it will show you that the proposed procurement is in the best interests of the United States.

Sincerely yours.

H. J. GOLDBERG,
Rear Admiral, SC, U.S. Navy,
Vice Chief of Naval Material.

THE NAVY FOOLS THE TAXPAYERS

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Recently, in a series of columns, I pointed out that wasteful procurement practices at the Pentagon were costing the American taxpayers an estimated $12 billion a year. The response from readers was immediate. Some wrote to me, some to Representative EARL WILSON who had lifted the lid on this shocking condition, and some to Defense Secretary McNamara. The Navy, which has been particularly remiss in this matter, has now been answering some of that mail, stating that I am misinformed and suggesting that it was cleared at hearings before a House Armed Services subcommittee late last June.

Nothing could be further from the truth, and those who took the trouble to write to Secretary McNamara should resent being brushed off in this manner.

To begin with, even Mr. McNamara publicly admits that at least $3 billion a year could be saved by proper procurement methods. Secondly, the Navy admitted at the subcommittee hearings that it had secretly "amended" procurement rules to give it even wider latitude to negotiate sole-source contracts without the competitive bidding which protects the Treasury from being overcharged.

It's all on the record. The subcommittee's report on Navy practices shows that far from being "cleared," it was roundly criticized. This report, from which I quote, was signed by all five members:

"The subcommittee denounces the action of the Bureau of Ships in attempting to set up this new policy and for following it without notice to anyone, including the Secretary of Defense and the other military Secretaries. These officials are charged, under the law, with the content of the procurement regulations.

"This Bureau policy, in our opinion, is contrary to regulations. We can only condemn it. * * * A secret policy of doubtful legality and irregular in its origins, has caused the Navy to be publicly criticized. * * * The eight purchases referred to by Representative WILSON on June 7, 1962, and submitted by him to the subcommittee are matters in which the purchase has been complete. Therefore, the subcommittee regards the disclosures therein as cumulative. Eacch points to abuses because of the use of negotiated sole-source procurement."

The House Armed Services Subcommittee recommended legislation to curtail the unlimited and unrestricted authorization to negotiate sole-source procurement which, Mr. Wilson has charged, makes up 80 percent of Pentagon contracting. It also called for administrative action by the Secretary of Defense to prevent the unauthorized enactment of procedures affecting the process of competitive bidding on defense contracts.

How the Navy could interpret these very sharp statements as any kind of vindication is difficult to understand. It is even more difficult to find justification for the Navy's insistence on the right to shut out competent companies which offer to do the work for less money—something which continues despite the investigation. The Navy, obviously, feels that it can ride out the storm by pouring oil on the troubled waters stirred up by Representative WILSON's documented charges and by my columns which reported the story.

This is, of course, a typical bureaucratic reaction. The coverup and the whitewash are standard operating procedure in all Federal departments and agencies which find themselves under unpleasant scrutiny. In this case, it is not a question of this or that official being put on the hot seat. The subcommittee was dealing here with millions and billions of dollars, at a time when a ballooning Federal deficit is hurting the American economy. The military budget exceeds $50 billion—and if just $5 billion were saved by proper management, it would give the President and Congress leeway to put through the tax cut so badly needed by the country.

In cases of real emergency, the Pentagon is permitted to bypass competitive bidding. But as the subcommittee report states: "Over the years the words 'urgency' and 'emergency' have been so overworked that they have almost lost their meaning."

The Pentagon now claims that it has reorganized procurement so as to eliminate the practices placed on the record by the subcommittee. But if Secretary McNamara is kept in ignorance of what the lower echelons are doing, all the directives in the world will not help. Mr. McNamara is a hard-working executive, but he cannot police the vast acres of the Pentagon. It's up to an aroused public to say: "$3 billion or $12 billion, the waste must stop—now."

Tax Credit Incentive: Another Penalty for Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the recent letter from my good friend William Witte, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and an article from the July 15, 1962, issue of the New York Herald Tribune by Donald I. Rogers entitled "Tax Credit Incentive: Another Penalty for Efficiency."

As I believe that this excellent article and Mr. Witte's letter should be called to the attention of the Congress and the American people, I am placing it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that it may have wider circulation.

Mr. Witte lives at 694 Valleyview Road, Pittsburgh, Pa., and at present is an executive with the James H. Matthews Co.—dies, rubber dies, and box dies. He has been with the company since 1928.

AUGUST 2, 1962.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Attached is a copy of an article from the New York Herald Tribune, Inc., on the tax credit of 7 percent for new plant and better equipment. This article could have been written for us, as we have consistently improved our plant and equipment and would not qualify.

To encourage investment, some other method of tax relief is in order, partially met by the new depreciation allowances set up by the Treasury Department. I am certainly not in favor of general tax reduction, without corresponding reduction in expenditures.

Please let me know to whom I should write on an exchange of ideas.

Cordially,

WILLIAM WITTE.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 15, 1962]

TAX CREDIT INCENTIVE: ANOTHER PENALTY FOR EFFICIENCY

(By Donald I. Rogers)

The Senate Finance Committee has approved the administration's plan for a tax credit incentive designed to spur businesses to modernize themselves with new plants and better equipment, even though a great many business leaders have said they do not want this kind of Government help.

The committee pegged the amount of tax credit at 7 percent, which, it is estimated would cost the Federal Government about $1.1 billion in revenues.

American business men, having observed Government subsidies in such areas as the shipping industry, small business and farming, are not anxious to have the administration embark on still another subsidy, and many business leaders contend that this proposed tax credit incentive system is exactly that—a subsidy.

It would provide a tax benefit to a company that responds to the Government's wishes, in this case by building a new plant or buying a new machine, and deny any benefit to a company that does not comply with the Government's current desires. Since the benefit is denied, it then becomes a penalty.

A company which has been efficient and well-operated might at this very moment be in a fine new plant and operating the best and newest machinery.

This company could get no tax credit incentive.

Yet a competitor, poorly managed, less efficient, housed in a poor plant and running inefficient machinery, would get the tax benefit of a 7 percent credit incentive.

Because the efficient company would be denied any tax relief and the inefficient company would be given tax relief, it means, in effect, that the efficient company would be taxed to remedy the inefficiency of its lagging competitor.

There is no way, under the proposed measure, that this preposterous arrangement could be avoided. It is silly to assume that a great many poorly managed companies will not take advantage of this.

The taxpayers, then, will be again in the position of subsidizing poor business men and keeping alive many businesses that, in the normal competitive world, would have perished, and should have perished.

Take the case of a department store, for instance, located in a declining area such as in some parts of West Virginia. Perhaps that store is as "modernized" as it should be, considering the condition of its marketing area. Yet, there would be nothing to prevent its owners from foolishly spending money to overhaul the entire store in the futile hope of getting more business, and then taking a tax credit of 7 percent because it has responded to the Government's "incentive." The taxpayers would foot the bill for this nonsense.

Members of the administration have referred to this program as a subsidy for American business and that is indeed precisely what it is.

American business doesn't need to be subsidized and most American business leaders don't want to be subsidized. They prefer to do their modernizing when they can afford it and when it will be the most practical and most effective under competitive conditions.

Because of the Government's benevolent attitude toward small businesses, many have been kept afloat which should have been permitted to sink. They are kept in competition at the expense of the successful small business men who get no tax benefits.

This would be the same treatment, except broadened to cover all business in the country, no matter its size and irrespective of its importance.

Subsidized farming over the last 30 years has brought worldwide ridicule to America's redtape-inundated agricultural program in spite of the fact that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has brought about some of the most spectacular improvements in foods, in horticulture and in animal husbandry in the history of man.

At the present time a battle is raging in the Southern peach-growing districts as orchard owners debate whether to accept a Government subsidy which would result in a large portion of the crop being put into Government storage to spoil, or whether to accept competitive challenges and sell the peaches on the open market, either as fresh fruit or as canned and frozen products. The point is that stored, spoiled peaches are of value to no one, representing neither food nor money.

In shipping, the Government's subsidization of payrolls to make up the wage differentials has led to absolute indifference on the part of managements, which see no reason to fight the demands of labor unions.

After these experiences with subsidies, American business should try to avoid further subsidization. In this tax provision, the consumer will be the loser, both as a consumer and as a taxpayer.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Bottum, Joe H., *S. Dak*	
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*	
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hickey, J. J., *Wyo*	4736 W St.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y*	1233 31st St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*	7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr. Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, Maurice J., Jr., *N.H.*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Benjamin A., *Mass*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Kerr (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, and Capehart.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan of North Carolina, Young of Ohio, Hart, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Bush, Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Tower, and Murphy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Butler, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Keating, and Prouty.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, Smith of Massachusetts, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Burdick, Metcalf, Hickey, Kuchel, Allott, Miller, Pearson, Bottum, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan of North Carolina, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Metcalf, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, Murphy, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan of North Carolina, Cannon, Hickey, Pell, Curtis, Dirksen, and Bottum.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.

Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.

Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.

Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd., NW.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire. Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Vacation Sensation: Wisconsin Chippewa Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times recently described the beautiful and exciting dances and art of the Wisconsin Chippewa Indians. I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by David Binder, of the New York Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWICE-A-WEEK CHIPPEWA DANCES SHOW VACATIONERS AN INDIAN ART

(By David Binder)

LAC DU FLAMBEAU, WIS., July 30.—Twice a week, when the sun dips behind the white pines fringing the Lake of the Torch, a troupe of Chippewas file into the Indian Bowl Amphitheater here to stage a homemade pow-pow for a thousand white vacationers.

To the two-beat boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom of a deerskin drum the size of a manhole cover they perform tribal dances, resume local legends, and demonstrate bits of Indian lore such as the uses of blankets while walking, riding, wooing, and hitchhiking.

Four elderly Indians beat the brightly painted drum throughout the 2-hour show, keeping up the monotonous though compelling rhythm while the moccasined feet of the performers aged 2 to 22, thump through such traditional Chippewa numbers as the Fish Dance, South Wind Dance, and Feather Dance.

The crowd, mostly Middle Western youngsters, loves it. And if the Indians smuggle in a few non-Cheppewa steps, such as a southwestern bean dance or snake dance, nobody minds. Nor does anyone take exception to the occasional dancer who wears sunglasses or bobby socks.

CLOTHES ARE CEREMONIAL

For the most part the Chippewas wear colorful ceremonial clothing for the pow-wows—buckskin tunics and leggings embroidered with shell beads, and headdresses of bright feathers and stiffened horsehair. The men and women have dozens of little bells sewed to their tunics to emphasize the dancing rhythms.

According to Bob (the Missing) Link, a 58-year-old Chippewa storyteller, the tribe has been holding public pow-wows for about 40 years—at first in the old tribal village west of the present town of Lac du Flambeau, and in recent years in the Indian Bowl.

Mr. Link's part in the pow-wow is to translate some Chippewa expressions and to tell a few tales in his thick northwoods accent. He explains, for instance, that "migwech" means "thank you," that "wagawa" means "walleyed pike," and that "mushkehameninboshkeminsaygenwe eeswegedisiganbahkweshegan" means "cranberry pie."

He also relates that Chicago got its name from a Chippewa word, "chicagons," meaning "little skunk."

Chief among the Chippewa dances is the pow-wow, or festive council dance. George (Kicking Horse) Brown, master of ceremonies, explains that it can also be a war dance, but that "we do it now as a friendship dance."

This is an exhausting heel-and-toe maneuver executed with arms swinging back and forth in long chopping motions. The drummers mute the beat every 2 or 3 minutes, to give the dancers a respite then resume the insistent pounding.

Another fascinating number is the feather dance, in which performers vie to pick up a feather from the ground with their mouths, without letting their knees touch the turf. Most of the agile Chippewas seem to be able to do this.

The high point for the crowd is the brave man dance in which two Chippewa males track and scalp an "enemy" who has bedded down for the night.

The final act is convincingly savage and provides an appropriate number of screams from the stands.

If the performers appear to grow tired, Mr. Brown calls for another pow-wow dance "to loosen up the bones."

As a final number the Chippewas invite the onlookers to join them around the drum in an "Indian two-step." Then scores of children and adults in T-shirts and baseball caps rush down the aisles to try their skill on the arm of an Indian man or maiden.

PLENTY OF COMPANY

Dancing along with them in ordinary street clothes are dozens of Chippewas from the Flambeau Reservation, who seem to enjoy the pow-wows as much as the whites.

The present pow-wows are run by the Indian Bowl Association, a nonprofit group that pays the dancers a small fee and turns over the rest of its gate money to local charities.

Mr. Brown, secretary of the Chippewa Tribal Council, said there were about 700 Indians living on the reservation and perhaps 700 more enrolled but living and working elsewhere.

Lac du Flambeau was and is the capital of the Chippewa Nation, which once ruled the river and lake country from here to Lake Superior. The name, Flambeau, comes from the pine resin torches used by the Chippewas for night fishing. It is said to have been bestowed by a French voyageur who traveled this part of the country 300 years ago.

During the pow-wows, a Chippewa paddles out on the lake with a torch to set the atmosphere. That, along with the incessant two-beat drumming and the chanting of the dancers carries even the most skeptical spectator back for a moment to the days of Winebesho, who, according to Mr. Link, was the Hiawatha of the Chippewas.

The Need for Additional Forest Research

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Second Congressional District of California, which I am proud to represent, contains some 12½ million acres of national forest lands plus several other millions of acres of forest administered by the Bureau of Land Management and in private ownership. I, therefore, have had an excellent opportunity to see firsthand the great need for expanded research in the field of forestry. This legislation would authorize the appropriation of funds which can be made available to land-grant colleges or agricultural experiment stations and to other State-supported colleges and universities offering graduate training in the sciences basic to forestry and having a forestry school. The Federal contribution must be matched by other forestry research funds obtained from State and non-Federal sources. All of the various fields of forestry research are eligible for support, including timber management research, watershed management research, range and wildlife management research, forest recreation research, forest protection research, and research in forest products utilization and marketing.

This legislation has great significance to my State. Most of our water comes from forests and related rangelands. Many of our people are dependent upon the timber and range resources and all of us, as well as many visitors from other States, enjoy the wonderful opportunities for outdoor recreation that are to be found in our forested regions.

Our land-grant college is the University of California at Berkeley, one of the foremost universities in the world. Its school of forestry, its forest products laboratory, its wildlands research center and its other scientific schools and departments offer numerous and varied opportunities for research in the sciences basic to forestry. The capabilities and willingness to expand forestry research at the University of California are excellent. Such an expansion is needed and this bill will help to stimulate it.

Finally, I would like to mention the close working relationships in forestry research that have long existed between the University of California and the U.S. Forest Service. For some 25 years the

Forest Service maintained an experiment station on the campus at Berkeley in quarters provided by the university. A few years ago, the Forest Service Experiment Station moved into its new laboratory-office building, two blocks away from the campus, but cooperative research relationships with the university are carried on as before. Some 50 different research projects are being carried on, or have been completed jointly by the Federal Forest Experiment Station and the university. Many university students, particularly graduate students training for careers in forestry research, find part-time and summer employment with the Forest Service Experiment Station. This bill will make this coordination even more effective, it will promote the training of more research scientists who are badly needed in forestry and it will benefit my entire State by expanding the fine program of forestry research at the University of California.

The 32d Division Comes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the year-ago Berlin crisis resulted in a callup of National Guard and other Reserve Forces—including Wisconsin's 32d National Guard and other State Reserve units.

Now these defenders of freedom are returning home.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin stations, I was privileged to discuss the significance—as well as the problems—involved in the callup of Reserve forces.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF CHIPPEWA FALLS, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS, AUGUST 4–5, 1962

In a world of crises, we—particularly here in Wisconsin—are day by day witnessing personally that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, yes; but also eternal readiness to defend freedom.

Almost a year ago, Wisconsin's famed 32d Division—and other fighting units—were called up "to the colors" as a result of the Berlin crisis. The majority of these men are scheduled to return home in August.

A cross section of Wisconsin, these soldier-citizens include teachers, students, farmers, engineers, laborers, businessmen, industrialists, and other trades and professions.

The reintegration of these sacrificing citizens, despite the best kind of help by all of us, will, nevertheless, be difficult and require maximum effort and cooperation by all segments of our society. Fortunately, a statewide survey has indicated that, for the most part, employers will honor reemployment rights of reservists and Guard members.

Our challenge, then, is to assure that these defenders of freedom, rather than being unduly penalized for emergency service, should be accorded every assistance, in act and spirit, commensurate with the significance of their sacrifices for our national security, and the difficulties of reestablishing themselves in civilian life.

MISSION: DEFENSE

In these critical times, the mission of our military forces includes: (1) serving as a deterrent force to any would-be aggressors, capable of striking a death-dealing blow to any attacking enemy; and (2) a protective shield—holding the Reds "at bay"—while we strengthen the free and non-Communist world; and seek solution or accommodation of East-West differences on diplomatic, economic or ideological fronts.

MAJOR GOALS OF U.S. DEFENSE POLICY

As a leader of the free world, and major obstacle to the Communist effort to control the globe, the United States must continue to: Maintain powerfully manned ground, air, and naval forces capable of defense, and of striking back against an attacking enemy; create an ever-stronger economy to support the skyrocketing costs of defense, as well as meet the fast-growing needs of an ever-increasing 186-million population; and mobilize our citizens in 'spirit' as well as militarily, to meet the challenge to survival by communism.

REVIEW OF RESERVE POLICY

After the call of the 32d—and similar units around the State and Nation—patriotic citizens and their families, and others concerned with national policy, asked: "Was this necessary?" "Did a callup, resulting in serious disruption of civilian life, serve our national security?"

In the Congress, the Armed Services Committee scheduled hearings to find answers to such questions. There were tremendous amounts of testimony. As yet, unfortunately, there has still been no clarification of national policy.

In the best traditions of America, however, Wisconsin's 32d, and other units', rise to the call enabled America to more strongly "flex its muscles," at a critical time in history. Once again, a show of strength discouraged aggression by demonstrating to the Communists that we stand ready and willing to protect the rights of freedom. For this contribution to the cause of freedom—at considerable personal sacrifice—you, and your families—deserve the gratitude of all America. Now, we are happy that you are home. Along with all fellow citizens, I, as your Senator, stand ready to do everything possible to make less difficult the problems of readjustment to day-to-day life in Wisconsin.

We'd All Like To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record two editorials that appeared Tuesday and Wednesday, August 7 and 8, in the Allentown, Pa., Morning Call, written by the associate editor, Mr. Gordon B. Fister.

The editorials follow:

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, Aug. 7, 1962]

PROPER RETALIATION

If the Israel Government cannot understand the language of friends, then it's time this Nation speaks in the terms suggested yesterday by Representative Francis E. Walter.

The Easton Representative called on the U.S. State Department to immediately cancel landing privileges in this country for Israel's El Al or any other airline involved in blocking the return of Robert Soblen to serve his life sentence for espionage. To be effective, the action must be prompt enough to prevent him from slipping into a Red haven.

Entirely too much consideration has been given this criminal, convicted of one of the most serious and dangerous offenses on the statute books of every nation. Too much leniency was shown him in this country after he was convicted and sentenced.

Technically, this spy who betrayed his nation to the Soviets is still a passenger of El Al, en route from Israel, which he entered improperly, to the United States, which he fled illegally. His trip was interrupted when he stabbed himself lightly enough to make a bid for the refuge England has quite properly denied him. Under its own laws, Britain cannot ask another airline to take him out unless El Al agrees.

Short of the methods the Israel Government used when it kidnaped Adolph Eichmann in Argentina and spirited him to its own courts for trial and deserved punishment, the Walter proposal seems like the most reasonable means of ending the impasse and blocking Soblen's escape. It has precedent in the action taken when docking privileges were lifted for the Polish liner on which Gerhard Eisler, another Soviet agent, made his getaway.

Notice should be served promptly that it will be invoked again.

We don't like the term "retaliation" when speaking of Israel and other nations we have reason to hope will continue to be our friends. Neither, however, do we like some of the tissue-thin excuses they offer for all-but-inexplicable actions like this one.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, Aug. 8, 1962]

WE'D ALL LIKE TO KNOW

It wouldn't be healthy for anyone to hold their breath while waiting for the U.S. State Department to announce cancellation of landing privileges for any foreign airline blocking the return of Robert Soblen to serve the life sentence awaiting him for selling his country's secrets to the Russians.

Neither should anyone stop breathing until someone in authority tells Representative Francis E. Walter and the rest of us why Soblen was permitted the freedom that made his escape possible in the first place.

He had, after all, been convicted of a capital offense and narrowly escaped the death penalty. His appeal had been denied and he was free under $100,000 bond while his case was carried to the U.S. Supreme Court. Even when the final decision went against him, evidently no steps were taken to prevent his escape.

Representative Walter isn't likely to be satisfied simply by asking why there wasn't adequate surveillance to prevent this convicted spy from jumping his bail, perhaps with more secrets he may have stored away to pay his final ransom. After all, this isn't the first time a Soviet agent has been permitted to get away.

We hope that in his characteristic way the Easton representative keeps probing for the answer until he gets it, if only to make reasonably certain the same thing doesn't happen again.

Progress in American Samoa Under Governor Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pleasure that I bring to the attention of our colleagues a news item taken from the August 4, 1962, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin regarding the progress being made in American Samoa under the leadership of Gov. H. Rex Lee. During the past 15 months since his inauguration, Governor Lee has shown remarkable initiative and leadership in getting our South Pacific territory on its feet, economically and socially, and has demonstrated what a well-trained and experienced civil servant can accomplish when ability is coupled with sympathetic understanding and cooperation of the Congress and the Department of the Interior.

My friend of long standing, Mr. Riley H. Allen, spent 2 weeks in American Samoa covering the South Pacific Commission Conference for the Star-Bulletin, of which he is the retired editor.

Mr. Allen's report follows:

LEE PERFORMS WONDERS IN AMERICAN SAMOA

(By Riley H. Allen)

(NOTE.—Mr. Allen, retired editor of the Star-Bulletin, has just returned from covering the South Pacific Conference held in American Samoa.)

PAGO PAGO, AMERICAN SAMOA.—What oldtimers in Samoa call a modern miracle has been achieved in just over a year of the driving administration of Gov. H. Rex Lee.

But Rex Lee calls it "just the start" in construction, education, hospital and general medical care, and making American Samoa a thriving territory of the United States and a demonstration of what American care does for dependent people.

Governor Lee was installed at Pago Pago on May 27, 1961. Within weeks he was starting a campaign at Washington, D.C., for greatly increased appropriations—and for awareness at the National Capital of its inescapable responsibility for the Samoans.

For years American Samoa has been dragging along on a budget of $1.5 million to $2 million annually.

DRAMATIC CHANGE

Now the financial picture has been dramatically changed.

For the fiscal year 1961 the appropriation was $2,486,000.

For the fiscal year 1962 it was $9,500,000.

For the fiscal year 1963 Lee is assured of $13,272,000.

This money of the U.S. taxpayers is going into urgently needed improvements in every phase of community life.

Among the dramatic achievements is a new jet airstrip—and on that strip the U.S. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and his official party landed early on the morning of July 18 to join in the opening of the 5th triennial conference of the South Pacific Commission.

For the first time the jetplanes speeding down from Hawaii, or up from Australia and New Zealand, or westward from Tahiti, can land safely and indeed easily.

STRIP IS 9,000 FEET LONG

Observers who know "old Pago Pago," were amazed at the speed and scope of constructing the airstrip at Tafuna. The old airstrip was abandoned, for good reasons.

Building the new one involved cutting out 200,000 cubic yards of rock and an immense amount of filling and paving. The new strip is 9,000 feet long—ample for the biggest airliners now flying.

Another dramatic addition is the new auditorium—designed by George (Pete) Wimberly of Honolulu—costing less than $280,000 with sound and movie equipment. It was done in less than 3 months, even with a delay in getting some materials.

Not less spectacular is the achievement in roadbuilding in less than a year—14 miles of 20-foot roadway with ample shoulders. And this is only the start of the road system which will eventually connect every village on this island of Tutuila with Pago Pago, the capital.

Seven more miles of good road are to be completed from the airport junction to the large village of Leone—long isolated except by trails and a road that even a jeep could scarcely navigate.

Construction of strong seawalls and a new terminal building complex at the airport are also planned. The terminal will be ample but not fancy.

Modern school buildings and modernly-trained teachers early got the Governor's attention.

In 1 year three high schools have been built. This will add space for 800 new high school pupils. And engineering and architectural plans are under way for 5 new junior high schools and 20 elementary schools.

FORTY TEACHERS SELECTED

The Government has arranged to bring more than 40 teachers—mostly from California and Hawaii—on a minimum 2-year term of service. All have been carefully selected.

For these elementary schools, which will be built on every island in the American Samoan group, the American Samoa Government will provide materials and supervision and the Samoans will contribute the labor free.

Governor Lee, who is imaginative as well as practical and pushing, early envisioned educational television as a need for the widely scattered people of American Samoa. He and his fellow planners are putting $1,600,000 into an educational TV plant and transmitters that will cover the main island, Tutuila. Distant Manu-a (also American Samoa) and Western Samoa, where there are many more people, will be able to pick up the telecasts.

Western Samoa, which for many years has been under New Zealand mandate and administration, on January 1 became an independent nation.

IDENTICAL RACIAL BACKGROUND

Its racial background is identical with that of American Samoa but the governments are completely separate and independent of each other.

The TV lessons will be transmitted from a set high in the mountains near Pago Pago. On Manu-a, a generator will be installed to make possible reception of TV by residents.

For the coming year also the minimum age for schoolchildren will be lowered from 7 to 6 years—this because more buildings and teachers will be available.

Health and sanitation have a high place on the Lee program. A team from the University of Southern California has been here studying the dread disease filiarisis (mosquito borne) at Lee's urgent invitation. One has returned to California. Two others are remaining for a while.

HOSPITAL PLANNED

A new hospital is in the planning stage, and a general sanitation survey to cost $25,000 will be made to help even the remotest village. Plans for the hospital will be completed by this fall, and the request for the needed appropriation will then go immediately to the Bureau of the Budget in Washington, D.C.

Lee with characteristic sportsmanship gives credit to others for American Samoa's advancement in the little more than a year since he was sworn into office.

He pays tribute first to the Samoan people—women as well as men. He says that they are quick to grasp techniques and to develop leaders of their own race. He adds that they are enthusiastically industrious—"they are willing to work day and night."

He adds that the American Samoan Government officers on duty here when he came responded with alacrity when he laid before them the need for vastly expanded plans and the work necessary to get the job done.

NAVY HELP LAUDED

And he is warm in praise of the civilian engineers and others whom he borrowed from the 14th Naval District and the Pearl Harbor shipyard.

Among these is Al Pratt, civilian engineer at Pearl Harbor with long experience in Pacific construction jobs; and Richard Webb. He got them in November 1961, and they reorganized and built up the local work force.

Lee emphasizes that they continue to rely on Samoan labor. Pratt has just retired, as director and manager, operation and maintenance division of public works. He returned to Honolulu and his Pearl Harbor duties July 29.

Pratt and Webb devoted themselves primarily to the colossal job of building the jet airstrip and their righthand men are two Samoan high chiefs. They are Chiefs Lutu, of Fagatogo, and Fano, of Fagalu—villages near Pago Pago. Fano is half Samoan and half Japanese. His father, a fisherman, sailed to Samoa many years ago, married there and remained.

GETTING JOB DONE

"None of these men, or the Samoans who worked with them, worried about long hours. All they thought of was getting the job done," says the Governor.

So when the South Pacific Commission came here for its triennial conference there were not only an excellent airstrip and good roads. There were ample quarters for the visitors—more than 150 people altogether. Most were put up in the new school buildings—finished, except for minor details, only a few days before. This is in the village of Utulei about a mile from the Governor's office and the legislative building.

American Samoa was committed to the South Pacific Conference long before Lee was appointed.

INVITATION ISSUED

The American Samoan delegates to the fourth Pacific conference at Rabaul in 1959—Rabaul is the administrative center of New Britain, a group of several islands—issued the invitation.

As Pago Pago and its nearby villages then existed, the Commission and its scores of advisers, observers and staffs, could not possibly have been housed.

Now the South Pacific Conference members and staffs are cordial in their praise. They have been well cared for, with modern, businesslike arrangements mingled with the unaffected and friendly hospitality of the Samoans.

The 26th Anniversary of the Spanish Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating this important anniversary in the history of modern Spain.

I used the term "modern Spain" in order to contrast the relatively short time that has elapsed since the memorable defeat that international communism suffered on the Iberian Peninsula, with the much older ties of friendship that have existed between our people and the people of Spain.

All of us are conscious, I am certain, of the contribution which Spain has made over the centuries to the establishment and development of Western civilization in the Western Hemisphere. In the United States alone, many of our areas, towns and cities clearly reflect the influence of Spanish culture. Those contributions have enriched our own lives in many ways.

But what is more relevant to the anniversary which we are observing today, is the extent to which Spain of today—modern Spain—can help us in enlarging the area of freedom and in establishing the foundation for lasting peace in the world. This is the task which confronts us today. And I am happy to say that Spain has contributed—and continues to contribute in many ways—to the achievement of those goals.

Our bases in Spain serve as vital links in the chain of free world defenses.

Spain's strategic position, and historic links with millions of peoples living in the developing countries, help our common cause.

And, even more recently, Spain's decision to apply for membership in the European Economic Community, to move into the mainstream of economic life of Western Europe, can result in an important contribution by enhancing the strength, unity, and economic viability of the so-called Atlantic Community.

I am very pleased that, during this time of change and challenge, Spain is so ably represented in Washington by His Excellency, Ambassador Antonio Garrigues. Ambassador Garrigues' friendship for our country, and his extensive experience in many areas of human endeavor, will serve him in good stead in his present assignment.

In concluding my remarks I would like to echo the sentiments expressed by President Kennedy when he accepted Ambassador Garrigues' credentials.

"The continuing cooperation of our two countries in defense of the West," he said, "has been of mutual benefit in many fields and I am confident that the benefits of this collaboration will continue."

I, too, am hopeful and confident that our two countries will continue to cooperate in the interest of freedom and peace in the world.

In conclusion, I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], a distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for his eloquent remarks. I further wish to extend my congratulations to the Spanish nation and its leaders on their important anniversary. It marks, as we all know, one of the serious reverses suffered by the Communist movement in its drive to extend its dominion over the free peoples of the world.

A Rebuke to the Cynics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest new programs upon which the United States has embarked as the leader of the free world is that of the Peace Corps. Under the able direction of Sargent Shriver, it is making an enviable record around the world.

On June 16, 1962, the Baton Rouge Advocate saluted this splendid organization in an editorial which I commend to my colleagues:

A REBUKE TO THE CYNICS

Rather astonishingly to some of us, the Peace Corps, at first the object of so much suspicion, cynicism, and sour humor, has completed slightly more than a year of activity with an enviable record of public and congressional support. It has the strong endorsement of such conservatives as Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee, and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona. Its appropriation has just been more than doubled without a dissenting vote in the Senate and with only 70 votes against in the House.

Though for a time interest appeared to be lagging among the young people constituting the best candidates for Peace Corps work, as of May 1 there were 1,399 volunteers at work on or in training for projects in 32 countries. More than 2,200 are expected to enter training this month for 44 projects in 28 countries. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Corps, says that all of the first 15 countries to receive Peace volunteers have asked that the number be doubled, tripled, or quadrupled.

The amount of actual work done by the Peace Corps always will be relatively small. It never will operate on a large enough scale to rebuild nations or to replace other forms of technical or economic assistance. But its members, working hand in hand with the people of many different nations to do simple but essential tasks and teach simple but essential skills, are in a position to accomplish important long-range results and make major contribution to understanding among peoples.

The Peace Corps originally was denounced by some critics as an "idealistic" and "do-gooder" project. It is a bit of both. And we are glad to see it succeed and provide rebuke to those who, in the hard-headedness and realism of which they boast, are in danger of forgetting that without ideals and a sincere desire on the part of some of us to do good, the world would be, at best, a rather miserable place, and at worst, a jungle in which not even the strongest long could survive.

Capt. William C. Hushing Cited for Polaris Submarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, Capt. William C. Hushing, U.S. Navy, presently serving as supervisor of shipbuilding and naval inspector of ordnance, Groton, Conn., whose hometown of Litchfield, Ill., within my congressional district, was on July 13, 1962, presented the award of a Navy Commendation Medal. Such outstanding service is of great interest to all of us and for the benefit of my colleagues who wish information concerning the award, I include an article which appeared in the Litchfield, Ill., News-Herald on July 18, 1962:

HUSHING CITED FOR POLARIS SUBMARINE

Navy Capt. William C. Hushing, supervisor of shipbuilding and naval inspector of ordnance at Groton, Conn., who considers Litchfield his home, was presented with the Navy commendation medal by Rear Adm. George H. Wales, commandant, 3d Naval District, New York, in a recent ceremony.

The citation signed by Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth cited Captain Hushing follows:

"For meritorious service from February 1960 to February 1962, as supervisor of shipbuilding and naval inspector of ordnance, Groton, Conn. Recognizing the extraordinary national contribution which lay in the deployment of the Polaris system, Captain Hushing responded admirably to the tremendous challenge of matching the complex weapons system, as it developed, with construction of an equally complex nuclear-powered submarine. The milestones achieved in the production of the first group of Polaris submarines can be attributed, in large measures, to his aggressive leadership, sound judgment, and marked ability to direct and utilize proficient military and civilian shipbuilding engineers and craftsmen in an unusual team effort. His enthusiastic and inspiring devotion to the fulfillment of an extremely important project reflects great credit upon himself and the U.S. naval service."

Captain Hushing has served in his present position since February 1960. Prior to this assignment he was comptroller and industrial engineering officer, Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.; from March 1955 to June 1957, he served in the Bureau of Ships at Washington as assistant head of the machine design branch, and as administrative aide and special assistant to the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, Rear Adm. A. G. Mumma. During World War II he served aboard the light cruiser *Detroit*.

Captain Hushing attended the U.S. Naval Academy, graduating in 1939. He later attended the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, receiving an advanced degree in naval engineering in 1944. Captain Hushing presently resides with his wife and two daughters at 205 Shore Avenue, Groton, Conn.

He is a nephew of Miss Ota May Hushing and William Hushing, of North State Street.

Two Pastors From Plains, Pa., Made Domestic Prelates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Thursday, August 2, 1962, carried an editorial tribute to two outstanding clergymen in my congressional district who were recently elevated by Pope John XXIII to the rank of domestic prelates in the Roman Catholic Church. I have known Monsignor Pilny and Monsignor McNulty for some years and I was personally delighted when I learned of their respective elevations to their present rank. In each instance, it is well-deserved recognition for outstanding performances over a period of years and deep dedication to the well-being of their parishioners and the progress of their respective parishes and the diocese of Scranton. I extend to each my warmest congratulations and very best wishes for continued service to the church.

The editorial follows:

Two Plains Pastors Domestic Prelates

Elevation of the Reverend Joseph B. Pilny, pastor of SS. Peter and Paul's Church, Plains, for 31 years, and the Reverend Francis G. McNulty, S.T.D., J.C.D., pastor of Sacred Heart Church, Plains, for 16 years, by Pope John XXIII to the rank of domestic prelate with the title of right reverend monsignor is recognition that is richly deserved on the basis of their achievements and service to the Roman Catholic Church. It is an unusual coincidence that two churchmen in the diocese of Scranton who are neighbors should be singled out by the Holy See for distinction the same day.

With their new rank, Monsignors Pilny and McNulty become members of the papal household for life, continuing through changes in the Pontificate. As ecclesiastical dignitaries, they will have special dress and privileges, including the right to be present when the Pope celebrates solemn mass and to participate in all public papal celebrations.

The honor that has come to Monsignor Pilny is the second for SS. Peter and Paul's parish, the other being the elevation of a native son, the Most Reverened Stephen S. Woznicki, D.D., bishop of Saginaw, Mich., to the hierarchy of the United States.

A $2 million plant, among other things, attest to the administrative zeal and spiritual leadership of Monsignor Pilny during the three decades he has labored there and explains the acclaim of the Holy See.

Monsignor McNulty, a Pittston native, who has an impressive record as an administrator, scholar, and diocesan official, is the second pastor from Sacred Heart parish to be elevated, the other being the Right Reverend Monsignor Dennis J. Kane, P.A., who was designated both a domestic prelate and prothomotary apostolic, and is now serving at Hazleton. As chairman of the Diocesan Liturgical Commission, prosynodal judge of the diocesan matrimonial court, member of the examining board of junior clergy, and diocesan director of St. Ives Guild of Catholic Lawyers, Monsignor McNulty has demonstrated his competence in many fields.

Plains Township, according to the 1960 census, has a population of 10,995. The fact that it has provided the Diocese of Scranton with two Domestic Prelates in 1962 is proof of the axiom that if a man builds a better mousetrap fame will seek him out, no matter where he is and what his modesty.

Radio-TV as Seen From Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I call attention of the House to the fact that on August 6, 1962, the Honorable Oren Harris, of Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee of the House on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, addressed the Georgia Association of Broadcasters, Inc., at its annual convention at Jekyll Island, one of Georgia's fine State parks.

This 1962 convention, presided over by H. Randolph Holder, of Athens, Ga., president of the Georgia Association of Broadcasters, Inc., and owner of radio WGAU, and guided by the quietly efficient executive secretary, Jack Williams, was unusual in at least three respects. First, under President Holder's leadership the Georgia Association of Broadcasters has achieved the enviable position of being the largest in the United States. Second, as stated by Frank Harden, president of the South Carolina Broadcasters Association, it was "the first occasion when our members have had the pleasure of officially meeting in joint session with our fellow broadcasters in the neighboring State of Georgia." And, third, it was the first time so outstanding a national figure as Representative Oren Harris had appeared before the annual convention.

It was my honor to present Mr. Harris to the assemblage and his speech was so well given and so vital to the radio and television industry, I requested that I be permitted to insert the following text in the Record:

Radio-TV as Seen From Capitol Hill

(Address by Representative Oren Harris, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege and pleasure for me to be with you here today. The subject which you have suggested gives me an opportunity of sharing with you some thoughts about the actions taken by our committee and the Congress during the 87th Congress in the field of radio and television.

Radio and television legislation has assumed a very prominent place among the many subjects over which our committee has jurisdiction.

We have been more active during the 87th Congress with respect to radio and television legislation than perhaps any of the numerous other subjects within our committee's jurisdiction.

Let me be more specific and give you some illustrations.

As of July 4, 1962, a total of 783 bills were referred to our committee. Of this total, 91 bills fell into the category of radio and television. This constitutes a very large percentage considering the fact that our committee jurisdiction includes, among others, subjects such as railroads, aviation, motor transportation, securities and exchanges, trade regulations, public health, food and drug regulation, oil and gas, and electric power, and so forth.

The large number of radio and television bills is only one of several yardsticks by which one can measure the awareness on the part of Congress with respect to radio and television matters.

Another yardstick is the close attention which the Congress is giving to the agency to which is assigned the responsibility of regulating radio and television—the Federal Communications Commission. When, in April of 1961, President Kennedy submitted to the Congress a reorganization plan affecting the organization and procedures of that Commission, Congress disapproved the plan. It was felt that the plan would concentrate too much power in the hands of the Commission Chairman by giving him authority to assign fellow Commissioners and Commission personnel to specific tasks.

Congress realized, however, that the steadily increasing workload of the Commission required some changes in the law governing the Commission's procedures. Also, in order to promote efficiency and to speed up the handling of applications and other cases by the Commission, it was felt that Congress would have to permit the delegation of some functions to qualified and experienced Commission personnel, subject, however, to review and final decision by the Commission itself.

Our committee gave careful consideration to this legislation which passed both Houses of the Congress and was signed into law on August 31, 1961. I believe, and certainly it is my sincere hope, that provisions of the legislation will be used by the Commission to reduce the large backlog of cases pending before it.

Two other measures on which our committee acted and which have become law attest to the interest of the Congress in an expanding broadcasting industry. I have reference to the all-channel television receiver and the educational television legislation.

The purpose of these two acts of Congress is to eliminate a great waste of one of our most valuable natural resources—the radio spectrum. As all of you well know, in 1952 the Federal Communications Commission adopted a nationwide intermixed UHF–VHF allocation structure for television and set aside a number of television channels for noncommercial educational television. Out of a total of 2,225 television assignments, 681 are VHF stations and 1,544 are UHF stations. Ninety-two of the VHF and one hundred and eighty-nine of the UHF station assignments are reserved for educational television. However, only 103 commercial and 16 educational UHF stations are actually on the air.

The principal reason why UHF commercial and educational broadcasting have not been able to develop successfully thus far has been the scarcity of television receivers which are capable of receiving stations operating on UHF channels. In addition, educators interested in operating educational broadcasting facilities have been confronted with a lack of funds to pay for the installation of educational television facilities.

The all-channel television receiver legislation and the legislation providing for Federal matching grants to assist States, local communities, and private nonprofit agencies in the construction of educational television facilities are designed to overcome these difficulties. The enactment of these two measures should, in my opinion, contribute to a vast expansion of UHF television—both commercial and noncommercial. Of course, this expansion will not come overnight, but it is my hope that the growth will be steady and that it will contribute greatly to making available to the American people television service to the fullest degree.

With all the attention which is given these days to television, our committee still has found time to go into certain complex and controversial questions of radio broadcasting.

The character of radio broadcasting has changed very much over the years. Radio has become preponderantly a local service and many persons have come to depend on radio for local news and information.

Our committee held extensive hearings on two subjects which have been of intense interest to radio broadcasters: daytime operations and clear-channel operations. As a result of these hearings and extensive consideration of the problems involved, our committee decided on a course of action with regard to each of these problems.

As you well know, the daytime stations have been asking for years for authority to broadcast at least from 5 a.m. until 7 p.m., and subsequently revised their request downward so that they would be permitted to broadcast at least from 6 a.m. until 6 p.m.

The Commission turned down both of these requests. In spite of repeated urgings on the part of our committee to authorize the conducting of actual limited tests with presunrise and postsunset operations, the Commission has failed to do so.

Our committee decided that the public interest requires that daytime stations located in communities which are not served by full-time stations be authorized to operate presunrise. At present, many persons in the United States residing in areas not served by full-time community radio stations have to do without early morning local news and information programs in wintertime because many daytime stations may not begin operations until after sunrise. In northern localities, which are not as fortunate as we are here down South, sunrise occurs rather late in the morning.

In order to make available to such persons in wintertime vitally needed local news and information programs, under the bill reported by the committee and passed by the House, presunrise operations would be authorized under certain conditions. Such presunrise operations would have to be discontinued or modified if the Commission finds that such operations cause harmful interference to a substantial portion of the area or population in the primary service area of another radio station.

The committee did not find on the basis of the hearings conducted by it that it would be in the public interest to authorize postsunset operations by daytime stations. During the evening hours there is not the same urgent need for local information and news programs which exists in the early morning hours. Furthermore, postsunset operations would cause a greater amount of interference to other stations since during the late afternoon hours more stations are on the air than during the early morning hours.

In view of the fact that we are rapidly approaching the end of this session, it is not at all certain that there will be enough time for the Senate to take up this legislation. It is my judgment, however, that the Federal Communications Commission will make a real effort to work out the problems relating to daytime broadcasting stations along the guidelines laid down in this legislation.

A somewhat related problem was involved in the case of the operations of class I–A clear-channel stations. The Senate adopted in 1938 a resolution to the effect that operations with power in excess of 50 kilowatts would be against the public interest. Relying in part on the Senate resolution, the Federal Communications Commission decided to duplicate 13 of the presently existing class I–A clear channel stations.

Our committee felt after extended hearings that the Commission's decision should be stayed for 1 year and that the Commission should review its decision in the light of a policy declaration passed by the House which would leave the Commission free to authorize operations with power in excess of 50 kilowatts if operation with such higher power is found to be in the public interest. The information given to our committee indicates that better radio service can be rendered to many persons in the United States by several of the clear channel stations if they are authorized to operate with power in excess of 50 kilowatts.

Finally, our committee reported and the House passed a bill providing for the establishment of a Communications Satellite Corporation. This bill, in my opinion, is one of the most important pieces of legislation which has come before the 87th Congress and it is likely to revolutionize the international communications industry. When we considered this legislation it was not thought of as being of primary interest to broadcasters. The outstanding success of Telstar, however, as a relay station for broadcasts demonstrates the terrific impact which communications satellites may have on broadcasting.

Shortly before Telstar was launched one of the technically most experienced Commissioners of the FCC gave a talk in which he pointed out several reasons why, in his opinion, communications satellites would not be used to any considerable extent for international radio and television broadcasting. He mentioned the great cost involved in using satellites for this purpose and the fact that time differentials would make simultaneous broadcasts impractical.

The Commissioner may well be right for ordinary day-by-day television fare, and Telstar was certainly not conceived by the A.T. & T. primarily for use as an international television relay station.

It is a fact, however, that Telstar caught the imagination of the people in the United States and Europe, not because it might some day replace undersea cables in international telephone or telegraph service. Telstar won the tremendous popular acclaim which it received because it has enabled millions of television viewers to participate in their own homes in events taking place thousands of miles away on other continents.

As a matter of fact, there have been reports that Soviet Russia is planning to use four satellites to transmit television programs from Moscow throughout the Russian nation instead of using cables or microwave relays. Of course, these Russian satellites will also relay programs to other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain and thus tie these nations together even more closely.

For that reason alone we should under no circumstances jeopardize the lead which our Nation has achieved with the successful launching of Telstar. It is my fervent hope that the Congress will complete action promptly on the communications satellite legislation so that we may go forward with the organization of the corporation which is expected to be the U.S. instrument through which we will participate in a worldwide international communications satellite system.

Apart from making available increased telephone and telegraph facilities, Telstar or its successor satellites, in my opinion, may before long become the medium by when television will expand into an important international force.

Since the end of World War II, developments in the broadcasting field have certainly left a tremendous impact on our present-day lives. They have transformed the leisure habits of a majority of our citizens. They are effectuating important changes in our educational practices. Educational television plays an ever-growing role in the education of our school and college age children in the sciences, in languages, and in the arts.

Television is affecting our political lives. The televising of the political conventions of our major parties, for example, has led to an insistent demand that convention proceedings be modified to fit them better for television. The televised debates of the two presidential candidates during the 1960 campaign perhaps created a precedent which may be followed in future presidential campaigns.

On-the-spot news coverage of important events has given millions of our citizens an opportunity to be present when these events occur. I need only mention such outstanding events as the space shots of our astronauts and the White House tour conducted by Mrs. Kennedy.

These outstanding events may not be the bread and butter of broadcasters—they may actually cost the broadcasters dearly in dollars and cents—but these are the events which make broadcasting the powerful medium which it has become in this Nation. And now our horizons may be broadened still further by the advent of Telstar which may permit the televising of such newsworthy events on an intercontinental scale.

What do all of these developments mean for you—the broadcasters? They mean that you are holding in your hands tremendous power and with that power must go a growing sense of responsibility.

As broadcasters you constitute a profession and not just a trade. Therefore, you must conduct yourself at all times as members of a profession.

As members of a profession you must deal with problems affecting your industry not only from the point of view of businessmen but also from the point of view of the public whom you serve.

As professional men and women you require a sense of unity. In the marketplace you may compete with one another. Individual television broadcasters may compete with individual radio broadcasters. Individual VHF broadcasters may compete with individual UHF broadcasters. Individual daytimers may compete with full-timers. Individual clear channel stations may compete with individual regional stations.

However, this competition among individual broadcasters in the marketplace should not let you forget that in dealing with the public and those who represent the public you are broadcasters and professionals together. If I may suggest, do not permit yourself to become divided into subgroups with one group fighting another group to the detriment of your profession and to the detriment of the public whom you serve.

I am saying these things advisedly on the basis of my legislative experience particularly during the 87th Congress. As broadcasters you will always have the sympathetic ear of the Members of Congress. As groups of broadcasters fighting for advantages over other groups of broadcasters without being mindful to the public interest, you are likely to jeopardize your professional standing and to exhaust in a very short time the tremendous reservoir of good will which you have created over the years.

I wish all of you a successful convention. I am happy to have been with you today. I am glad to say in conclusion that the future looks exceedingly bright for the broadcasting profession and I want to congratulate you for it.

Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Council of Ministers of Chad, Francois Tombalbaye; and His Excellency, the Ambassador of Chad to the United States, Adam Malick Sow, on the occasion of the second anniversary of Chad's independence.

Formerly part of French Equatorial Africa, Chad is a landlocked country in central Africa about twice the size of France. But in spite of the fact that it has no outlet to the sea, it has long been an active crossroads of trade since it lays on the main routes between east and tropical Africa. Its location has also made it a meeting place of various ethnic groups and has been a determining factor in its interesting history.

Nomads from the north and sedentary populations from the south mingled in Chad. In pre-European times African empires flourished until Islamic conquerors penetrated in the 14th century. Accounts of European voyagers in the 19th century sound like a tale from the "Arabian Nights" in their descriptions of sultans who displayed their wealth in slaves, ostrich plumes, and ivory. Its people today are as varied as in the past: Arab nomads, Negroid herdsmen, primitive villagers and fishermen, Muslims, Christians, Animists.

Its topography matches its population in variety, for Chad is a land of desert, savannah and forest, mountains, rivers, and plains. The north is a sahara, while vegetation and rainfall increase as one travels southward to actual jungle areas in the far south near the border. One of the most rewarding aspects of the country to the current voyager is that the bird and animal life so rapidly disappearing in other parts of Africa still abound in Chad. There are still hunting areas where herds of antelope, buffalo, elephant, and giraffe are plentiful.

But Chad, like the rest of independent Africa, is engaged in a determined campaign to catch up with the 20th century in political and economic development, and its swift progress forms a striking contrast to the background just painted. To trace briefly its political development since World War II, in 1946 Chad acquired the status of oversea territory of the French Republic. A territorial assembly was created whose powers were gradually broadened. Then, in August 1960 Chad became an independent Republic. Executive power is exercised by the President of the Republic assisted by an appointed Council of Ministers. Legislative authority rests in the National Assembly whose Members are elected by direct universal suffrage for a 5-year term. Soon after independence Chad became a member of the United Nations. Thus, in a few short years Chad has successfully made the political leap to the 20th century and joined the world community of sovereign states.

In the economic field Chad has also moved forward. The year 1961 saw a record cotton crop—Chad's chief export—increased construction activity, and an increment in the national budget. Chad's second largest export is meat, and Chad is encouraging the development of tanneries, meat-processing plants, and cottonseed oil presses.

Thus, on this anniversary of independence we congratulate the Republic of Chad for its successes of the past and extend our very best wishes for its future development.

The President Should Back Up His Words With Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we hear some hopeful utterances from the White House with respect to the Nation's dollar but the sad fact is that words alone will not solve our problem.

For example, in a recent press conference the President reiterated that the United States would not devalue the dollar, but with the statement came no indication the administration would change its ideas with respect to deficits and cheap money. As a matter of fact, not long after the statement was made the Nation's supply of monetary gold fell to the lowest point in 23 years.

Newsweek's Henry Hazlitt on August 13 reviews the situation in a column headed "Assurance Versus Acts."

It follows:

ASSURANCE VERSUS ACTS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In his press conference of July 23 the President announced that "those who speclate against the dollar are going to lose. The United States will not devalue its dollar." The effect was dramatic. Gold-mining shares fell. The dollar was stronger on the foreign exchanges.

It was gratifying to have this assurance reiterated. But Mr. Kennedy gave the same assurance in his first month in office and it is necessary to point out once more that the dollar cannot be defended merely by uttering the right phrases. These must be followed by actions and policies which will convince the world that such pledges can and will be kept.

The right policies have not followed the right words. The administration has been pursuing a policy of deficits and cheap money. The outward flow of gold has continued. Three days after the President's pledge of July 23 the Treasury announced a further weekly loss of $90 million, bringing the Nation's supply of monetary gold down to $16.2 billion, the lowest in 23 years. Against this our short-term liabilities to foreigners and international institutions total $23 billion.

Yet in the same week in which Mr. Kennedy made his renewed assurance he let it be known that he favored a tax cut of "at least $7 billion a year." As a deficit of some $3 billion to $6 billion is already in prospect, this could mean a total deficit of $10 billion to $13 billion.

INFLATION THE CAUSE

Now the blunt truth, as I pointed out in this column of December 4, 1961, and on other occasions, is that our balance-of-payments deficit is simply the consequence of our internal inflation. No matter what solution we adopt for our dollar problem, the first and indispensable step is to halt this inflation. Yet not only the administration, but the greater part of the business and banking community, has been treating this problem either with astonishing lack of understanding or with disturbing levity. One of the country's outstanding business organizations has been advocating a big slash in taxes without a corresponding slash in expenditures.

Two exceptions to this irresponsible attitude deserve honorable mention. Last November Hans A. Widenmann, a partner in Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., pointed out that the only solution to the dollar problem was to "balance our budget and put an end to inflationary trends." Anything else was a mere "gimmick." He listed 11 such gimmicks that the administration had already tried or suggested—from reducing tourist duty-free imports to $100 and the proposal to eliminate the 25 percent gold-reserve requirement to attempts to "improve liquidity" through the International Monetary Fund. And he showed that each of these gimmicks was at best a stopgap, and that some would mean dangerous steps in the direction of more world inflation.

UNDERMINING THE DOLLAR

In May of this year, John Exter, senior vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, made a brilliant analysis of the cause of the dollar crisis. He stated his conclusions bluntly: "A balance-of-payments deficit is caused by monetary policy alone. It is a question of creating too much money * * * of running the printing presses. If one country runs its printing presses faster than other countries run theirs—remember Gresham's law—then that country is going to have a balance-of-payments deficit." He went on, like Widenmann, to list the gimmicks to which the administration had resorted to solve the problem, and pointed out that they enabled us at best to postpone it. "Why do we continue easy money when it becomes clearer day by day that it is relentlessly undermining the dollar?"

If I may presume to answer his question, I should say: Because we are still under the delusions of Keynesianism and inflationism. Because we still think that economic salvation lies in government spending, in deficits, and in cheap money. Because many of us hold the insane belief that balanced budgets and sound money cause depression and unemployment. Because we have not stopped to ask ourselves how irreparable the damage would be if confidence were once undermined in the world's anchor currency—the dollar.

M.D. Supports Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the leaders of the medical profession in Philadelphia has written a letter to the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin regarding the medicare legislation. He observed that one-third of the medical profession approved the King-Anderson bill.

His statement is so interesting that I have included it in my remarks so that all Members can read it:

Medicare Defeat Scored

Now that the sounding fury has subsided and the Congress has defeated medicare, the truth of the manner in which this defeat was brought about is gradually becoming known to the people. It sheds no luster on the heirarchy of the American Medical Association or of its hidden allies. It is only a Pyrrhic victory.

That the defeat preserved the integrity of medical practice, the physician-patient relationship, the freedom of choice of physician or hospital to the ill, or that it warded off socialized medicine is an absurdity. Because all of these consequences were imaginary. Only Congress can legislate socialized medicine, and I doubt if it ever would.

To deny justice is to perpetuate injustice. The right to health and well-being is as necessary to a segment of our population as are the four freedoms. To say to the aging population "get rich or go broke in order to receive or to afford the excessive costs of adequate medical care" is to be deprecated. That is why one-third of the medical profession, though mostly silent, approved the King-Anderson legislation. The Kerr-Mills bill, approved by the American Medical Association, is definitely socialistic. According to published statistics, 50 percent of the practicing physicians in the United States are salaried and under the social security program. We are the only nation without a national health service. That one can be developed without the taint so strongly objected to, is possible through conference and conciliation. Peace, prosperity, and strength as well as freedom from anxiety of the elderly citizens with regard to medicare is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Leon Solis-Cohen, M.D.

Thomas B. Curtis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected Members of this body is the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis]. A diligent and hard-working member of the Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Economic Committee, Representative Curtis has been a credit to his country, his party, and the Second District of Missouri.

It gives me real pleasure to place in the Record a recent editorial carried by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. It proves, I believe, that back home, his neighbors and constitutents know that they have an excellent spokesman here in Washington. His overwhelming renomination last Tuesday emphasizes this point.

Because the Globe-Democrat sums up his career so well, I insert the July 28–29 editorial in full in today's Record:

Reelect Congressman Curtis

On the basis of ability, achievement, and a national stature of statesmanship in the House of Representatives, Thomas B. Curtis should be renominated and reelected to Congress from the Second District of Missouri. Mr. Curtis is one of the most effective, distinguished Congressmen this State ever sent to Washington.

The senior Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee—probably the most influential committee of his Chamber—and ranking Republican member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, Mr. Curtis is seeking his seventh consecutive term in Congress.

During his dozen years' service in Congress, Tom Curtis has shown an unrivaled devotion to his country and his State. It has been a dedicated record of intelligence, courage and hard-digging work.

He has grown in his career until his voice is respected in Washington, his judgment quoted throughout the country. If Republicans should win the House, he will be in line to head a major committee.

If diligent, sound devotion to his job is a criterion of high political service, Mr. Curtis abundantly merits reelection. Regardless of party fealties, we believe the people of his second district and of the whole area recognize this.

Congressman Curtis is an outspoken critic of many fiscal and social welfare programs of the administration. With him this is not blind partisanship, routine carping from across the aisle.

He is sincerely convinced of the fallacy of Government poking its nose into almost every phase of American life, subsidizing, dominating, and spending like a drunken prodigal.

He has facts and figures to show how deeply we are plunging into deficit bogs. He has counterproposals, constructive and blueprinted to show a saner way of Government.

Mr. Curtis is not a GOP Jeremiah, heralding brimstone and doom upon the Democratic establishment. He is an exponent of rational opposition, an outstanding Capitol Hill figure to prove the wisdom and virility of the two-party system.

He can lay into the administration with rifling articulateness. He also has a vote for White House proposals he finds good, and kind words for Democratic executives whose work he admires.

He was a chief foe of the President's medicare scheme, because of its limited coverage, compulsory nature, and wedge for socialized medicine. He sturdily and properly fought aid to Communist nations, potential enemies we continue to bolster in a delusion of statescraft.

He constantly demands a reduction in Federal spending and derides the Kennedy proposal for a tax cut without slashing Government's steadily mounting deficits.

Congressman Curtis conceives no sanity in the President's policy of maintaining an unbalanced budget as a Federal way of life. This Curtis criticism makes tremendous sense to us and must to every householder, who has never been able to keep out of trouble by adding endlessly to rising debt.

Yet Tom Curtis is strongly in favor of the Kennedy trade bill to put the United States in a position to compete with the Common Market. He has been generous in praise of Defense Secretary McNamara for doing an excellent job.

And he has helped enormously at home, giving impressive aid to the Riverfront Memorial and realization of Plaza housing. He was chosen the Globe-Democrat Man of the Year in 1960.

In short Thomas B. Curtis has chalked up a splendid career of vital, expanding public service in Washington.

Democrats as well as Republicans of his district know this, and we have every confidence they will send him back to Congress.

His integrity, proved ability and fine record have earned him solid indorsement by his constituents.

Economics at the School Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1962

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, the World magazine of August 7 points out the alarming fact that but 2.5 percent of the U.S. student body now takes an economics course of any kind, and only 23 percent of the country's high school social science educators have ever had a single economics course. This situation is frequently called to our attention through our daily office correspondence.

I am pleased to note that Boston University has recognized this serious deficiency in our educational system and reportedly is doing something about it. The interesting World article is submitted herewith:

Economic Facts May Soon Hum on Classroom Typewriter Keys

The "quick brown fox" typing exercise in public schools may give way to such economic maxims as "bad money drives out good."

If it does, it will be in some part due to the efforts of the Center for Economic Education at Boston University.

The center is dedicated to promoting more economic instruction at all levels of public schools, according to Prof. Kenneth Sheldon, director of the center and assistant professor of education at the School of Education.

"One of our recent studies revealed that the majority of our public school teachers have received little or no economic education," Professor Sheldon said. "As a result most students receive little formal economics before the last year of high school, if at all. This fact bodes ill for the economic health of the Nation."

TEACHERS TAKE CENTER'S INSERVICE COURSES

Some 250 teachers have participated in tuition-free inservice courses offered by the center, and financed by The New England Economic Education Council.

The teachers are taught some of the critical principles of economics and the techniques, visual aids and source material available for instruction in economics. A great deal of this material is supplied by the Boston University Center.

A requirement of these courses is preparation by each teacher of a lesson plan which introduces economics to the classroom.

One typing teacher substituted epigrammatic economic principles for the usual meaningless typing phrases.

She tested her group against one that had practiced the standard typing drills and found that her students had absorbed a considerable amount of economic knowledge.

Another teacher conveyed basic economic principles to her pupils by having them manufacture and sell pastries.

A first-grade teacher launched into an introduction of mass-production economics when a pupil remarked on the similarity of suspender buckles.

SPECIAL CONCERN FOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

"Although the incidents occurring in the lower grades are of particular interest," Professor Sheldon said, "the Center is especially concerned with increasing economic instruction at the high school level."

In addition, the center sponsors a series of educators seminars at Boston College on current economic problems and issues.

Professor Sheldon said, "The idea was so successful that on the suggestion of the teachers we opened the seminars to their high school students in 1960 and now the educators junior seminars are a regular part of our program. Each year they are focused around one specific economic area. This year the area was taxation."

The problem of stimulating more student involvement in economic instruction on the junior high school level through the use of actual business case histories is now being investigated.

Better To Pass No Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor dated July 27, 1962, had a very interesting editorial entitled "Another Snag for Farm Controls." This publication is, in my judgment, one of the responsible papers in this country. This particular editorial points up a very significant fact to which all of us in Congress should be alerted: If no new farm bill passes in this session of Congress, we probaly would be better off than to have the kind of a bill that can pass.

I would like to insert in the RECORD this editoral from the Christian Science Monitor because it does state so well this simple fact:

ANOTHER SNAG FOR FARM CONTROLS

Congress is not buying the Kennedy administration program of rigid crop control or "supply management" in agriculture. By a switch of votes in the Senate Agriculture Committee, the committee will not recommend strict controls on grain marketing when the House-approved compromise farm measure comes up again before the Senate.

The House bill proposes continuance of the current emergency programs for support of wheat, corn, and feed grain prices with provisions aimed only at reducing acreage, not at putting limits on producers' sales. Secretary Freeman estimates the annual cost of these programs at $2,400 million.

Against such extravagance the administration has legitimate complaint. To keep paying high support prices with only ineffective acreage controls is like pouring fuel into a locomotive that's running with an open throttle. The Freeman program of strict controls would try to set the engine brakes but would still pour on the fuel.

That is not the only way of doing it. The American Farm Bureau Federation points out that it would be no disaster if even the emergency programs of last year were allowed to lapse. The laws which then would apply would be the Agricultural Acts of 1949 and 1958.

Under the latter act the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to reduce the support price of corn from $1.20 to $1.05, with corresponding cuts on soybeans, grain sorghums, and other feed grains. And under the 1949 act he could and should reduce the support price of wheat from $2 to $1.82.

These changes would take some of the fire out from under the agricultural boiler. They would reduce the likelihood of explosions like the Billie Sol Estes case, they would reduce the evidently unneeded incentives for piling up surplus production, and they would reduce the demands on the taxpayer to buy and store that surplus.

Spending Makes Taxes Higher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian, Mich., Daily Telegram of July 27, 1962:

SPENDING MAKES TAXES HIGHER

About 2 months ago Secretary of Commerce Hodges testified before a Congressional committee that 10 percent of the jobholders in his Department are performing jobs started 40 years ago that "now are just not needed." What's been done about that? Nothing.

Actually the Federal payroll continued to gain. More than 2½ million people are to be in the Federal agencies in the current fiscal year that started July 1. That's 40,065 more than are on the payroll now, and 131,361 more than a year ago. Federal agencies always grow. None ever seems to get smaller. The Government undertakes new services—and hires new employees. Meanwhile it keeps on those already employed. Some of them, nobody knows how many, must, as Secretary Hodges said of his Department, be performing jobs that "now are just not needed."

Meanwhile the cost of the Federal Government goes up; meanwhile deficits pile up; and meanwhile the national debt increases. The cost of all government—Federal, State and local—increased from 15 percent of the National income in the early twenties to 27 percent in the forties and it's now close to 35 percent. That increased cost of government—the amount taken out of the national income by taxes—is the basic reason why the national economy is not expanding as fast as it should. Money paid to government does not go for consumer goods nor into investments in industry to create new jobs.

And it is not true, as the administration says, that the principal reason for the increased cost of the Federal Government is for defense. Defense costs certainly are high but nondefense costs also are high. In his 18 months in the White House President Kennedy has sent to Congress some 200 proposals for bigger Federal obligations. He has urged spending, not economy. Of the $3.5 billion spending increase for the 1963 fiscal year 57 percent has nothing to do with national defense.

The spending advocates in the administration have declared that spending will spur the economy. But the impetus to the economy did not come as expected; instead the stockmarket went into a decline. Now a tax cut is being talked about. That is fine. A tax cut would help. What would help much more would be a reduction in spending to justify the tax cut on sound economic grounds.

Needed: Simplified Handbook of Farm Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation regrettably has not yet found any "magic formula" for solving the problems in agriculture.

For this year, the outlook is also problematical.

In a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to discuss highlights of pending legislation and, as well, make some suggestions which if adopted, would help make existing programs more effective in meeting the challenges of agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: SIMPLIFIED HANDBOOK OF FARM LAWS

Friends, this is your senior Senator, ALEX WILEY. I welcome the opportunity once again to discuss some of the problems confronting us in agriculture.

On the legislative front, the House of Representatives recently passed a bill called the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. Currently, the measure,, after some "surgery" by the Senate Agriculture Committee, is pending before the Senate.

Generally, the provisions relate to: extending the existing law on feed grains; a modified wheat program; revising Public Law 480 for shipping food abroad; liberalized farm credit; expanding research for industrial uses of farm commodities; and revised land-use programs.

Realistically, the bill, similar to a major measure defeated earlier in the session, is highly controversial. On the positive side, there are two features which, if adopted, would be of significance to us here in Wisconsin:

1. Expansion of research for industrial uses of agricultural products, including milk and other dairy products. (Earlier this session, I recommended the establishment of a special laboratory here in Wisconsin for expanding research for commercial—industrial uses of dairy products.)

2. Secondly, the land-use recommendations could prove of value. These include: permanent agricultural conservation programs on a national basis; assistance to producers under long-term agreements (not to exceed 15 years) to conserve and develop soil, water, forest, wildlife and recreational resources; appropriations would be restricted to $10 million annually; a loan program to State and local public agencies for carrying out more effective land utilization programs; and special assistance for Federal participation in installation costs of recreation projects and in land costs for fish, wildlife and other purposes.

Tourism increasingly is an aspect of Wisconsin's economy. The creation of close-by, on-the-farm vacation spots could provide more citizens—about two-thirds of whom now live in urban areas—with greater opportunities to: get either weekend, or vacation "breaths of fresh air" in the country; acquaint children with nature and animal life; and generally provide an opportunity for improving the health of our citizens—mentally, spiritually, and physically, through the enjoyment of our out-of-door heritage.

Fundamentally, however, the bill contains seriously controversial provisions—particularly relating to the degree of Federal control over farmers. Consequently, the outlook is problematical on this or any other major legislation this session.

Over the years, the Nation has adopted, if in somewhat "patchwork" fashion, an extensive, complex system of laws relating to agriculture.

Unfortunately, these laws too often, are wrapped or entangled in legalistic redtape and obscured by bureaucratic language.

As a result, programs that might be of assistance often may not be known to farmers; or, if known, the requirement may be too complicated to encourage wide participation. Consequently, these do not adequately serve their originally intended purposes.

For this reason, I am recommending that the Secretary of Agriculture prepare for farmers in clear, not bureaucratic language, a "Handbook of Farm Laws and Programs." The handbook, I believe, could well include: a summary of existing laws and programs; a clear definition of their purposes; illustrations of how these can effectively help the farmer; and simplified ways for participating in such programs.

If this were done, I believe that: (1) many of the existing programs being carried along at the taxpayers' expenses administratively could be of greater help to the farm economy; and (2) the handbook would provide a useful guide for review, revision, and, if necessary, repeal of existing or adoption of new programs to improve the economic outlook of agriculture.

A Pro-American Address by Col. Fred D. Stevers, U.S. Air Force, Retired, to the Rough Riders Rally, Disneyland Hotel, California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Col. Fred D. Stevers, U.S. Air Force, retired, given at the Rough Riders Rally at Disneyland Hotel, California, on July 17, 1962.

Here is an address that every American should read in order to be informed as to the Cuban fiasco. Colonel Stevers was the last military attaché to leave the American Embassy in Havana, and he warns the people that the same State Department clique responsible for Castro's takeover is now being moved into strategic positions to simplify the Communist takeover of other Latin American countries.

The address follows:

Captain Barnes, Dr. Del Junco, Mr. Lyons, Spanish-American War Veterans, members of the American Committee to Free Cuba, ladies and gentlemen, tonight, we are here to honor the heroes of the Spanish-American War. Then, the United States, with a conscience, and with compassion for the sufferings of others, liberated the Cuban people from a cruel foreign oppressor.

From the stirring events of the summer of 1898 in Santiago de Cuba—from our heritage of the past, when the United States, as a "nation under God" was successful in her undertakings—from that heritage, perhaps today, we can draw the strength we so desperately need to cope with the mounting dangers that face us.

I am sure I express the feelings of everyone present as we render our salute to the veterans of 1898.

As the last air attaché to Cuba, I saw our country deceived, insulted, dispossessed, defeated, and our flag hauled down at the American Embassy in Havana. This is an experience one cannot forget. It is why I find myself here, this evening, in this unfamiliar role.

I saw a monstrous process called communism, fasten itself onto the Cuban people; the total eradication of all freedom; the destruction of wealth and industry; the studied dismemberment of the Cuban family; and the poisoning of minds of young and old, to the degree where mountainous hatreds have been deliberately instilled into the hearts of the people.

Despite these realities, the stated policy of our Government today is that Cuba is only an island; it is not important to the security of the United States; we had better forget about it and get on with "more important business."

But the world knows that the Communist onslaught on Cuba was not an attack on "just an island." It was, and continues to be, a direct attack on the United States of America. It is imperative that we, the citizens of the United States, come to realize that this Communist invasion of Cuba is a deadly dagger, pointed straight at the heart of this country.

Lenin's dream has come one step closer to reality: "We shall surround the United States without having to fire a shot. It will drop into our hands like a ripe fruit."

Why did all this happen? Who allowed it to happen? How is it possible that one of the most prosperous nations in Latin America should become infected by the dread Communist plague?

If you had listened to Communist propaganda emanating from Cuba, there was a pat answer to all these questions. The eternal broken record of Castro propaganda that Cuba was a poor country, that its peasants were starving wretches who groaned under the tyranny of Batista, that Cubans were living in a feudal state before Fidel Castro rescued them.

The picture is false, and the lie deliberate. Cuban labor enjoyed the protection of the most advanced social legislation in this hemisphere. Cuban industries boomed. The currency was as hard as the dollar. Cuba owed not a cent, and asked for no loans.

This points out the fallacy in our assuming that Communists can only win in a country that is desperately poor, and that foreign aid is the cure-all.

Before Castro appeared on the scene, Cuba appeared the least likely of any of the Latin American countries to fall to communism. In Cuba, there existed good will dating back to the era when the United States assisted the Cubans in winning their freedom, and setting up a constitutional government. Through the years, we gave Cuba large-scale economic support through the Sugar Act, paying premium prices for her principle product. And, while neither Cubans nor Americans would voice it openly, Cuba has looked to the United States for leadership.

The fall of Cuba, despite all these favorable factors, emphasizes the falsity of many of our U.S. programs for combating communism.

If we want to give aid for humanitarian purposes, fine, but let's not delude ourselves that this, in itself, is going to save the world for democracy. No country in the world will follow a nation which refuses to lead.

Cuba was taken over by Communist subversion just as other victims of communism have been taken over. As has been said, "the audacious few can take over from the apathetic many." Castro subverted the Cuban nation, and gained U.S. Government support while so-doing, by calling for a program of "socialistic reforms".

The conquest of Cuba had little to do with prosperity, or the lack of it.

A myth that should be exploded once and for all, if we are to fight communism effectively is the importance given to the so-called rising of the masses.

A few pseudointellectual liberals, college trained and Communist trained, were the people who subverted Cuba through conspiratorial action, namely; Fidel Castro, Raul Castro, Che Guevarra, Vilma Espin, and a few others.

When are we going to learn something of the true nature of communism and how to fight it?

I mentioned that Castro came to power with a good deal of assistance from the United States. This assistance came from liberal-minded Foreign Service Officers in the State Department in Washington, and the career officers in the political section of the Embassy of Havana.

During this crucial time, the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs was Roy Rubottom, and his assistant was William Weiland.

The day before Castro took over power in Havana, Mr. Rubottom reassured the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that there was no organized communism in the Castro movement.

It is inconceivable that such an opinion could have been given by Mr. Rubottom, who was with General Marshall in Colombia at the time of the Bogotazo—the Communists first great blow against the United States in the Western Hemisphere. During that uprising in Bogotá, Fidel came on the radio 1 hour after the murder of Guitan, and exhorted the people of Colombia to join in and support this Communist insurrection. The Colombian police files contained irrefutable evidence concerning Castro's Communist connections. The FBI reports on the Bogatazo pointed up his Communist connections.

Mr. Rubottom and Mr. Weiland were in the key positions on the Latin American Desk to determine what information was to be used by our Government in the development of Cuba-American policy. They apparently shelved the reports of Ambassador to Cuba, Arthur Gardener, and later, Ambassador Earl Smith, who waved red caution flags to the effect that Castro was going to put in a Communist government if he came to power. Also, Ambassador Hill, at Mexico City, made the strongest of representations concerning communism in the Castro revolution.

The U.S. military attachés and mission chiefs reported on the strong Communist direction of the revolution, as did the FBI reports.

However, at this time, the mutual support between the New York Times and the State Department came into play on this issue. Herbert Matthews of the Times was sent to interview Castro in the Sierra Maestra. Castro only had a handful of followers, and was making little progress. Matthews' subsequent articles praising Castro's program of social reform, aroused great interest in the United States. The articles systematically reported the revolution as a high-minded experiment in social justice, agrarian reform, and emphasized Castro's promises that he would not seek political position for himself.

Other news mediums, including leading church magazines, and certain organizations now picked up the pro-Castro line. The sentiment within state grew so pro-Castro that an interview with Herbert Mathews of the Times was required of all key Foreign Service officers before going on station in Havana. (Later, I want to touch more on this mutual supporting of liberal ideas between state and the Times. This is important to you because I understand in the near future there will be a Los Angeles edition of the New York Times.)

How was it that professional Foreign Service officers could be so deceived on a matter of such importance to the security of the United States? Perhaps it can be explained by the fact that to the liberal minded, the appeal of a Socialist Cuba, 90 miles from the United States, displaying all manner of agrarian and urban reforms conforming to Liberal-Socialist goals, held such fascination as to result in impaired judgment in making vital assessments. And here is the thesis of my talk: That the affinity between the goals of socialism and communism is so strong, that it is impossible for a state moving toward socialism; namely, the United States, to fight Communist subversion effectively.

What are the remedies?

A return to American traditions of free enterprise. Renewed belief in the superiority of the American way. And forthright, pro-American leaders.

Castro's victory did not come as a result of success in battle. There was never any significant military involvement. When U.S. military assistance was withdrawn from Batista in March of 1958, it effectively "pulled the rug" from under his regime, and passed the blessing of the United States to Castro. From then on, the easy victory of the 26th of July movement was assured. Our officials saw fit to close their eyes to the arms and supplies being shipped to Castro by sympathizers in this country.

After Castro's entry into Havana, and assumption of power in January 1959, another glaring error of American policy allowed him to consolidate his power. One of his first hostile acts was to "throw out" the American military mission, and denounce the military assistance agreement between the United States and the Cuban Government. At this point, the military mission chiefs forwarded urgent recommendations that all U.S. military planes and other equipment, provided under the agreement, should be returned to U.S. control. Here, again, the State Department did not agree, stating it was best "not to antagonize the revolutionary leader at this time." As it turned out, it was this very equipment which enabled Castro to subjugate the Cuban people, and hold all resistance elements in check—until the arrival of arms purchased in Europe, and later, the massive shipments of Communist arms. Also, it was these same American military planes which were used so decisively by Castro in the defeat of the April invasion.

Think how different the situation in Cuba might be today, if a forthright and adamant stand had been taken for the return of this U.S. military equipment to U.S. control, as provided for in the assistance agreement.

Another act by Castro immediately following his assumption of power was the destruction of the former Government's extensive files on Communists and their activities. Here was another indication of the direction the revolution was taking.

Now, the communization of Cuba proceeded at an increasing tempo.

The almost complete destruction of the regular military services was pushed ruthlessly. Executions were particularly heavy amongst the officers of the Air Force and Army and in their place, a people's militia was formed. The Communists had learned their lesson in Guatemala, and were not going to leave any nucleus for organized resistance in the military.

These executions have not gone unobserved by the military in other Latin American countries, as evidenced by the strong stand which is taken in country after country to thwart Communist takeovers.

The revolutionary government next imposed its will over all unions by placing selected Communist leaders in the top positions. This was done in spite of the violent resistance of the membership.

As harsh police state controls were imposed, the resistance of the Cuban people began to grow. Dedicated, patriotic Cubans who were being forced to choose between submission to communism or their freedom, began joining counterrevolutionary groups. They set up several fronts in the mountains. Fellow Cubans flocked to these areas.

Now, the only limiting factor was the amount of U.S. support available. Castro threw everything he had at the principle front in the Escambray: Paul went there and failed; Che stated he would never return to Havana until every counterrevolutionary was dead. But, he, too, failed. The insurgency grew. Castro was scared. I firmly believe that at this point, in the fall of 1960, if the policy of our government had been to vigorously support the insurgency within Cuba, that Castro would have been defeated by the Cubans, themselves.

But our support failed. The counterrevolutionaries in the mountains were dependent on supplies delivered by air drop. At the camp of the Cuban Liberation Air Force in Guatamala, aircraft crews and supplies were available, but the American officials in charge would allow only occasional missions. The briefings were so bad, and the means for identifying the drop zones were so poor, that most of the supplies were lost. The Cuban flyers at the camps told me later that they felt there was no interest in succeeding with the aerial resupply.

As the Communist complexion of the Castro regime now was apparent to all, the United States, as a nation, certainly had every moral right and obligation to support the resistance within Cuba.

Foreign Communists, in the guise of advisers, technicians, military instructors, were arriving in alarming numbers, in addition to the arrival of massive shipments of Communist arms. In this first Soviet arms package, $100 million worth of weapons were delivered. Incidentally, Raul Castro and the same defense ministry officials are in Moscow again negotiating the second arms shipment. This shipment undoubtedly will include missiles and the latest jet aircraft.

The Air Attaché Office was successful in reporting the first shipload of Soviet arms arriving in Cuba. It came at the time of Hurricane Donna in September of 1960. When we evacuated the Embassy aircraft from Havana, we spotted the Soviet cargo ship being unloaded in the Casa Blanca navy drydock. As evidenced by the elaborate security precautions taken, the Russians expected a severe reaction from the United States. Here was the time we should have stated that the Monroe Doctrine was not dead and we were not going to stand idly by while the Western Hemisphere was invaded by a foreign power. But instead, we did nothing.

The U.S. policy of trying to placate Castro was carried to a ridiculous degree. Despite the wholesale confiscation of American property, including U.S. Government property, all strictly on the Communist timetable, abuses to American citizens, insults to the American Ambassador, and torrents of anti-American propaganda, we continued to try to appease Castro in the hope he could be won over to the democratic viewpoint.

In October of 1960, purchases under the Sugar Act were finally canceled, but not before most of that year's production had been purchased at premium prices.

Castro now felt that he had received about all the help he needed from the United States to bridge the gap from the former economy to the new state socialism. He increased pressure to try and get the United States to initiate a break in diplomatic relations. He achieved this when he stipulated that the American Embassy would have to be reduced to a total of seven people.

At that New Year's, when the American Embassy closed and the flag came down, the United States suffered another major defeat in the cold war.

After the break in relations, the military attachés moved to Miami. It was soon apparent that all was not well in the training camps of the Cuban Liberation Forces in Guatemala. Cubans were defecting from the camps and returning to Miami in increasing numbers, stating that morale was breaking because of lack of confidence in their leaders, and the growing realization that they were not being allowed to do the job for which they had volunteered; namely, to liberate their country. Relations between the Cuban Revolutionary Council in Miami and the C.I.A. became very strained. The Cuban exiles' only contacts were through "nameless" C.I.A. agents, who dictated all terms. Many able Cubans resigned from the council. Martin Ellena, the capable and experienced officer who was slated to be in command of the military operation, resigned when he was not allowed to inspect his men at the camp.

The results of the Cuban invasion on April 17, 1961, are generally known. By the time of the belated decision to go, the Castro forces had been brought up to 300,000 trained and equipped troops. A liberation landing force of only 1,300 men seems pitifully small for the task they were expected to perform. The liberation air unit in Guatemala was given the impossible task of flying close support missions for the invasion landings. The long round trip necessitated removal of all defensive armament from the B-26's.

The weak and vascillating U.S. support, which, at the last moment stopped the preinvasion bombing of the Castro Air Force, and canceled the planned use of U.S. fighter support, doomed the operation to failure.

Although there was a U.S. Naval Task Force in the area, it was not allowed to either support the operation, or rescue the landing force when it was pushed back to the beach. Never had the United States been involved in such a weak and callous operation as this.

The invasion was, in fact, so short lived, that it was no test of whether the people inside Cuba would have actually supported the liberation army to depose Castro. The numbers of Castro's militiamen in the beachhead area, who, in the initial stages did defect, gives some indication of what might have been expected in a larger scale, better supported, operation.

Civil disturbance was certainly anticipated by Castro, as evidenced by the massive roundup and detention of Americans and Cubans throughout the land. But the invasion effort was so marginal in size, and the element of surprise deemed so necessary by the U.S. invasion leaders, that the keymen of the resistance within Cuba were not informed, and the entire underground was caught up in the mass arrests by the government.

Here, again, U.S. action proved to be much too timid.

The returning Cuban flyers, after the invasion attempt, found none of their former U.S. contacts in Miami. They turned to my office for information on their casualties, on their future, and to register their disgust with those who had lied to them about the promised U.S. air support.

I did advise the U.S. Air Force headquarters that the Cuban liberation air force should be held together, and constituted the most important asset left to us; that it was the key to any future steps to free Cuba. There was agreement on this within the Air Force, but the action was frozen while future U.S. policy toward Cuba was being reformulated.

That policy decision was soon apparent. The local CIA man called me and said he had received word from Washington for our office to stop interviewing Cuban air force personnel immediately.

The defeat in Cuba was to be made permanent.

In the dismal aftermath of the invasion failure, this subject became so distasteful, that all official discussion of it was suppressed. This suppression extended into the military, in areas, where, in my opinion, there was a need and a right to know for the proper performance of duty. At the Latin American Conference of Air Attachés and Mission Chiefs in Panama in June of 1961, I was scheduled to talk on Cuba. At the last minute, the subject of the invasion was not allowed to be mentioned on orders of Richard Goodwin, the presidential adviser for Latin American Affairs. The explanation given was that President Kennedy had ordered an investigation of the debacle by General Taylor, and that pertinent information would be released at the proper time. More than a year has now passed and no announcement of the results of that investigation have been forthcoming.

The same people who were in positions of influence around the President still remain. Mr. Rubottom's name is up before the Senate for promotion. The charges of the former Ambassadors that our policy toward Cuba involved serious questions of judgment and loyalty, should be answered. It would seem to me that now is the time for a thorough investigation of our entire United States-Cuba policy.

I mentioned the New York Times earlier, and now I am going to relate a personal experience concerning the disproportionate influence of the Times in Government policy formation. At a conference in Panama in 1960, 2 years after Castro had come to power, my superior officer said to me: "Stevers, be sure and read the New York Times every day and send me the answers to any articles on Cuba, because on my morning intelligence briefing for the Air Staff, the questions I get are those posed by the Times." Imagine that. After the Times was one of the principal influences in the loss of Cuba. But, the Air Staff in Washington were being questioned by the civilian Secretaries concerning the Times articles, many of which were inspired by Government officials on subjects they would hesitate to put in memorandums.

In this way, the brainwashing of the military continues.

What has happened to President Kennedy's stated policy, in his speech after the invasion failure, in which he said: "Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction, if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist pentration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of this Nation."

The President referred to the commitments contained in the Rio Pact of 1947, and the Caracas Declaration of 1954, which provide the collective teeth to oust communism.

Contrast our President's statement with the present administration policy stated recently by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY during a TV interview in Miami after his return from a Presidential factfinding tour of Latin America, I heard him state that Cuba is just a small island constituting no threat to the United States, and that the way to fight communism in Latin America is to "speed up our economic aid under the Alliance for Progress." This same attitude has also been more recently expressed by Mr. Adlai Stevenson, as he recommends "that we get on with more important business."

My feeling is, that if we cannot work out policies and actions which can gain freedom for Cuba, with its proximity and other elements favorable to the United States, how can we hope to do so in remote areas all over the world?

My contact with the Cuban disaster, and subsequent events, have raised serious doubts in my mind as to the effectiveness of our U.S. programs in combating the spread of communism. If Cuba were the only country affected by our ineffectiveness against the Communist advance, we might allow ourselves the calloused luxury of "passing it off" as unimportant. But the Red tide is seriously threatening the rest of Latin America, and our attitude of tolerance, and solitary weapon of economic aid is sorely inadequate.

Arms shipments are arriving regularly at remote places of the South American coasts. Czech machineguns have been shipped to Red elements in Colombia where they control large sections of the interior of that country with total impunity. The Cuban radio periodically announces the graduation of classes from a school for saboteurs.

Guerrillas are being trained in Cuba to infiltrate Venezuela from the friendly borders of the Communists in British Guiana. Northeastern Brazil is blazing with the Communist torch. Chilean military and educational circles are hotbeds of communism. An enormous segment of the student body and faculty of the University of Mexico is all for the Soviet and the Red Chinese. And so it goes, in every single country of Latin America. The whole of the southern continent is being rapidly undermined by the Red termites.

Our public information program has been almost completely lacking in these areas. There has been no effective news medium reaching the people in Cuba to counter the incessant anti-Americanism preached by the Castro Government beamed at both Cubans and the rest of Latin America.

The urgent need has always been for hard-hitting U.S. information programs on the broadcast band, as few Cubans can receive the 1-hour USIS broadcast via short wave. Without U.S. rebuttal, it must appear to all of Latin America that we have no answer for Castro's many charges against us.

As stated previously, despite serious provocations, the United States was slow to apply economic pressures to Cuba. The suspension of the United States-Cuban Sugar Act was not effective before the revolutionary government had sold much of the 1960 crop to us at premium prices. And even as late as November 1961, less than a year ago, we were still authorizing the shipment of millions of dollars worth of food and drugs. Stringent trade restrictions in the initial stages of Castro's regime could have been a decisive weapon.

In the political field, we showed the most incredible weakness. Despite our experience with tactics used by the Communists in the subjugation of the Chinese, we were again taken in by the same old slogans of "Agrarian and social reforms". When the Communists find a successful formula, they use it over and over again. Of course, Fidel Castro continuously denied his intentions of setting up a Communist dictatorship until success was assured. This is a Trojan horse gambit, which is now being repeated in a number of other Latin American countries.

In looking back on the stages of the communization of Cuba, a successful solution could have been achieved in the early stages merely by making the correct assessment of Castro's intentions. The information was available for a correct assessment to have been made.

Through the middle and latter stages, courses of action open to us became more and more limited, costly, and dangerous.

But now, let's take a look into the future.

With the ever-increasing numbers of Communists pouring into Cuba from Red China, the European satellites, and from the Soviet Union, it is probable that the Soviet Union will be in complete control of Cuba in the near future. Massive modern weaponry will then be installed on this small island capable of dominating and blackmailing all of the Western Hemisphere. This is certainly in line with the nature and past performance of this enemy and must be expected.

At some point, we, as a Nation, must turn and take a stand.

To understand the defeat in Cuba, it is necessary to know "defeat in Washington." The fiasco at the Bay of Cochinos was only the outward manifestation of the lack of faith in ourselves as a nation and in the justice of our cause. We have become so entangled in our commitments to the internationalist organizations at the U.N. and the OAS, that we can no longer act in our own national interest, nor in that of the free world. Our enemies, with no moral or spiritual restraints are not so affected.

This defeatism is finding expression in new policies that compound our ineffectiveness. One such is the so-called no-win policy. This holds that victory over the Soviet Union must be avoided; that by making massive concessions in unilateral disarmament and on cold war issues, we hope that the Soviet Union will reciprocate. Dr. Rostow, who authored the plan, is Chairman of the State Department Planning Council.

Some of our recent concessions have been: (1) A slow-down in the B-70 bomber program; (2) insistence on a Communist-dominated coalition government for Laos, and agreeing to pay for its upkeep; (3) a pledge that we will not cross international boundaries in guerrilla warfare, even though our enemies do; (4) that in future conflicts we will bomb only military targets; (5) and, during the last few days, our offer to enter into an uninspected test ban.

So far, there has not been much evidence of the hoped for reciprocation. Mr. Khrushchev appeared to be delighted and encouraged with the concessions in Laos, and immediately afterwards stated that some day the hammer and sickle was going to fly over our Capitol, and that the Americans themselves would haul it up.

There is really nothing new to Mr. Rostow's no-win policy. Since the 1930's, when we closed our eyes to the brutality of the regime and recognized Russia, providing technical assistance to restore her shattered economy, we have been making massive concessions and contributions, and it has only assisted the Communist drive for world domination, not altered it.

Socialism is the first stage leading to communism.

How strong is the drive toward socialism within the present administration. Special Presidential Assistant, Arthur Schlessinger, Jr. is in the key spot within the administration.

In the May 1947 issue of a periodical, the Partisan Review, an article by Mr. Schlesinger states this opinion: "There seems no inherent obstacle to the gradual advance of socialism in the United States through a series of new deals * * *. The classical argument against gradualism was that the capitalist ruling class would resort to violence rather than surrender its prerogatives * * *. Here, as elsewhere, the Marxists enormously overestimated the political courage and will of the capitalists. There is no sign that the capitalists are putting up a really determined fight. The active agents in effecting the transition will probably be, not the working class, but some combination of lawyers, business, and labor managers, politicians, and intellectuals, in the manner of the first New Deal. Moreover, workers, as a mass have rarely had the impulses attributed to them by Marxism. They too often believe in patriotism or religion. Thus they are rarely swept by the proper mass emotions."

In a recent memorandum by Mr. Schlesinger entitled "The Big Decision: Private Indulgence or National Power?", I quote: "We will have to abandon the illusion that the free choices of millions of individual consumers can solve all our problems * * *. We shall have to begin purposefully to focus our national energies in ways which will give us the things a great Nation must have—defense, foreign assistance, education, medical care, scientific research, elimination of private property, and so on, even if these things don't make profits for private business in the market."

I wish I had time to read all of this article by Mr. Schlesinger, but do so for yourselves. Recently, when asked if he had changed his mind about these views, his reply was "I neither apologize nor withdraw."

These views are quoted to help us understand the current trends in Washington. This is socialism.

Getting back to Cuba, the loss of one skirmish at the Bay of Cochinos is no reason to make defeat in Cuba permanent, for us to assist in the maintenance of a Communist tyranny 90 miles from the United States.

There is real hunger in Cuba today. Daily the rumblings of rebellion grow louder. On June 16 the people of Cardenas surged into the streets beating their pots and pans and shouting: "We're hungry," at the tops of their voices. This small edition of Budapest was not quelled until tanks forced their way into the town, and Russian Migs roared overhead threatening annihilation.

There have been defections amongst the militia units. There will be larger ones. Let us be prepared to free Cuba when the opportunity comes.

We should support the underground. We should allow the Cubans to reactivate their liberation forces; form a government in exile; allow them to maintain their patriotism and their resolve to free their enslaved and suffering countrymen.

If we believe in ourselves; if we believe in the justice of the liberation of the Communist enslaved peoples, Cuba will be free in the near future.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us free Cuba and release a wave of pro-Americanism and anti-communism that will sweep the hemisphere.

Let us win our first great victory of the cold war.

Leading Doctor Favors Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I read a very interesting letter on the editorial page of the Philadelphia Bulletin of August 8. It was written by one of the leading physicians of Philadelphia. His views refer to the position of one-third of the medical profession as favoring the King-Anderson bill.

I have known Dr. Leon Solis-Cohen for a great many years and have observed his outstanding contributions to the public welfare. He has been very active in civic and fraternal affairs and has frequently participated in matters affecting the welfare of the people.

His observations are contained in the remarks by the Honorable JAMES A. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, who has included the newspaper report. I wish to commend Dr. Solis-Cohen for his views and for his strong statement in favor of medical care for the aged under social security.

James A. Farley: Rainmaker in Elmira Bustling in Batavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, with the refreshing effervescence associated with the product for which he has won worldwide acceptance, former Postmaster General James A. Farley is receiving a glad hand wherever he travels in New York State. In Elmira, the general, who has credit due him for many great gains, is now attributed a power to affect the elements. In Batavia the general walked in the sunlight of many old friendships. Sun and rain germinate good growth and the State of New York would welcome more of that. There is no question that General Farley could make an immense contribution in that direction.

I submit herewith two editorials from the Batavia Daily News of July 20, 1962, and the Elmira Star-Gazette, of July 21, 1962, attesting to the continuing high regard our communities have for this great American:

[From the Batavia (N.Y.) Daily News. July 20, 1962]

MR. FARLEY HERE

Although a bit further from the limelight than in the bustling days of the early Franklin D. Roosevelt administrations, James A. Farley remains a striking figure.

Mr. Farley made his first official visit to Batavia Downs as a member of the New York State Harness Racing Commission and was well pleased with what he saw.

Long known for his excellent memory of people and places, the former Postmaster General recalled the late Albert F. Kleps, longtime Democratic political leader here and a personal friend of Mr. Farley for many years.

Mr. Farley, who for years was "Mr. Democrat," still is highly regarded in his party, and in the State. His declining to talk politics seemed to indicate strategy of the moment. For a man of his stature with politics in his veins, he is certain to have something to say later.

[From the Elmira Star-Gazette, July 21, 1962]

FARLEY AND RAIN—BOTH WELCOME

Jim Farley always brings something welcome to town on his all-too-rare visits. That's a warmth and glow of a man who counts friends across the world and in every station in life.

Wednesday's flying visit was true to form, for Jim's thoroughly at home in Chemung County and has friends here by the score.

Wednesday Jim brought something more than his welcome presence. A badly needed shower rode into town with him, and friends stood gladly in the rain to greet him and a token gift from the skies.

CAP Dinner for International Air Cadets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 6, I had the great honor and pleasure of attending a dinner at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington by invitation of my good friend Col. Barnee Breeskin, special assistant to Col. Paul Ashworth, national commander of the Civil Air Patrol.

This dinner is an annual event sponsored by the Pan American World Airways for the air cadets and their escorts from 21 foreign countries. These cadets visit Washington each year, after having been guests of the United States, touring most of the States in groups of 5 and in several instances even as many as 25.

On this particular occasion, at the dinner on August 6, Colonel Ashworth presented a plaque award to Adm. Harold Miller, retired, vice president of Pan American World Airways, for meritorious service in the international air cadet exchange program.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the Senate majority whip, made a wonderful address on the merits of the cadet exchange program. I, too, had occasion to express some views regarding this program which I consider very important to the free world.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Pan American World Airways on their great contribution to this worthwhile exchange program. For the past 10 years this company has consistently sponsored projects of great benefit to this program and thereby was instrumental in bringing together many fine citizens of this country in the common bond of brotherhood, thus resulting in a successful exchange of ideas and a better understanding of problems. Mr. Juan Trippe, president of Pan American World Airways, has long been known for his efforts in the cause of international good will.

We, of New York, are very proud of the fine work being done by the Civil Air Patrol and we are particularly proud that our fair city of New York is one of the host cities, just as is Washington, for these foreign cadets visiting the United States under the exchange program.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to list the States that have served as hosts to the foreign cadets. They are as follows:

Alabama, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The following is a list of the countries that participated in the program: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey.

Finally, I want to include also the names of the distinguished guests at the head table at the dinner given by the Pan American World Airways:

Head Table Seating Arrangement, Civil Air Patrol Dinner, Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., August 6, 1962

1. Mr. Ira D. Mackler, Wilson Co.
2. Col. Dan Evans, wing commander, National Capitol Wing.
3. Col. Edward F. McGinnis, American Legion.
4. Col. Daniel F. Boone, deputy regional commander, Civil Air Patrol.
5. Mr. C. William Martin, Jr., president, Pepsi Cola Bottling Co. of Washington.
6. Maj. Gen. Walter Agee, former national commander.
7. Mr. John R. O'Brien, vice president, Touchdown Club.
8. Mr. Robert G. Baker, secretary to the majority, U.S. Senate.
9. Representative James Morrison, Louisiana.
10. Col. Paul Ashworth, U.S. Air Force, national commander, Civil Air Patrol.
11. Senator Hubert Humphrey, majority whip, U.S. Senate.
12. Adm. Harold Miller, vice president, Pan American World Airways.
13. Commissioner John B. Duncan, District of Columbia.
14. Representative Victor L. Anfuso, New York.
15. Mr. Fred Black, Blyco Corp.
16. Representative Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland.
17. Mr. Glen B. Eastburn, New York Airways.
18. Maj. Gen. Lucas V. Beau, former national commander.
19. Mayor Frank Mann, Alexandria, Va.
20. Col. Milton Kronheim, old friend of Civil Air Patrol.
21. Col. A. Paul Fonda, office, Assistant Chief of Staff of Reserved Forces.
22. Lt. Col. Wm. H. Schulie, special assistant to the national commander, New York phase.
23. Col. Barnee Breeskin, special assistant to the national commander, Washington, D.C.
24. Mr. Lincoln White, press officer, State Department.

The Colombian Lotteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to apprize the Members of this House about the Colombian lotteries.

Colombia is a small and poor country, yet, it realizes the worth of lotteries. The gross receipts from said lotteries in 1961 amounted to over $12 million of which about $3 million went to the Government.

The income received is used for hospital development, homes for the poor, the blind, deaf mutes, the aged and other charitable institutions.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time that we stopped being reckless and careless with the tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery? If we would have the courage to wipe out hypocrisy, we could raise over $10 billion in additional revenue which would help to cut our high taxes and reduce our mounting national debt.

Farley for Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of our "greats" in the Democratic Party is the Honorable James A. Farley of New York. He is not only considered "great" by the membership of the Democratic Party, but he is considered "great" by the people of his community, his State, and this Nation. He has set an exemplary example as an American, as a public servant, as a businessman, and in all phases of civic and social life. For these reasons, he has received acclaim all over the country.

As an illustration of the high respect in which he is held, I insert the following article from the Chemung Valley Reporter:

[From the Horseheads, N.Y. Chemung Valley Reporter, July 12, 1962]

Farley for Governor

(By Jim Smith)

A few days ago a letter to the editor of another newspaper from William J. Murtaugh of Elmira proposing Jim Farley as the Democratic candidate for Governor of the State of New York was published. We are extremely happy to second that proposal.

James A. Farley, former postmaster general and now chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Corp., is without a question, the best known Democrat in the State and, we do not hesitate to say one of the most popular.

Mr. Farley is a man of oustanding qualifications: an administrator of proven ability, a man of keen judgment, a man admired by both Democrats and Republicans, and we predict that, should he be nominated, he would be elected by an overwhelming majority.

He has always championed the rights of the common man; he is of unimpeachable honesty and integrity, the type of man needed in the Governor's chair during these difficult and perilous times.

It has been our privilege to meet Mr. Farley personality on several occasions and we have always found him to be the same congenial, down-to-earth gentleman, whom it is a pleasure to meet.

A true friend to all mankind, to business, to labor and all others of the commonwealth, James A. Farley is our favored candidate for Governor of New York State.

Fitting Tribute to George P. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to share the representation of Alameda County, Calif., in the House of Representatives with a truly dedicated public servant and a great American, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Honorable George P. Miller.

Chairman Miller has received many deserved and glowing tributes during his 18 years in Congress but none, I am sure, more gratifying than the very appropriate editorial which appeared in his hometown newspaper, the Alameda Times Star, on August 3 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, every Member will vicariously enjoy this editorial which lauds the quiet and effective work of a dedicated Member of the House of Representatives.

Why Congressman Miller Has Won High Praise by GOP Paper

When a political figure draws praise from a publication whose editorial viewpoint is that of the opposite political party—and especially when that publication happens to be the Chicago Tribune—one may be assured that he has more than partisan political actions to his credit.

Such a man is George P. Miller. On page 5 of today's Times-Star is a feature story, reprinted from the Chicago Tribune, dealing with the career of the Alameda Congressman. The story traces his career from his employment as an Alameda streetsweeper during the days of the depression to his present distinguished position as Chairman of the House Space and Astronautics Committee.

The chairmanship of such an important committee, while awarded on the basis of seniority, is held only by ability, and Miller, in effect chairman during the final illness of the former chairman, has both then and since he took formal possession of that post, repeatedly demonstrated a tremendous grasp of what the job requires, plus an extraordinary ability to carry out the work the job entails.

What that work consists of is not generally known to the great majority of the public, but the heart of it is concerned with determining what is the best legislation for our space program and then proceeding to make that proposed legislation into law. In other words, any man who does this job so well as Miller must have not only a vast fund of advanced knowledge, but he must also possess both political know-how and executive ability. Needless to say, such an extraordinary combination is rare indeed.

But quite aside from these all-important points is the fact that during his long tenure in the House, Congressman Miller has never forgotten that he has been chosen by his constituents of the Eighth Congressional District as their personal representative in Washington, D.C. A request to Miller's office always brings an immediate reply, and action, whether the request comes from Democrat or Republican.

And as one might suspect he has given ample evidence of the courage of his convictions. For example, during the height of the hysteria fomented by the late Senator

Joe McCarthy, a man whose vicious lies and calumnies finally won him the distinction of the censure of the Senate, Miller did not give in to fear, as so many other Members of Congress did. On the contrary, he did not hesitate to speak his contempt for the Wisconsinite. And lately, despite the powerful opposition of organized medicine, along with threats made against those who supported the proposed medicare program, Miller has again demonstrated that his political courage has in no wise diminished.

Such a man as this, whom not even the crustily Republican Chicago Tribune can keep from praising, clearly must remain in office for the good of all the people.

Representative Griffin's Farm Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in today's Washington Daily News delved into history in regard to an amendment offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin].

In this article, it was pointed out that farm subsidies, surplus grain storage and a growing army of Government overseers to keep the farmer poor, goes back to Kublai Khan.

The gentleman from Michigan's amendment to the farm bill would have prevented the Agriculture Department from hiring more employees than there are farmers.

The amendment was finally rejected, it is interesting to note.

For the edification of my colleagues, the editorial about this amendment and its place in history follows:

Representative Griffin's Farm Amendments

They laughed when Representative Robert P. Griffin of Michigan got up recently to offer his amendment providing that "employes of the Agriculture Department shall at no time exceed the number of farmers in America."

They thought Mr. Griffin was just having his sly little joke at the expense of the administration's hardluck farm bill.

Maybe so. Probably it couldn't happen, but it could come close enough for discomfort and already has. And recent emphasis on the cliches of our forefathers prompts reminder that statesmen have been working on the problem for a long time.

One such was Kublai, Great Khan of China. He invented paper money and when he ran out he just printed more, thus proving that, as an economist, he was away ahead of his times. His method of storing surplus grain first was reported to the Western world, about 750 years ago, by Marco Polo, Venetian businessman.

Historian Harold Lamb records in his "March of the Barbarians" that Kublai, observing how deep the farmers had to scratch for a living, ordered his mandarins to get the economy moving.

Later, seeing little change, he asked why, when the peasants worked so constantly and were given so much aid by the state, they remained so poor.

"Because the state," the mandarins answered, "encouraging the workers in the soil, draws its chief wealth from them. The laborers themselves have little left because the greater part of their earnings goes to pay overseers and taxes, with the cost of collecting the taxes."

That is the historic problem of Government help to industry. It tends to cost more than it brings home and only the well-off can afford it.

But we digress.

At last count there were 98,500 employees in the Agriculture Department. That is roughly one Government helper for each 37½ of our 3.7 million farms. Or one for each 70 of our 7 million farmers, counting family and hired hands. The Department of Agriculture has $5.8 billion in the budget for next year.

Farmers are moving to the city while the Government is continuing to hire. On the charts of the economists one curve is ascending, the other descending. These unparallel lines could meet somewhere short of infinity.

Maybe Representative Griffin's amendment isn't so funny at that. Maybe he's not, as they say in the larger towns of the corn-hog country, just "bumping his gums."

Tax Cuts and Fiscal Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as comments and opinions are expressed on the subject of tax cuts, it is becoming increasingly evident that the public is aware of the detrimental role and fiscal irresponsibility that the Federal Government is contributing to these economic complications.

An illustration of grassroots thinking on this subject is contained in an editorial in the Chicago Heights Star, an outstanding semiweekly publication in one of the major towns in the Chicago metropolitan area, in its editorial of Thursday, August 2, which I am pleased to submit for the Record.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Heights (Ill.) Star, Aug. 2, 1962]

Tax Cuts and Fiscal Sanity

Few would deny that current talk in Washington about an income tax reduction is pleasant conversation. The burden of the annual levy has undoubtedly denied many families a number of good things they would like to enjoy.

Considered in conjunction with other activities in the Capital, however, there arises the suggestion that some restraint is in order with respect to our optimism.

The theory is that a tax reduction will spur the economy—ideally to the point where a fatter gross product will completely offset the loss of Federal revenue and perhaps do even better than that. The reasoning certainly is not without foundation.

Discretion being the better part of valor, we think it is essential to prune nonessential expenditures to the greatest possible degree as a counterpart of tax reduction. There is substantial reason to believe that the combination of Government frugality and increased payrolls would provide sufficient income at lower income tax rates to forestall endless deficits.

While practically all of us contemplate with enthusiasm the possibility of handing over a little less money to Uncle Sam each year, few want to enjoy the privilege at the expense of earmarking the tab for future generations.

Meanwhile, there gnaws away the uneasy feeling that we have people in Government who want to be all things to all men. For while the talk from one side of the mouth dealt with spurring the economy by cutting income taxes, the talk from the other side concerned increasing the social security tax to buy yet more things with Government money.

Proponents of the social security tax increase said it was needed to guarantee hospitalization costs for the elderly, what with advances in medical science having developed the ranks of senior citizens into a voting bloc.

Yet it can be vigorously disputed that anyone who stands for increasing deficits, Federal aid to everything, inflation and further devaluation of the dollar is sincerely interested in the plight of the elderly. More than anyone else, the senior citizen on a fixed income is the sufferer.

Unless sane fiscal habits can be substituted for careless Government spending, then, even the joy of a highly desirable tax cut can be had only at the expense of making retirement a day of reckoning.

The Soblen Case—Why Blame Israel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is quite astonishing, and more than a little irrational, that there should be people who have picked upon Israel as the "culprit" of the whole sad Soblen affairs. A simple recapitulation of the cold facts shows how completely illogical, and unfair, this attitude is:

When Soblen attempted to enter Israel illegally, the Government of Israel reacted in the most speedy and efficient manner and to the utmost extent compatible with Israel's own laws; indeed, some persons have criticized the Government of Israel for having allegedly stretched the framework of its laws rather widely in acting as it did on the 1st of July, when it placed Soblen on the first outgoing El Al Airlines plane in spite of the attempts of his lawyer to prevent this.

The Government of Israel has defined this step as an act of expulsion; there is no reason to quibble about legal terminology—it is in any case clear that what the Government of Israel did on that day did not, to say the very least, make it at all difficult for Soblen to find himself back in this country. Whoever may have "goofed" in not keeping an eagle eye on Soblen either in New York or upon that plane, it is surely not the Israelis whom we can blame for that.

Since that time, and purely because of such lack of vigilance, Soblen has found himself in Britain for several weeks now, and it seems rather amazing that no one here has lost patience with British legalistic quibbling as to methods of disposing of this case. After all, surely the real problem does not concern legalism in the purely formal sense of the word. Is it not the case that Soblen arrived in Israel too upon a foreign carrier—Air France—and, yet, I do not recall that the Government of Israel made any attempt to force Air France to deal with Soblen, although it too could very easily have sheltered behind such excuses. No, the Government of Israel expelled Soblen and placed him upon one of El Al's own aircraft. One hears a great deal concerning friends and friendship, but such words are apparently used lightly and freely. I can think of few examples of acts by a foreign government which would prove the spirit of friendship more indisputably than the action of the Government of Israel on the first of July.

Yet, Britain, in a similar situation, did not do the quick and straightforward thing, but found no more gallant way of dealing with the matter than to pick upon Israel to act on its behalf. If Israel did not ask Air France to take Soblen out, and Israel, after all, did not want Soblen on its soil any more than Britain does, why then does Britain require El Al to act on its behalf? If Israel sent Soblen out on an El Al plane could not Britain have sent him out quickly on BOAC? Or upon an American airplane? Or, indeed, have handed him over to the nearest American consul?

Israel's actions right at the very beginning left no doubt whatsoever that, as far as was compatible with the widest possible interpretation of its own laws, Israel would help this country. Of course, no one expects even one's very best friends to break their own laws, and I understand that this fact has been stressed by the State Department's spokesman. I believe that the Secretary of State explained to a Member of this House the problems connected with the fact that this offense is not internationally recognized as extraditable. We have, of course, no ratified extradition treaty with Israel, and as for Britain, she claims that her extradition treaty with the United States does not cover such cases as this. Yet why could Israel find a swift way of action on the first of July, and why does Britain apparently expect Israel to do twice what Britain is clearly not prepared to do even once? If Britain has any intention whatsoever of seeing Soblen returned to the United States, why then does she insist on forcing him back into Israel's hands, after Israel has done the decent thing once, and after the Israel authorities have stressed for over a month that their hands are now entirely tied by the developments which have arisen out of several weeks' legalistic quibbling in Britain.

Israel is a country of law, and surely we would not wish her to be otherwise. She has already done the utmost compatible with such a framework of law; she has gone out of her way to stress that her laws would make it quite impossible for her to take Soblen to New York, since under the changed conditions prevailing because of the delay in Britain, such action would now clearly amount to extradition, whereas Israel law permits no more than expulsion. If Britain realizes this, and Israel left her in no doubt on this matter during the whole time, why then does she persist again and again in her attempt to force Soblen upon the Israelis knowing full well that this is not the most likely way of returning him to the United States? Indeed, I might ask why so little was done—apparently, by both the Government of this country and of Great Britain to obviate this eventuality, after Israel had served clear notice that her hands were now tied? It is almost incomprehensible that under such clear circumstances we should be blaming neither ourselves nor the British, but, of all people, the Israelis. Are we by any chance "picking on the little guy?" Is it easier to press small countries than large ones? Could it not be clearly proved that if Israel is in trouble at all now, it is because she was overly eager to be helpful to us on the first of July? Is this the kind of lesson we want to teach the world? Maybe if we sit a little and think a little and permit irrationality and illogic to pass, we may feel just a little ashamed.

I do not think that there is a single country in the whole free world which has less to "prove" as to where it stands than the democracy of Israel. There is no single country, including those formally allied to us, whose stand over 14 years has been more consistently, unequivocally, and single-mindedly on the side of freedom. Is it enough to get a little annoyed—and, moreover, over a secondary issue in which the Israelis are less at fault than anyone else—in order to simply forget all this, to sweep it aside, to drop it overboard and abuse and bully our sincerest and most genuine friend?

In conclusion, I should like to cite a few excerpts from one of the very rare, sane, and balanced pieces of writing to have appeared so far on this sad matter. I am referring to yesterday's editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer, which says:

> There is a feasible way for the British to cut the legalistic knot that has kept the unwanted Robert Soblen in their hands: simply place the Soviet spy on a plane that will return him to the United States.
>
> The British have denied Soblen political asylum and they want the El Al airline, which brought the fugitive to England, to take him off their hands and carry him to New York.
>
> Israel has had its own troubles with the spy when he fled there after jumping $100,000 bail in New York. The Israeli Government charged him with illegal entry and promptly sent him off on the flight intended to return him to this country. Now that the problem has become Britain's, the Israelis are disinclined to take orders from the British Government on Soblen's disposal.
>
> It would be unfortunate if a byproduct of his maneuvering should be friction between the United States and our friends in Britain and Israel.
>
> El Al Air is not the only airline available for passage. The spy could be flown back on an American airliner, thus ending the bizarre case as far as both Britain and Israel are concerned.
>
> If the British quibblers consider that it would not be cricket for them to place the fugitive bodily in a U.S. airliner, some other arrangement could surely be made. * * * Possibly the British would be agreeable to transfer Soblen, as a fugitive illegally in England, to the custody of the American Embassy, from where he could be taken to a U.S.-bound plane.
>
> All that is needed to defeat his plan and get him to prison is a simple act of redtape cutting by the British—making sure, this time, that he makes it all the way to New York.

Parallelism, Kennanism, and Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Members of the House debated the issue of continuing aid in any form to Yugoslavia and other Communist-occupied nations. At that time argument was advanced that Tito's Yugoslavia was not part of the Russian bloc and that by helping Tito we encouraged other Communist countries to take an independent attitude toward Moscow. I did not agree with that argument. I opposed it. My argument was that Tito was Moscow's Trojan horse, Moscow's weapon of economic warfare against the United States and other free nations. As an agent of imperial Russian communism Tito should be judged for what he is.

The noted labor columnist, Victor Riesel, who has the happy faculty of reducing complex issues to their naked simplicities, has undertaken a long and careful examination of Tito from the vantage point of inside Europe. In a recent column he exposes the new Communist tactic of "parallelism." By this he means the parallel positions taken by Tito and Moscow—parallel actions which have no other purpose but to strengthen the international Communist conspiracy.

Victor Riesel concludes his analysis of this tactic of the international Communist conspiracy with a well-deserved mention of Ambassador George Kennan "Shame on George."

By leave previously granted, I insert this article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

TREND OF TITO POLICY IS CALLED PARALLEL TO RUSS

(By Victor Riesel)

ATHENS.—A mystery plane streaked across Greece on March 30. It refused to identify itself. In a few minutes, Greek fliers forced it down. The strange plane, it developed, had been in the control of the personal pilot of Egypt's dictator Gamal Nasser. It was strange indeed—for it had some $2 million in gold bullion aboard. And it was headed for Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

The Egyptian pilot was returned to Cairo. Later, my informant tells me, the plane and the gold followed. Why this bullion was headed for Tito's capital no one quite knows. The point is that Nasser, an outspoken critic and international opponent of the United States and a neo-Socialist, trusted his friend Tito sufficiently to place the gold in his care.

Aid debate: I report this because of the controversy back home over aid to Communist Yugoslavia. Some of Tito's champions owe us critics of Tito's communism here in the Balkans, an explanation. How does it happen that Yugoslavia is constantly dealing with our enemies and gets our aid, while such lands as Greece, whose peoples' blood drenched the countryside during the Communist invasion a decade ago, get their U.S. aid slashed?

There are many instances of Tito's wooing the Iron Curtain bloc up north. Shortly after I flew into central Europe, I learned of the visit to Moscow of a topside Yugoslavian delegation.

That was on the afternoon of July 2. The delegation was headed by none other than Yugoslavian Vice President Mijalko Todorovic. With Tito spending more and more time away from his administrative offices, Todorovic is mighty topside. He runs much of the nation. He is philosophically, intellectually, politically, and in any other fashion, anti-United States.

Big hello: His mission to Moscow was to negotiate with the Russians for the expansion of economic cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia. Obviously the Kremlin placed high priority on all this. For, at the Vnukovo Airport to greet Todorovic were none other than First Deputy Premier Mikoyan, First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade Arkhipov, Deputy Foreign Minister Firyubin, and the rest of the Soviet economic delegation to the negotiations. Mikoyan will head this negotiating committee.

It can positively be reported that during their talks, the Russians found considerable sympathy among the Yugoslavs on one point the Khrushchev people believe most important: The Russians want the Belgrade government to fight the Common Market. The Kremlin wants the Yugoslavs to come into the "Comecon"—the Soviet counterpart of our Common Market.

Economic clash: Todorovic indicated he was for it and would try to prevail on his people to take such a stand. Such a move would mean open economic warfare with us and our allies—even while we are pouring millions into Yugoslavia.

Nor is this the only sign of alinement between Belgrade and the Communist International. The Soviets have given tanks to the Yugoslavs. Why? Certainly not because they expect the Tito government to use them against the Sino-Soviet bloc in an emergency.

The Belgrade government now has drawn closer to the tough Communist Government in Sofia, Bulgaria. Thus there is a tightening of the lines between Moscow and Belgrade and the satellites.

Parallelism: Certainly the Yugoslavs will not become one of the Soviet's satellites. But the sentiment in many foreign diplomatic circles is the Belgrade will parallel Moscow. Parallelism is as dangerous to us as satelliteism. Many of our friends among the free nations see us supporting parallelism. And they say to themselves that the United States really doesn't know what it is doing with its money and support. So we lose face and considerable prestige.

There also is another Belgrade export which few back home know anything about. The Yugoslav export is invisible. It is the spreading of the doctrine of a type of national socialism and "works councils" to run factories. This means that a shop or factory committee really decides how a plant shall operate, how its produce shall be distributed, what wages shall be paid and whether there should be profits to the state, or to some private investor.

Shame on George: This philosophy of production is being shipped to such lands as Algeria, Ghana, and even far-off Dahomey, where the United States and our allies have considerable investments. Those investments will be worth nothing if Yugoslavia succeeds in spreading its form of works-councils socialism and controlled production throughout Africa.

Our Ambassador to Belgrade, George Kennan, has said that criticism of aid to Yugoslavia is "vindictive" action. That hardly seems fair on Mr. Kennan's part.

Is it vindictive to oppose the spread of Tito's type of communism and to object strenuously to his constant cooperation with the enemies of the United States?

Program for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems facing America's rural communities is the fate of our agriculture. The 1960 Federal census disclosed a dropping of population in many rural areas. This affects the business community. Since Mr. DuBois has had much experience in banking and thoroughly understands this problem, the following statement is pertinent and worthy of consideration:

STATEMENT OF PAT DUBOIS, CHAIRMAN OF THE INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 7, 1962, RE PROPOSALS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN "AN ADAPTIVE PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE"

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Pat DuBois. I am executive vice president of the First State Bank of Sauk Centre, Minn., and appear here as chairman of the Independent Bankers Association Agriculture Committee. The association, with a membership of more than 6,000 banks, mostly smaller banks in rural communities, maintains its headquarters in Sauk Centre.

Our association is vitally interested in the economy of rural America. We are close to farm people. We are fully aware that the farmer's problems are ours, for we deal with these problems each day.

The Independent Bankers Association, and our committee, wish to place on the record here our emphatic opposition to the Committee for Economic Development's proposal. It would move 2 million farmworkers off the land in the next 5 years and would adjust commodity prices downward. For the most part, when we speak of farmworkers, we are referring to married men with families. The proposal for migration out of farming would, as I see it, mean the departure of at least 6 million persons from rural America within 5 years.

The CED report containing this recommendation, titled, "An Adaptive Program for Agriculture," says that agriculture is, and I quote, "using too many resources." My reaction to this is the same as that recorded in a dissenting footnote by Fred C. Foy, chairman of the Koppers Co., and a member of CED's Research and Policy Committee. The footnote, on page 9 of the report, says, and I quote, "* * * who is the CED to say that in this situation 'too many resources' are being used?" On that, I'm with Mr. Foy.

As I read the report, my reaction was that it demonstrated a highhanded, arbitrary attitude toward a sizable and vital segment of our population. What's the real objective here? To further depress the already low price level of food and fiber and to secure even lower farm labor costs by having available a large pool of unemployed farmworkers?

The CED report affirms what we all know—that agriculture is ailing—then offers a prescription that would make it much sicker than it is now. The report acknowledges that the farmer has achieved a high degree of efficiency, then proposes that as a reward he be kicked off his land.

The CED concedes, on page 27 of its report, that, and I quote, "* * * there are uncertainties in the course we recommend." I might add there also is hardship and degradation for the farmer in the CED course. If the recommendations of the report were followed, hundreds of thousands of farm people who now are on employment rolls in agriculture would stand a good chance of being transferred to relief rolls in urban areas.

In view of the uncertainties that the CED itself admits are in its plan, I submit there is no wisdom in trying it on American agriculture.

It is not difficult to visualize what would happen to rural communities if the migration of 2 million farm families to metropolitan and industrial centers is hastened in the manner proposed by the CED report. Fewer farm families mean fewer people to buy shoes and groceries and overalls and shirts. Remove one farm family and you have taken away the financial resources to support one town "service family." Remove 20 farm and rural town service families and you have lost the people who spend the income that will sustain one substantial rural business.

The proposed migration would trigger a drop in our rural communities that challenges comprehension. Further, the serious dislocation of our Nation's rural economy would so greatly reduce the buying power of rural America that the ability of nonfarm industries to absorb the displaced farmers would be further diminished. We would be dumping an additional 2 million workers on a labor market that already has more than 4 million unemployed.

Who is to hire the displaced farmer? Not steel, which already is operating at only a fraction of its productive capacity. The electronics industry has sufficient employees. The auto industry is not operating at full plant capacity. Farm implement production is down.

Here again I wish to refer to a dissenting footnote appearing on page 33 of the report. Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and a member of the CED Research and Policy Committee, says, and I quote, "The problem of absorbing the increased flow of labor out of agriculture under these proposals will be formidable in view of the prospective increases in the total labor force." While the seriousness of the problem is understated by Mr. Kappel, it is a recognition of one of the numerous "bugs" in the report.

I am sure that all of you on the committee are even more familiar than I with what has been happening in rural America for a number of years. All across the land are rural communities whose economic level has been depressed by the inadequate prices farmers receive for their products. The depressed condition of agriculture already has prompted millions of farm people to leave the soil. There is no merit, no benefit to anyone, in attempting to accelerate this movement.

Our committee's position is that the producer, the rural community and the country banker, are so interdependent that they must be considered as one. All are completely dependent on farm income. The withdrawal of human and financial resources from agriculture does not answer the agricultural problem.

Presently, country bank loans, earnings—and expenses—are at an alltime high. As one of the members of our committee put it recently, and I quote, "On the surface, we never had it so good, but expanded credit cannot much longer serve as a substitute for adequate earnings in agriculture." Our committee believes that a higher price level for agriculture's production is the key factor in any attempted solution of the farm problem.

Let's project a bit on the basis of today's price trends in agriculture and other segments of the economy. A U.S. Department of Agriculture official estimates that gross farm income in 1975 will be $41 billion, compared to an estimated $39.6 billion in 1961. The increase, then, in the next 13 years, is estimated to total $1.4 billion.

Now let's look for a moment at a projection of gross national product, the value of all goods and services produced annually. The 1960 total was $504.4 billion. It's estimated the total will be $787.8 billion in 1970, and increase of $283.4 billion. It's evident that agriculture's increase of $1.4 billion is a pitifully small portion of the total.

I mention these projections to emphasize my conviction that agriculture must have better prices for its products.

We country bankers can see the handwriting on the wall. The depression in agriculture has forced farmers to increase their borrowing. The borrowing always is in anticipation of future profits, but the sad fact is that repayment often is made from liquidation of assets accumulated in prior years. I know this is happening every time a farmer brings in savings bonds to pay off a loan.

The declining farm population and depressed condition in agriculture is today's problem but it can be closely related, if the condition continues, to the big banking problem of the 1970's, which is the threatened disapearance of hundreds of small independent banks in the poorer farm communities. Move the people from the farms and you also remove the banks and other service institutions. There is no need for them then.

If the CED proposal became reality, it's likely that country banks would be little more than service stations for the large city banks by 1970. In fact, it is probable that many customers would bypass the local bank. They would go directly to the larger centers where a larger number of service institutions is located.

Recently a noted agricultural economist warned, and I quote, "The farmers came to the prairies before the towns and when the farmers are gone there will be no further need for the towns."

Pushing farmers off the land at the rate of 400,000 a year to take jobs in manufacturing doesn't make good sense. There are 1½ million fewer jobs in industry today than there were just 7 years ago. The CED recommendations would produce a net economic loss to the total economy. Our economy cannot afford to go backwards.

We in the Independent Bankers Association ask ourselves, "Can the erosion of 2 million farm families in a period of 5 years as projected by CED be considered anything but abnormal attrition by any stretch of the imagination." The proposal creates a dangerous and difficult condition, one that it seems our economy is incapable of coping with.

Is it possible that this report sees an opportunity of flooding the labor market, making it easier for the managers of our large industries to deal with organized labor.

Up to now in rural America, the county seat towns and those ranging from 1,000 to 5,000 population have suffered only moderately. This is primarily because of the decline of the relatively smaller communities. Their loss has been the larger communities gain. This loss has been going on almost unnoticed but the drop in farm income over the past several years has made shoppers out of farmers and they are ranging out to the larger communities to spend their money. From now on the larger rural communities in the 1,000 to 5,000 population bracket will begin to lose important service organizations. The erosion on Main Street will no longer be insidious and in small pieces. As these towns lose a major implement dealer or a drugstore or a doctor or a bank, and become less efficient than the neighboring small cities in providing goods and services to farmers, the distintegration will become glaringly obvious and the loss will be in chunks. Our organization takes the position that the CED proposal is both economically and socially wrong and that it will ultimately plague the Nation with its most severe economic problem.

It has been demonstrated in the past that when agriculture is sick for a long period, its ailment infects all other segments of the economy. Unless agriculture can be put into a better economic condition this country is in for the worst depression that it has ever seen. The CED proposals would further depress agriculture.

This association has stood strong over the years in opposition to the merging or branching of banks. It now is apparent that it must stand as the strong friend of the farmer in a fight for survival of not only the farm family but of our independent banking system, which is in danger of losing its lifeblood, the people it serves.

In concluding my remarks, let me urge that you reject the CED report. It is morally, socially, and economically unfair to the people in rural America, and unworkable in this country.

Let us develop an agriculture, working shoulder to shoulder as an indispensable part of a dynamic and fully employed and fully operating national economy with relative prosperity for every segment. Let us devise means whereby our economy does not cheat the true producer of wealth in this country. Let us develop price and profit for farm commodities and farm production.

By doing this we can achieve a huge bonus of output and income by making full use of all our resources, raw material, human and financial. We can provide full employment, full plant capacity, balance the budget, and commence retirement of some of the national debt.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for the privilege of appearing before you.

Liberia's 115 Years—"Here We Will Remain"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 115th birthday of the founding of the Republic of Liberia, Ambassador Peal welcomed over 600 guests at a reception given at the Embassy. During the festivities, the Ambassador stated that:

> It has been a great pleasure for Mrs. Peal and me to have you with us to help celebrate our national day. I need hardly tell you the great significance all Liberians attach to this day. But I do want to say that we are particularly happy to celebrate today as we reflect on the frontier of freedom extended in Africa since our own was declared 115 years ago—long years in which by dint of courage and perseverance, we held the lone torch of freedom that glowed in Africa.

Ambassador Peal expressed the hope that those assembled had enjoyed the Liberian music and the Liberian national anthem, sung by the Peace Corps trainees at Pittsburgh University who are to take up their duties in Liberia later this year.

The Ambassador then introduced the following poem by explaining:

> In 1822, when our Founding Fathers, after much fruitless voyaging along the west coast of Africa reached Providence Island—Liberia's Plymouth Rock—there was a moment of doubt and hesitation as to whether this was indeed the place where their settlement should be established. One of the little band, Elijah Johnson, rallied the rest of the group by saying, "I have sought a home in vain for 2 years. Here I have found one and here I shall remain."

The poem follows:

They dragged their precious cargo up the beach
They waded through the breakers for the shore.
Here was the prize, at last within their reach,
The guerdon they had prayed and voyaged for.

The sea's wild music echoed their refrain:
"For two long years we sought a home in vain.
Here found we one, and here we will remain."

On the wet rocks, their sodden bales they laid,
Before them, which their hands must hew and hack,
The towering forest's tangled barricade
And the Gulf's league-long thunder at their back.

Yet still the wild wind echoed their refrain:
"For two long years we sought a home in vain.
Here found we one, and here we will remain."

And now the lone ship's glinting sails are gone.
A nation's history wavers at its start.
Naught is there now for hope to build upon.
Naught but the strong arm and the sturdy heart,

Naught but the grim resolve of that refrain:
"For two long years we sought a home in vain.
Here found we one, and here we will remain."

Firm against phantom terrors they must stand,
Ghost adversaries, nameless and unknown,
The sudden, secret fevers of the land
Which shrank the flesh and agonized the bone.

From dying lips there died not the refrain:
"For two long years we sought a home in vain.
Here found we one, and here we will remain."
From leaf-built shelters which the wind threw down
And huts the midnight deluge washed away
Grew, mortised with their sufferings, a town.
Out of their yesterdays grew our today.

Louder and stronger swells that old refrain:
"Too long our fathers sought a home in vain.
Here found they one, and here we will remain."

Representative Fulton's Stand on H.R. 12580

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 20, 1962, I left for Patrick Air

Force Base at Cape Canaveral, Fla., on official business of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. This was in connection with the Mariner I Venus launch, and a meeting with Pratt & Whitney executive and research organization in regard to the difficulties encountered on the Centaur hydrogen engine program.

Had I been able to be present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 169 on the passage of H.R. 12580, the State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill.

Support for the Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of August 8, the Courier-News, of Plainfield, N.J., a Gannett newspaper, included an editorial expressing strong support for the wilderness bill. In straightforward and unequivocal language, the editorial makes an effective presentation of the principal reasons this legislation is needed. It is a position shared, I believe, by the great majority of our people who understand the principles of conservation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial and I join the editors of this outstanding New Jersey newspaper in calling upon our colleagues of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to bring this important bill to the floor for action:

WILDERNESS BILL

Among the major bills pending in Congress is the Wilderness Act which was passed by the Senate in a 78-to-8 vote last September. The proposed act, which would “establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people,” is still in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There is opposition to the bill from diehard commercial interests. There is strong support for the bill on the part of those who know that once the remaining wilderness is invaded, the trees are cut and roads are built, it can never again be restored to its primary state.

The bill would erect statutory barriers to the commercial exploitation of the tracts now designated by administrative ruling as ‘“wilderness,” “wild,” “canoe” and “primitive” within the national forests. Most of such remaining land is in the Western States. Some of those opposed to the bill feel that its provisions are too protective and would exclude great numbers of persons from the use and enjoyment of the land.

In support of the bill, Idaho's Senator FRANK CHURCH made this statement regarding its purpose: “I think the wilderness bill will go down as one of the great conservation measures * * *. If it becomes law, we will have preserved, for now and for generations unborn, areas of unspoiled, pristine wilderness, accessible by a system of trails, unmarred by roads or buildings, but open to the considerate use and enjoyment of hikers, mountain climbers, hunters, fishermen, and trail riders ,and of all those who find in high and lonely places, a refreshment of the spirit, and life's closest communion with God.”

There is a poetic appeal in Senator CHURCH's words. There is a practical side too. We have seen what happens when trails are widened into highways and commercial interests and people move in. The area simply isn't wilderness any more.

We favor the wilderness bill. We would like to see the House get it out of committee and act on it favorably.

Address of Chairman Swidler of the Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, recently addressed the American Bar Association meeting in San Francisco on “The Challenge of Natural Gas Regulations.”

Chairman Swidler who has made significant improvements in the operations of this very important Commission presented to the bar association a strong case for further improvement in hearing procedures before the Commission. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I insert Chairman Swidler's remarks at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF NATURAL GAS REGULATION

(By Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman, Federal Power Commission)

The title announced for this talk, which I selected months before I knew I was going to say, is broad enough to cover anything remotely touching upon the Federal Power Commission's functions in natural gas regulation. Perhaps I should disclose to you now that the corner of this very large field which I shall dwell upon today is the need for improvement in hearing procedures before the Commission.

The current interest in improving administration procedures represents a healthy reaction to the increasingly apparent need for administrative reform. On all sides there are demands that the procedures in each agency be reviewed critically and objectively with a view to putting into effect whatever reforms may be required to enable them to do their jobs in their particular areas of activities. The establishment by President Kennedy of the Administrative Conference, under the leadership of Judge E. Barrett Prettyman, is perhaps the most important and potentially useful of the many current approaches to administrative improvement. Through the Administrative Conference it is possible to bring to bear upon the problems of Federal administrative agencies the insights and talents of practitioners, judges, and scholars as well as of the responsible officials of administrative agencies.

I do not mean to slight the study and effort which were devoted in the middle 1940's to the problem of insuring an impartial disposition of cases before administrative tribunals. As a result of this effort, Congress passed the Administrative Procedure Act, which dealt primarily with the problem of the fairness of the administrative process, and particularly with insulating the administrative process in contested proceedings from external pressures.

The present focus is on the efficiency of the administrative process. There need be nothing inconsistent between the objective of fairness in administrative adjudication and the objective of conducting the proceeding in such a way as to make the best possible use of agency staff and of the counsel and witnesses of the litigants, and to bring the case to a conclusion as soon as the nature of the case permits. On the contrary, a speedy trial is a basic element of fairness in any proceeding and in many types of administrative hearings it is just as true as in judicial hearings that justice delayed is justice denied.

Delays feeds on itself. After a segmented and protracted hearing the facts which were proven are likely to be out of date by the time the case is ready for decision. The “test year” upon which the case has been tried has become ancient history. According to their interests, counsel will urge disposition on a stale record or holding further hearing to consider later operating periods. The hearing examiner, or the Commission itself, is faced with the dilemma of making a decision on a record which is out of date or of starting the case on a new round of hearings.

The natural gas cases before the Federal Power Commission are too important to be permitted to drag on over the years. They are among the most important cases decided before any adjudicative tribunal in the country, judicial or administrative, except for courts of review. Natural gas rate cases involve the gas bills of 34 million consumers throughout the country. The sums of money at stake in rate suspensions in individual cases may accumulate with time so as to be the controlling factor in the financial strength of interstate pipelines and may strongly affect the value of the securities of the many thousands of stockholders in these companies. In the past year, there have been disposed of over a dozen pipeline rate cases each of which involved rate increases of more than $5 million annually collected subject to possible refund. We have still pending before the Commission one pipeline rate case in which the sums collected subject to refund over a period of years approaches the staggering figure of $400 million, and the amount increases at the rate of $9 million a month.

It is obvious that extended delay in these proceedings may cause great damage to all concerned. A company cannot plan its future with assurance and investors cannot determine the value of its securities when the potential refund obligation is equal to a large part of the equity capital. Consumers who have been forced to pay inflated gas bills for many years find little comfort in refund prospects which are hedged with contingencies, including the ability of the consumer to survive until the refunds are ordered and paid.

The aggregate of money collected by the interstate natural gas pipelines subject to refund in cases pending before the Federal Power Commission is still over $900 million, despite the success of the Commission's settlement program, because the accretion of additional amounts in the remaining cases almost offsets the large amounts involved in the cases which have been settled or decided. There are also pending certificate applications for a billion dollars of pipeline construction. This figure has smaller significance than the refund figure because much of the pipeline construction is covered by temporary authorizations, and some of the rest may represent duplicate facilities or may be disallowed for other reasons. There can be no doubt, however, as to the necessity for speedy disposition of FPC rate and certificate proceedings which have such a broad impact on a basic industry and the consumers it serves.

I am happy to be able to report that we are moving steadily to dispose of the mountain of pending pipeline rate cases and have in recent months ordered refunds of approximately $150 million including one individual case in which the refunds exceeded $40 million. The Commission is determined to clear up its existing backlog of cases and to revise its hearing procedures to insure that future cases are handled with dispatch.

I had the pleasure a few months ago of speaking to the members of the Federal Power Bar Association to which many of you here belong. In my talk I spoke of the vital role of the examiners in moving our cases along with dispatch. The handful of men in the Office of Examiners of the Federal Power Commission are basic to the discharge of the Commission's work.

I take this occasion to say that one of the most important contributions which Congress could make to the improvement in the administrative process would be to provide for adequate compensation to examiners in agencies such as the Federal Power Commission where the responsibilities of the examiners are so great and the benefits of improvement would mean so much to the public and to the great industries under FPC regulation. All of the suggestions for administrative reform assume an even greater degree of control of administrative proceedings by the examiner. Implicit in these recommendations is a basis of compensation which will make it possible to hold the excellent examiners already on our staff, and to attract candidates for examiner positions in whom the Commission could safely lodge broad additional responsibilities.

In my talk before the Federal Power bar I also spoke of the need for the cooperation of the bar in eliminating wasted time and inflated transcripts in proceedings before the Commission. I urge practitioners to exercise restraint in introducing cumulative testimony and proof of limited or doubtful probative value. I urged a double dose of restraint in cross-examination, and especially with respect to evidence which might better have been dispensed with in the first place, pointing out that there was no point to loading a record with a mountain of material which a detached appraisal by counsel at the outset would have convinced him was most unlikely to be of controlling importance in winning his case, whether before the Commission or the courts.

Let me add on this score that cases before the Federal Power Commission are not likely to be won on technicalities. The Commission is just as much impressed with a solid point of law or of administrative policy whether it is based on 10 pages of record or a thousand and its conclusions of law and findings on the facts are not likely to be swayed by cumulative testimony no matter how elaborately developed. Extended arguments with expert witnesses in an effort to persuade them of the falseness of the theories upon which they have built their professional lives add bulk but not light to a transcript. Cross-examination of an expert witness on his qualifications or his testimony, of the kind used in attempting to sway a jury to discount what he says, is wasted in an FPC proceeding.

Sometimes the Commission finds in cases which have been in hearing for many months that basic issues have not been raised and important factual areas have not been touched upon, so that the Commission is required to send the case back for further hearings. We have been forced to conclude that mass cannot be equated with thoroughness or completeness and may in fact represent a poor alternative for a carefully thought-out presentation of a complete basic case.

Let me describe for you the tortuous hearing course of one of our rate cases. The original filing was made in February of 1957. The first hearings were held in April of 1957, recessed to July and continued off and on through the remainder of 1957. Hearings were held in January and February of 1958. The hearings then recessed again to October when a further recess until December was granted, and then yet another recess was granted until January and then further postponed to March, April, and May of 1959. Hearings were finally resumed during May of 1959 and then recessed until September.

Three days of hearings were held in September and then the case was recessed until November, at which time it was further postponed to December. In December of 1959 the record was closed on one issue and an examiner's decision on this issue was rendered in May of 1961. The Commission twice heard oral argument on this one issue and issued its final decision in February of 1962. The rest of this case, I regret to say, is still with us.

There is something radically wrong with this way of conducting a rate case. This was a complex case, true enough, but it was not that difficult, nor is its history unique. No one who participated has great reason for pride in the way the case has been handled thus far. I say this although all the counsel involved were able and dedicated and the examiner dealt skillfully with many issues in an elaborate record. The fault was not the fault of the individuals but of the system, or rather lack of system.

Our staff made a recent study of rate investigations, rate filings and abandonment applications. This study showed that from the date of filing to a final decision, it has taken an average of 1,782 days on rate investigations initiated by the Commission, 1,865 days on filings by pipelines for increased rates, and even in abandonment cases, which should be reasonably simple, it has taken an average of 493 days. The average rate investigation has accumulated 3,172 pages of transcript and 868 pages of exhibits. Any system which requires so much time for decision and such voluminous records must contain ample room for improvement.

What happened in these and similar proceedings is water over the dam, or perhaps to this audience I should say gas flared to the atmosphere. It becomes now our responsibility to distill the lesson from what has happened, and to avoid additional administrative monstrosities in the future.

The first conclusion one reaches from a study of the lugubrious record of the case whose 5-year history I have just reviewed, and of many similar cases, is that they were not planned that way; they just drifted. There was no early definition of the issues; there was no broad stipulation of the readily provable facts; there was no collaboration among the parties on the presentation of proof; there was no schedule of the presentation of testimony; there was no target date for each of the steps and for completion. Without such advance planning and preparation and without advance arrangements for cooperation in the presentation of the case, it is inevitable that there will be waste motion, confusion and delay, most of which could have been avoided by a well organized prehearing conference at the inception of the case.

The Commission has long recognized the need for improvement in prehearing conference procedure. In November 1959, the Commission promulgated its Order No. 217 providing for the use of prehearing conferences and the early designation of the presiding examiner. However, Order No. 217 has not been invoked and the attempts to use prehearing conferences have been without great success. I do not know every factor which militated against successful use of such conferences, but I can point out some of the reasons they did not work.

In the first place, I am told that the parties who attended the few conferences that were held went into them with little preparation. Few of the parties were well enough prepared to be willing to agree to the undisputed facts, to identify the issues, or even to plan for an orderly hearing. Moreover, some of the participating counsel seemed to think of an administrative proceeding as a contest in the courtroom skills of counsel. They wanted to save their ammunition to ambush the opposition at the hearing, rather than to lay their forensic guns on the conference table and devote themselves to simplifying and expediting the process of bringing out all the relevant facts.

In addition, examiners were compelled to supervise the prehearing conference with little or no knowledge of the case and, being saddled with a predetermined hearing date, no room in which to operate with the degree of flexibility which I believe is the very essence of a successful use of the prehearing procedure. The prehearing conference was thus merely the anteroom to the hearing maze.

The Commission now proposes to revitalize the prehearing conference procedure. We are impressed by the fact that almost every group that has sought for ways to improve administrative procedures has agreed not only that the prehearing conference can be made a valuable part of the decisional process, but that it is essential to the prompt and effective disposition of complex cases, the kind which abound in the work of the Federal Power Commission. Order No. 217 was adopted as a result of suggestions by the American Bar Association and the Federal Power bar. The House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight strongly recommended that agencies make use of this procedure. Senator CARROLL's Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practices and Procedure also recommended it and the existing Administrative Conference, on which I am serving as a member, has under consideration strong proposals for more effective use of prehearing conferences.

It appears, therefore, that there is general agreement that prehearing conferences should be beneficial if we can make use of them properly. In order to make a prehearing conference procedure work we must first understand its objectives and then determine precisely how to achieve them.

I believe the first objective of a prehearing conference is to give every party an opportunity to know and evaluate the positions of the other parties. Its purpose is to eliminate the surprise element, which, I submit, has no place in administrative proceedings, and which is being progressively restricted even in Federal court proceedings under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as well as in the courts of many of the States. The obligation of the parties in a prehearing conference is to identify the genuine and substantial issues, to reject the spurious ones at the outset, to stipulate all the relevant facts which cannot honestly be controverted, to arrange for the reconciliation of factual differences where this is feasible, and to list the key matters in factual dispute which can only be resolved in a hearing.

Matters which can be fully investigated and resolved without open trial should be eliminated from the hearing.

As a basic step to attaining these objectives, Prof. A. J. G. Priest, of the University of Virginia Law School, in his report to the Administrative Conference, emphasizes the importance of identifying the big case at the outset, and of the use of the prehearing conference device in these cases. His advice is especially pertinent to the FPC because we have so many big cases and also because we have already perfected techniques for disposing of the routine cases expeditiously. The big cases, once identified, must be assigned to the examiner at once so as to enable him to provide the necessary control of the proceedings. With the examiner in control, Professor Priest suggests that there must be early definitions of the issues, confinement of discovery within the boundaries of the defined issues, and careful procedural planning.

These are excellent suggestions and I agree with all of them, but to make them work the pleadings must be adequate to permit detailed case analysis when the prehearing conference is held. This has not been required in the past in FPC proceedings, and this defect we propose to remedy. The Federal Power Commission, with the advice of all interested parties, is revising its regulations to provide that original pipeline rate filings shall contain sufficient information to allow all parties to a proceeding to identify the difficult cases, the issues therein, and to prepare their own cases with dispatch. As many of you know, our proposed new rules provide that pipeline rate filings must be so complete as to provide in substance the pipeline's case-in-chief, should suspension of the filing prove necessary. On the basis of the applicant's exhibits and the supporting testimony, our staff and all interveners should at an early date prepare and file their own rebuttal exhibits and testimony.

As soon as our staff is ready to present its answer to the filed information of the applicant, an examiner should be assigned but no hearing date should be set.

The examiner could then call a prehearing conference, confident that an analysis of all the submitted evidence will refine and reduce to a minimum the issues which he must decide. Once assigned, the examiner would be in control. If it appeared at the first prehearing conference that some necessary evidence was missing, he could call a short recess to obtain that evidence and then resume the conference. As soon as he felt the issues and evidence had been refined as far as possible, he could set a date for a hearing confined to those matters on which cross-examination appeared to be necessary.

Where analysis of the issues and comparison of the testimony revealed that the differences were small, or lent themselves to compromise, there would be no point to proceeding to trial. The exercise of complete control of the proceedings by a competent examiner who fully understands the unresolved issues is extremely important in deciding for the parties whether a trial or settlement conference is more appropriate as a next step.

I make a final suggestion for expediting hearings which may come as a shock to those of you who have become accustomed to recesses as a way of life in FPC hearings. I suggest a single continuous hearing directed to full cross-examination of all witnesses presented by all parties. Of course, the examiner would have wide discretion in handling the hearing and he might, where circumstances warranted, make use of during-the-hearing conferences. In general, however, once the prehearing conference has been concluded and the hearing scheduled and begun, counsel would be expected to present their entire case without substantial interruption for the preparation of testimony or cross-examination.

It seems to me that the use of continuous hearings is a logical outgrowth of the full filings now required by our regulations and of a revitalized and flexible prehearing conference procedure. Following a full presentation of a written case and an exploration of all issues in a prehearing conference, a continuous hearing should be less burdensome than in a court trial, where a continuous hearing is taken as a matter of course.

It should be clear that the procedure in which all parties will prepare their direct case in advance of a single continuous hearing will greatly de-emphasize the role of cross-examination in the proceedings before the Federal Power Commission. This, in my judgment, will be all to the good. I do not mean to say that cross-examination is not an important part of the adversary process but I believe there has been far too much reliance by counsel on the use of cross-examination for making their own case. The new procedures will also have the salutary effect of forcing counsel for all parties to present their facts in a more orderly and concise manner.

Improvement in administrative adjudication means a constant search for improvement at every step of a proceeding. All who participate in a proceeding must be alert to take advantage of opportunities large or small to do a quicker or better job than we are now doing. The small improvements are important in total, but we cannot rely on them alone. We must also be willing to consider and adopt such major and radical changes as I have proposed.

Administrative reform cannot be achieved by any one device or strategem. It can only result from an unremitting drive for excellence in every phase of the administrative process. An administrative agency is a unit. If the agency as a whole is deeply motivated to achieve a high standard of performance the results will show at every stage of its work including the conduct of its hearings. Conversely an agency operating on slack standards is not likely to be a model in the handling of its caseload. The Federal Power Commission is aiming at a high quality of administrative performance in every aspect of its work.

I do not doubt that the practitioners before the Federal Power Commission will have their problems of adjusting to the new procedures and quickened pace, many of which they themselves have long advocated. The bar which practices before the Commission is an integral part of the machinery for the discharge of the Commission's adjudicative functions. The bar and the Commission must now help each other in the quest for a system of administrative justice in natural gas cases of which we can all be proud.

Remarks of Rev. John J. Jakubielski, 30th Anniversary of the General Joseph Haller Post 125, Polish Army Veterans Association of America, South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts of an address delivered recently by an outstanding citizen of my State, the Reverend John J. Jakubielski, pastor of the Sacred Heart Church of South Bend, Ind.

Father Jakubielski's address was delievered on the occasion of a banquet marking the 30th anniversary of the General Joseph Haller Post 125, Polish Army Veterans Association of America.

Father Jakubielski is a priest who serves his own parish well. He is also a man who has contributed to the life of the entire community by his fine work with young people. It was because of his experience in working with youth that I was pleased this year to recommend that Father Jakubielski be named a member of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. On April 18, 1962, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, as Chairman, announced that Father Jakubielski was appointed a special adviser to the President's Committee which was established under the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1961, of which I was sponsor in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Father Jakubielski's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF REV. JOHN J. JAKUBIELSKI TO POLISH ARMY VETERANS ASSOCIATION, SOUTH BEND, IND.

January 20, 1961, was one of those historic days in the annals of American history. It was the occasion when in the Capital City of our great country a new President officially took office, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In his historic inaugural address the President made this pointed remark as a challenge to his fellow Americans and to citizens of every nation in the world, "Fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country. Fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

Truly the occasion of today's festivities lends itself to this challenging admonition of a great American, our Commander in Chief. In the very year that our youthful President was born, nearly 45 years ago, a group of courageous Americans of Polish extraction took up, literally, this challenge of our President to seek "what together we can do for the freedom of man." At a time of gravest need and opportunity, these men sprang forward in the noble traditions of their forefathers, seeking to obtain and to defend the cause of freedom with their lives. These soldiers, impressed with our American way of life and firm in their conviction of the freedom of man, banded together as an army under Gen. Jozef Haller to fight for a free and independent Poland on the side of the Allies in World War I in France. And though their efforts met with a measure of success, today, unfortunately, this Poland, much against her will, finds herself a satellite under a godless dictatorship.

GENERAL HALLER'S ARMY

These veterans of General Haller's army are particularly close to my heart because two of my favorite uncles, having lived prosperously in this country for several years, volunteered to fight for the cause of freedom for their native Poland. One of them remained in Poland after the First World War and became a successful farmer. When 4 years ago I had the privilege to visit him in Poland he told me in words that will forever ring in my ears his appreciation of the blessings of America, "Of my 65 years I truly lived only 5 years." Of course, he meant the 5 years spent in America.

This wasn't an indictment of Poland but it was to me a convincing and sincere admission that ours, the United States of America, is the greatest country, the greatest republic in the history of mankind. Our Nation holds in trust the last hope of a free civilization—and it is your task and mine to keep it so.

TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE FREEDOM

As we recount the noble deeds and sacrifices of the volunteers in General Haller's army, we must realize our sacred responsibility to protect and preserve the sacred heritage of freedom. History bears out the truth that liberty once won must constantly be defended.

We salute our heroes who paid for every inch of ground with their courage and their lives. We salute those who left all they held dear in life to make the world a better place to live in.

In spirit the honored dead seem to say to us, "It was not easy thus to die, to feel the loneliness of pain, but O tell us, won't you, that it was not in vain?"

We fought two major wars in the last generation, World War I to make the world safe for democracy; then the tragic event of Pearl Harbor in 1941 which brought America's entry into World War II and cost the lives of 400,000 courageous Americans fired up with the ideal to once and for all end all wars.

Yet, today we are not safe and cannot afford to be complacent. Deadly enemies continue to challenge the right of Americans to live in freedom and dignity under God. The enemy that plagues us from within is the serious weakening of moral and spiritual fiber in our society, and from without we are at war with the Communists.

DOUBLING OF CRIME IN UNITED STATES

I spoke of the enemy from within. During the past decade a recent report shows that crime has nearly doubled across the United States, outpacing the growth of our population at the rate of 4 to 1. Crime is no respector of age, race or creed. America's juvenile lawlessness is directly traceable to the failure of parents and adults to meet their moral obligations. Let us never forget that a loose state of morals, a corrupted conscience is incompatible with true freedom. It destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity, and fairplay. Is it any wonder that the Father of our Country, George Washington, gave as advice that we "ever keep alive in our breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience."

The founders of our country were men of faith and trust in God. The Declaration of Independence which we cherish contains within itself another document, a declaration of dependence—for it affirms that this country trusts in God.

From without the deadly menace to our way of life is the hammer and sickle and the United States is its prize target. Communism is more than just an economic, political, social, or philosophical doctrine. It is another way of life, it is 20th-century slavery, stripping man of his belief in God, his heritage of freedom, his trust in love, justice and mercy.

The picture of a Communist America cannot be overdrawn. It could happen here and there are people in this country even working to make it happen here. When the Communist Party was at its peak in the United States (80,000 in 1944), it was stronger in numbers than the Soviet Party was at the time it seized power in Russia. Each of the Soviet satellites disclose how a well-organized band of revolutionaries can impose its rule over the majority population. William Z. Foster, former national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States in dedicating his book said, "To my great-grandson, who will live in a Communist United States." And who hasn't heard that favorite boast, "We will bury you"?

More than 20 years ago Bishop Sheen, then a monsignor, not a prophet but an excellent student of history, declared in a radio address: "Mark these words: the enemy of the world in the near future is going to be Russia, which is playing democracies against dictators and dictators against democracies; which is using peace when it can and war when it must; and is preparing when Europe is exhausted from war, to sweep over it like a vulture, to drink its blood and make away with the spoils."

PRICE OF LIBERTY

I don't like to be an alarmist but someone once said, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance." In this hour of grim challenge, in this age of national peril, a struggle between freedom and enslavement, we must want peace but not peace at any price. We must say with J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, "I would rather be dead than Red."

Our great American patriots would have us know that fear, apologies, defeatism are alien to the thinking of true Americans. That is why Patrick Henry asks the searching question: "Is life so dear or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

Or, as Benjamin Franklin declared, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty, nor safety."

Men like these we honor today, these veterans and all our war dead, say to us in spirit, keep your heads up, looking for honorable solutions and selling America rather than keeping your heads down, looking for shelters and the compromise of human rights. It means buckling down to some serious business. The famous boast, "We will bury you," shouldn't cause us to tremble. We need fear only fear itself.

THE CHALLENGE OF SURVIVAL

If we are strong enough morally and physically, if we care enough, we will meet the challenge of survival. Let us put God more and better into our daily way of life if we hope to heal our moral illness. You can't preach morality and practice inmorality. You can't just follow the line of least resistance or make a cafeteria style selection of God's laws. I'll obey only if it suits me, if it doesn't rub against my grain. It means to do more than just use slogans like "In God We Trust," as our coins state, and then to place our vote of confidence in everyone and everything else but God. It means that we will better appreciate living in the greatest Republic in the history of mankind, that we will exhibit in more positive ways the value and superiority of our form of government over any foreign ideology.

It means that we accept the challenge of survival, that each of us to his fullest capacity will shoulder the burden.

One American hero said something all of us could remember: "We cannot do more than our duty; we would not wish to do less."

Please God, give us the courage to accept the unselfish admonition of our First Citizen—"Fellow Americans. Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

Regulations Run Riot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the public is alarmed with the expansion of regulatory power of the Government over an increasing number of areas that have operated in a free and effective fashion.

The public is beginning to understand that Government regulations, even under the guise of benevolence, bring controls that are detrimental, costly, cumbersome and, in the end, develop conditions that are contrary to the expressed expansion offered by proponents of good government.

This type of opinion is excellently illustrated in an editorial which appeared in the Blue Island Sun-Standard of Thursday, August 2, entitled "Regulations Run Riot" which I place into the RECORD at this point, as a concise, clear-cut commentary that deserves attention.

The editorial follows:

Regulations Run Riot

There are influential groups in this country, numbering among their ranks men in high office, whose major goal is to interject the regulatory power of the Government more and more into the affairs of citizens. The philosophy back of this would seem to be that many, perhaps most, consumers are incompetents who don't know what they want or whether the're being stung or not.

Take, as an example, the proposal to establish a Department of Consumers. This new Cabinet-level authority would investigate production, distribution, prices for goods and services, the quality and suitability of goods, and "the degree to which the trade and commerce of the United Stats succeeds in satisfying consumer needs for goods and services."

In other words, practically the whole economy of the country would be under investigation—and, unless past precedent is meaningless, this would be followed by demands for regulations of every conceivable kind. The end result would be that producers and sellers would no longer be free to make and distribute what they felt consumers wanted, and consumers would no longer be free to buy what they wanted, unless a Government bureau agreed with their judgment.

Freedom of choice is a fundamental freedom. Excessive, needless regulation is its eternal enemy.

Medford's Amelia Earhart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on July 24, 1962, I introduced H.R. 12678, legislation which directs the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the memory of Amelia Earhart. In a recent resolution addressed to the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee, the Medford City Council stated:

> All the citizens of Medford join in a united effort to pay due homage to Miss Earhart's memory. Medford was the home of Miss Earhart and members of her family are among this community's most respected citizens. Medford is proud of the brilliant record she compiled as a true pioneer of the air age.

The city of Medford, which I am honored to represent in the Congress, has claim to Amelia Earhart as she made her home there. However, all Americans may claim Amelia Earhart as a national symbol of the American pioneering spirit and aviation heritage. The mystery of Amelia Earhart's death has led to important discoveries and new procedures in air-sea rescues. The following excerpts are from an article by Macon Reed which was printed in the July 14, 1962, edition of Navy Times, concerns a heretofore unpublished report by the Coast Guard officers whose ship was sent to the island where Miss Earhart was to have landed. After reading the article, one gains greater understanding as to how much a breakdown in communications between those working on the flight led to her disaster:

COAST GUARD REPORT—SECRET FOR 25 YEARS—ADDS TO EARHART MYSTERY

(By Macon Reed)

In 1937, the age of the heroic airplane flight was coming to an end. It was 10 years since Lindbergh had flown the Atlantic. Byrd's pilots had long since flown him over both North and South Poles. The exploits of Post and Gatty were deep in the pages of history.

But Amelia Earhart was still going. She, too, had flown the Atlantic and brought off other achievements. She was a world figure and a national hero in the waning age of pioneer aeronautics.

The era was not quite over. There was room in it for just about one more first-class, top-headline stunt flight, around-the-world flight by Amelia Earhart, who had married a book publisher, George Palmer Putnam.

Only now, 25 years after one of aviation's most written about tragedies, is the story of this tragedy as seen by Thompson being made public. He found himself suddenly thrown into the most intimate connection with the event.

While still at sea a few days afterward, he wrote his story. It was stamped confidential and shut away from public view.

In connection with the 25th anniversary (July 2) of the Earhart tragedy, the file and associated papers were made available to Navy Times.

The story contains no senational new theories about Miss Earhart's fate. But it conveys a sensation, a feeling of a buildup of uncertainty and confusion, building up from that first uncertain message from division about her communication plans, building upand up to the last climatic uncertainty that came out of the morning sky over Howland, a message putting Miss Earhart either northwest or southeast of Howland, with nobody knowing which nor how far out.

The responsibility for guessing landed squarely on the shoulders of the late Warner Keith Thompson. Whether he guessed right or wrong, nobody can ever know. But he could not sail *Itasca* both northwest and southeast at the same time.

And no ship but *Itasca* was within 1,000 miles.

Thompson let his communications log tell his story. Messages to and from the ship, day by day, hour by hour.

Any number of questions arise from the *Itasca* story. Why were Miss Earhart's transmissions so infrequent and fragmentary? Why did she never at any point give *Itasca* a position? There's indication that her transmitters were working but her receivers were not. If so, curious that she didn't say so early in the game.

Why didn't she come up on 500? If she had, *Itasca* might have been able to give her a homing on that one message she is known to have got from the ship.

Itasca, by the way, was being heard all over the Pacific all night; no question of any transmission failure on that end.

Why was the Thompson story sealed up for 25 years?

It had a couple of caustic comments, one directed at Miss Earhart, a mild one at Black and Hampton and Putnam, as we have noted, and some pretty sharp ones about ham radio operators, whom he believed had confused him with "criminally false transmissions."

At this distance the report looks harmless, but perhaps in the excitement of the times his comments could have been explosive.

To what extent was the report really confidential?

There's evidence that every one of its 106 pages at some time was photographed with the "Confidential" label covered.

One Paul Mantz, an associate of Miss Earhart, asked Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1940 to get him permission to look at the report.

She interceded with the Coast Guard and the permission was given.

There were some pencil marks in the margins, with the word "include" written several times.

At one place the word "omit" was penciled, and the marked sentence was:

"The Navy direction finder on Howland was powered by Itasca's gun batteries, which ran down during the night."

Did Miss Earhart know the Navy direction finder was on Howland?

The San Francisco Division as late as March 1938, said she did not know it was there. How could the Coast Guard, which wasn't being kept very well informed, have known whether she knew or not?

One thing is sure: A failure of communications cost Amelia Earhart her life. There was radio failure on the spot, and perhaps a failure of communications in the larger sense that people didn't know what other people were doing.

For a long time there's been a story around the Coast Guard that Amelia Earhart died because she jettisoned a low-frequency transmitter at Lae. She gambled radio equipment against gasoline and lost.

Thompson's report made no such statement, but he did say this:

"Viewed from the fact that Miss Earhart's flight was largely dependent on radio communications, her attitude toward arrangements was most casual, to say the least."

The report on the affair made 6 months later by the San Francisco Division said that even then nobody had been able to find out what radio equipment Miss Earhart had aboard.

It was pointed out that she knew about the low frequency direction finder. Why didn't she come in on 500 for a bearing? She never did so, and, as the division report added, "did not choose to explain why not."

But put yourself in her position.

Your flight is a success. You are poised on the brink of its climax. But you are doubtful whether you have quite enough gasoline capacity to make it to Howland. You are, as you wrote in your last words at Lae, stripping your plane of everything "unessential." You have a corking good navigator who can probably bring you to Howland blindfolded. You have a direction finder loop, and the *Itasca* will play A's to it, a beacon for you to come home on.

And if all that fails, there's a Navy high-frequency direction finder that—despite the Coast Guard's distrust of it—can get a bearing on you by listening to your normal broadcasting frequencies.

Would you not then see it as a good gamble that you would not need the low-frequency part of your gear, could jettison it and take aboard more gas?

Even without knowledge of the backup high-frequency direction finder, the gamble might have seemed a pretty safe one. And remember, Amelia Earhart was not one to be daunted by risk. There was risk in everything those early aviators did.

So one can adopt the theory of the junking of the low frequency gear—though for all the record shows it is only a guess—and still feel nothing but sympathy for Miss Earhart. She bet. She lost. She paid. All of her flying life she had been well aware, on 1,000 bets before, that it might some day come out that way.

But you can sympathize with the Thompson point of view, and the Coast Guard point of view. If the theory was correct—if there ever was a low-frequency transmitter aboard the plane and if she dropped it at Lae—then she pulled Thompson out into the middle of the Pacific only to tie his hands, leaving him helpless to help her.

This old file is, of course, just one side of a complex story. There were other radio logs—Navy logs, and Pan-American Airways logs, particularly. She did lots of her communicating through Pan-Am.

In March of 1938, Pan-American made some statements that evidently criticized the Coast Guard's handling of the affair. The statements were in a "Pan American Airways System Report on Proposed Joint Rescue Procedures." That report is not in the file, but an answer to it is.

The answer is from Capt. Stanley Parker in San Francisco to the commander of the Hawaiian section, with instructions to show the letter to Pan-Am.

Point 7 of the Parker letter said:

"The statement regarding 'regrettable lack of coordination' might possibly have arisen from differences of opinion between the two civilians and the Itasca's officers, but it is apparent that the entire flight lacked coordination between the assisting vessels and Miss Earhart, and that this was due in a large measure to the fact that the Coast Guard was not consulted by the civilians in charge of the flight.

"This last was due possibly to their own lack of information, as even Mr. Putnam at San Francisco was very poorly informed of flight schedules and actual conditions on the plane.

"The lack of coordination existed from the beginning of the flight between the principals, not the assisting agencies. Had persons who know the meteorological and radio conditions in the Tropics been consulted, and the assisting agencies been given an opportunity to meet personally around the conference table, instead of doing everything half way round the world with extremely poor communications facilities, the chances for a happy ending for the flight would have been infinitely greater."

But, in a sense, there was a happy ending. It was occurring in this very exchange between Pan American and Parker. It was building up a set of agreed procedures for future emergencies.

Agreement came immediately that in future air-sea rescue cases all dates should be given in Greenwich Mean Time.

And more gradually the lessons and the mistakes of this flight and this search became the basis of much of the procedure in air-sea rescues that have saved many lives since then and that are still evolving toward more effective measures.

Miss Earhart flew to advance the interests of aviation. That was her mission. She may not have advanced them, on this last flight, in the manner in which she had envisioned, but advance them she did.

However she came down, she was not a failure.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Retraining Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Retraining Farmers" which appeared in the July 29 edition of the Richmond, Ind., Palladium-Item.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETRAINING FARMERS

Claude R. Wickard, former Secretary of Agriculture, is right in opposing the retraining of farmers for city jobs.

He believes that such procedure would be "difficult and even inhuman" in the face of unemployment in urban centers.

The agricultural industry is a basic one in our economic setup. It requires specialists, men trained for the task, landowners and employees who like to till the soil and harvest the crops.

The men on our farms are not casual workers that have no fixed residences. They are landowners, permanent residents, in their own way, professionals, experts in their calling.

To uproot them and transplant them in cities and towns to learn new trades and engage in new vocations is nonsensical.

The farmer and his helpers do more than drop seeds in the ground and then let nature take its course. They cope with soil conditions and weather vagaries, they study seeding and cultivating procedures, they acquaint themselves with harvesting methods, and marketing techniques.

Huge crops raised on American farms as a part of our great agricultural industry are the result of the combined efforts of men who have made farming and its allied industries a life's work. They did not result from haphazard and random operations.

The plan of the Committee for Economic Development to train 2 million American farmers for factory and commercial jobs to cure farm problems caused by overproduction is impractical.

It simply amounts to a mass shifting of the population.

Conditions in the farming industry should be remedied to keep the farmer on the land. To transplant him to the city will neither solve his problem nor help him.

Former Secretary Wickard also pointed to a threat to the future farm industry in moving 2 million farmers to the city, namely, the effect which the removal will have on the farm boys and girls who wish "to establish themselves as farm owners and operators."

What incentive is there for them to train themselves for this vocation if the Government proposes to move them to cities and train them to operate lathes and to be clerks and stenographers?

Where will be the source of future farmers? Admittedly, they cannot learn farming on cement streets, in city parks, on parking lots, or in crowded factories.

Russia faces a different predicament. There townspeople have flocked to the farms in such numbers in summer that the Soviet Government and the Communist Party have called on local officials to stop the exodus.

The Soviet decree said the diversion of city workers reduced production in the factories; that the seasonal manpower shifts were "very expensive," and that the use of city workers "resulted in low labor productivity and high production costs."

West Virginia Glassware Finds Favor With Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson—President of Morgantown (W. Va.) Glassware Guild, Samuel K. Haden, Praises Industry's Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the glass products industry of West Virginia is a valued and rapidly growing enterprise which contributes toward increased prosperity and opportunity among our citizens. In an area where the hardships of unemployment have been keenly felt, success of the glassware industry provides not only an economic boost, but brings optimism and confidence to the hearts of many.

Some months ago, the Nation's First Lady, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, added significant impetus to the rising popularity of West Virginia glass products during her television tour of the White House. She called attention, in her meaningful explanations, to the beautiful tableware which is used at White House state luncheons and dinners, and which was produced by glassworkers of West Virginia's Monongahela Valley, at Morgantown. Immediately, the demand soared upward.

More recently, still another meaningful recognition has come to the skilled craftsmen of the Mountain State. The wife of the Vice President, Ladybird Johnson, has revealed that she too uses West Virginia glassware in her home.

An article appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star of August 5 reports that Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson not only adorns her table with West Virginia glass products, but also employs them frequently as gifts. Since the Vice President's wife is widely respected as a lady of charm and taste, her endorsement of West Virginia glass is an added boon.

The Star article quotes Samuel K. Haden, energetic president of the Morgantown (W. Va.) Glassware Guild, and explores effects of the popularity of West Virginia glass products on another progressive State industry: Tourism.

Mr. Haden commented and praised the glass-producing factories for the part they play in drawing increased numbers of tourists to the Upper Monongahela Valley. He said that, "people drive hundreds of miles out of their way to visit the sample rooms in our glass plants."

Mr. President, clearly, the patronage of the land's "First" and "Second" Ladies is showing to good effect in West Virginia.

I request that the article entitled "Mrs. Johnson Also Likes This Glass" appearing in the Sunday Star of August 5 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. JOHNSON ALSO LIKES THIS GLASS

It has not been generally known, but the Nation's "Second Lady," Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, also uses glass tableware produced in West Virginia's Upper Monongahela Valley.

First Lady Mrs. Kennedy's selection of glass tableware from the Morgantown Glassware Guild for use in the White House focused global attention last year on the widespread handcrafted glass industry in West Virginia's Upper Monongahela Valley.

The company producing the simple, beautiful glassware used at White House state luncheons and dinners is only one of nearly 20 firms in the valley. All specialize in the production of hand-pressed, hand-cut, or hand-decorated glass products.

SIMPLE STEWS

Mrs. Johnson uses simple stem goblets and wine glasses from three separate West Virginia firms at her home, the Elms. A prime example of the fine workmanship of the glassmakers is a beautiful heavy crystal ashtray with the Vice Presidential seal that is often given as a wedding gift by Vice President and Mrs. Johnson.

President Samuel K. Haden, of the Morgantown Glassware Guild, reports that thousands of women from throughout the Nation have been swamping the industry with orders for the same tableware being used in the White House. Locally, it is carried at Charles Schwartz & Son on F Street NW.

West Virginia's area plants—located mainly in Morgantown, Weston, and Salem, are generally small. They employ skilled craftsmen whose families have been in the glass-blowing or glass-cutting business for many years. "They have their roots down in West Virginia," Mr. Haden observes.

TOURIST ATTRACTION

Mr. Haden said the plants represent one of northern West Virginia's principal tourist attractions. "People drive hundreds of miles out of their way to visit the sample rooms in our glass plants," he said. And, due to Mrs. Kennedy's efforts, he adds, the flow of visitors has increased appreciably.

Although the West Virginia glass industry has been producing glass tableware for years for use in prominent surroundings such as U.S. Embassies, leading hotels, steamship lines, and executive mansion of the Republic of Liberia, it was relatively unknown to the public.

It became noted, nationwide, the day Mrs. Kennedy waved her television wand in the direction of a table setting in the White House state dining room.

Compensation for Certain World War II Losses

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7283) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the statements of the various members of the committee who have discussed this legislation. Repeatedly, I hear the expression that this is to be the final legislative action having to do with the War Claims Commission. If that is true, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to call the attention of the committee handling this legislation to a rather unusual situation that occurred at the close of World War II. It has to do with the husband of a constitutent of mine from Sutton, W. Va., who was serving as a member of the Air Force and who was a pilot in one of our fighter planes.

On the morning of the cessation of hostilities which ended the war between the United States and Japan, he was aboard a carrier in Tokyo Bay. They received orders to bomb a certain Japanese objective. His squadron left for that purpose, but before reaching the point where they were to begin their bombing operations, they received notice that we had arranged an armistice with Japan. However, the Japanese Government failed to notify the leader of a Japanese air squadron that such an armistice had been agreed to. On their way back to their carrier in the harbor, the American planes which were flying out of their regular squadron formation, the pilots and crew enjoying the thought that the war was over, were attacked by a Japanese squadron. Four planes were shot down and 16 airmen drowned, including the husband of my constituent. The situation was such at the time that the widow had to go back to teaching to support their two young boys. She had been a schoolteacher prior to her marriage. The effect of the tragedy was such that the wife became ill, and only after considerable time was she able to go back to teaching. Throughout the intervening years she educated those two youngsters. I think she has a valid claim against the Japanese Government for their failure to notify their squadron commanders that there had been a cessation of hostilities. The negligence of the Japanese Government caused the death of this young American flier and I think there is compensation due from the Japanese Government. However, I am at a loss to know just where to start to amend this bill. This is a rather intricate bill and I am at a loss to know how to amend it to make it broad enough to cover such a deserving case as this.

Might I say, Mr. Chairman, this claim has been filed with the War Claims Commission, and they advise me that that act is not broad enough to cover this type of claim. Surely we are not going to close this out and leave out a deserving case of this kind. It seems to me we are committed to make it broad enough to cover such a claim.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to place this matter before you.

Address by the Honorable Herbert Hoover at the Dedication of the Herbert Hoover Presidential Library at West Branch, Iowa, August 10, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 10, 1962

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

HERBERT HOOVER ADDRESS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE HERBERT HOOVER PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY AT WEST BRANCH, IOWA, AUGUST 10, 1962

A PROPOSAL FOR GREATER SAFETY FOR AMERICA—THE ASSURANCE THAT WE ARE NOT IN THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

When the Members of the Congress created these Presidential libraries they did a great public service. They made available for research the records of vital periods in American history—and they planted these records in the countryside instead of allowing their concentration on the seaboard.

Already the three libraries of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and President Eisenhower, by their unique documentation, serve this purpose, and today we dedicate a fourth—my own.

Within them are thrilling records of supreme action by the American people, their devotion and sacrifice to their ideals.

Santayana rightly said: "Those who do not remember the past are condemned to relive it." These institutions are the repositories of such experience—hot off the griddle.

In these records there are, no doubt, unfavorable remarks made by our political opponents, as well as expressions of appreciation and affection by our friends.

We may hope that future students will rely upon our friends. In any event, when they become sleepy they may be awakened by the lightning flashes of American political humor.

A PROPOSAL FOR GREATER SAFETY FOR AMERICA

It is exactly 88 years since I first came to Iowa. Since that visit, I have seen much of peoples, of governments, of their institutions, and of human woes. I can count 50 nations with which I had something to do. I was not a tourist; I worked with their people. In my professional years I brought to them American technology with its train of greater productivity and better living. In two wars I served amidst famine. And in the war-shattered aftermath, I directed reconstruction in many nations. I have worked with great spiritual leaders and with great statesmen. I have lived under governments of free men, of kings and dictators, and under fascism and communism.

Uppermost in the minds and prayers of the plain people everywhere was that war should cease and that peace would come to the world. They treasured a confidence that America would maintain freedom and that we would cooperate to bring peace to all mankind.

During my long years, I have participated in many world negotiations, which we hoped would promote peace. Today we have no peace.

From all this experience and now as the shadows gather around me, I may be permitted to make an observation and to offer a course of action.

Leaders of mankind have for centuries sought some form of organization which would assure lasting peace. The last of many efforts is the United Nations.

The time has come in our national life when we must make a new appraisal of this organization.

But, first, let me say that I have, in all my official life believed in a world organization for peace. I supported the League of Nations when it was unpopular. I went down to defeat when, as President, I urged the Senate to join the World Court. I urged the ratification of the United Nations Charter by the Senate. But I stated at that time, "The American people should be under no illusions that the charter assures lasting peace."

But now we must realize that the United Nations has failed to give us even a remote hope of lasting peace. Instead, it adds to the dangers of wars which now surround us.

The disintegrating forces in the United Nations are the Communist nations in its membership.

The Communist leaders, for 40 years, have repeatedly asserted that no peace can come to the world until they have overcome the free nations. One of their fundamental methods of expanding communism over the earth is to provoke conflict, hostility, and hate among other nations. One of the proofs that they have never departed from these ideas is that they have, about one hundred times, vetoed proposals in the Security Council which would have lessened international conflict. They daily threaten free nations with war and destruction.

In sum, they have destroyed the usefulness of the United Nations to preserve peace.

When Woodrow Wilson launched the League of Nations, he said:

"A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants."

More unity among free nations has been urged by President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy. In cooperation with far-seeing statesmen in other free nations, five regional treaties or pacts have been set up for mutual defense. And there are bilateral agreements among other free nations to give military support to each other in case of attack. Within these agreements are more than 40 free nations who have pledged themselves to fight against aggression.

Today, the menace of communism has become worldwide.

The time is here when, if the free nations are to survive, they must have a new and stronger worldwide organization. For purposes of this discussion I may call it the "Council of Free Nations." It should include only those who are willing to stand up and fight for their freedom.

The foundations for this organization have already been laid by the 40 nations who have taken pledges in the five regional pacts to support each other against aggression. And there are others who should join.

I do not suggest that the council of free nations replace the U.N. When the U.N. is prevented from taking action, or if it fails to act to preserve peace, then the Council of Free Nations should step in.

Some may inquire where the offices of such an organization should be. Fortunately, there are ample buildings in the world's most accepted neutral nation. Geneva has been the scene of great accomplishments in peace until poisoned by the Communists and the Fascists.

Although the analogy of the Concert of Europe formed in 1814 is not perfect yet, with much less unity and authority, it fended off world war for 100 years.

Some organized Council of Free Nations is the remaining hope for peace in the world.

THE ASSURANCE THAT WE ARE NOT IN THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

Another subject lies heavily on American minds today. Our people are deeply troubled, not only about the turbulent world around us but also with internal problems which haunt our days and nights. There are many despairing voices. There are many undertones of discouragement. The press headlines imply that corruption, crime, divorce, youthful delinquency and Hollywood love trysts are our national occupations.

And amid all these voices there is a cry that the American way of life is on its way to decline and fall.

I do not believe it.

Perhaps amid this din of voices and headlines of gloom, I may say something about the inner forces from which come the strengths of America. They assure its future and its continued service to mankind.

The mightiest assurances of our future are the intangible spiritual and intellectual forces in our people, which we express, not by the words "the United States," but by the word "America." That word "America" carries meanings which lie deep in the soul of our people. It reaches far beyond the size of cities and factories. It springs from our religious faith, our ideals of individual freedom and equal opportunity, which have come in the centuries since we landed on these shores. It rises from our pride in great accomplishments of our Nation and from the sacrifices and devotion of those who have passed on. It lifts us above the ugliness of the day. It has guided us through even greater crises in our past. And from these forces, solutions will come again.

This representative government, with its 186 years of life, has lasted longer than any other republic in history.

If you look about, you will see the steeples of tens of thousands of places of worship. Each week a hundred million people come to reaffirm their faith.

If you will look, you will find that the Bill of Rights is an enforced law of the land; that the dignity of man and equality of opportunity more nearly survive in this land than in any other on earth.

If you look, you will also find that from our educational system there comes every year a host of stimulated minds. They bring new scientific discoveries, new inventions, and new ideas. It is true that they revolutionize our daily lives. But we can readily adjust ourselves and our Government to them without the assistance of Karl Marx.

I could go on and on reciting the mighty forces in American life which assure its progress and its durability.

Perhaps on this occasion it would not be immodest or inappropriate for me to cite my own life as proof of what America brings to her children.

As a boy of 10, I was taken from this village to the Far West 78 years ago. My only material assets were two dimes in my pocket, the suit of clothes I wore. I had some extra underpinnings provided by loving aunts.

But I carried from here something more precious.

I had a certificate of the fourth or fifth grade of higher learning.

I had a stern grounding of religious faith.

I carried with me recollections of a joyous childhood, where the winter snows and the growing crops of Iowa were an especial provision for kids.

And I carried with me the family disciplines of hard work. That included picking potato bugs at 10 cents a hundred. Incidentally, that money was used for the serious purpose of buying firecrackers to applaud the Founding Fathers on each Fourth of July.

And in conclusion, may I say to the boys and girls of America that the doors of opportunity are still open to you. Today the durability of freedom is more secure in America than in any place in the world.

May God bring you even more great blessings.

Forces Shaping Business Future—Public Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the national economy—despite a strong foundation—exists today under an aura of uncertainty.

Among the varied analysts, there are various theories on cause and remedy.

With a relatively sound, economic base, however, national attitude—optimistic or pessimistic—can be a tremendously forceful factor in determining the direction and pace of trends in the economy.

Recently, the Nation's Business published an article by Emerson E. Mead, the president of Smith-Corona Marchant, Inc.

Reflecting thoughtfully upon influencing factors in today's economy, including a warning against talking ourselves into recession, I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt of the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORCES SHAPING BUSINESS FUTURE—PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

What can Washington do to improve uneasy relations between Government and business?

Here are some specific recommendations by a leading business executive, Emerson E. Mead, president of Smith-Corona Marchant, Inc., who also describes what he thinks businessmen can do.

In this interview, Mr. Mead tells why he thinks businessmen are deeply concerned about antibusiness attitudes of Washington officials. He denies that businessmen are hobbled by obsolete economic theories and explains that he believes Washington can benefit from discussing economic policies with businessmen.

"Businessmen are progressive thinkers and planners," Mr. Mead explains. "If they weren't they wouldn't be running businesses."

Mr. Mead, how do you size up the relations between business and Government at this time?

I should say first of all that I believe some officials in Washington recognize the importance of encouraging business and industry. Yet statements that come out of Washington seem to be consistently antibusiness.

After all, business is the backbone of our country and it seems to me that there has to be a meeting of the minds about both Government and business. Until we get this I think we are going to have a lack of confidence in the economy in general.

What do you think is needed to restore business confidence?

What's needed is for the administration to assume a different attitude and a different role, at least as far as business is concerned. I believe they have to reverse their stand on certain issues so that there is a closer relationship between Government and business. Washington has to realize that businessmen are not hobbled by out-of-date myths but are standing up realistically to basic economic facts of life.

What else do you think is needed?

Perhaps the President would benefit by consulting more with businessmen on their theories of economics. I don't believe that he has done enough of this.

A little more bipartisanship between business and Government is needed. I think the President should consult with representative businessmen at all levels, not just a few major corporations. This would have a significant, favorable reaction.

For Government and business to have a better understanding, Government officials need a better understanding of industry's basic problems.

What can businessmen do to help restore confidence?

There's probably too much discussion about the wrong things. We can talk ourselves into business troubles and a recession. If we talk less about this possibility and do more to promote good sound business, the economy would improve.

If we all panic and start curtailing our activities, it could have a serious psychological impact. Businessmen have to take a positive, optimistic attitude. At the same time it's wise to watch every move of the economy carefully, and be ready for whatever comes along. By talking with confidence and optimism, we can curtail pessimism, besides.

Will a tax cut help restore confidence?

Yes, but I don't think a tax cut alone is going to provide a foundation for economic stability and growth. There are many things the Government can do. The administration should consider everything possible to stimulate business.

What specific things would you have Government do?

No. 1, the Government could encourage business by actually adopting a policy of noninterference. No. 2, I think there has to be some incentive for industry to continue to expand plants and facilities, creating more employment and the development of new products.

We don't have sufficient incentive today.

If we look at what is happening in some of the foreign countries, Germany being a prime example, we see liberal depreciation schedules to give businessmen the incentive to modernize their plants, build additional plants, and install new equipment. The new depreciation schedules announced last month are a hopeful indication.

Do you consider expansion of public works a stimulant to business?

This is no real economic stimulant. I think this approach is overrated and too long range a solution.

Do you see any virtue in a Government deficit?

No. There has to be a way, eventually, of balancing the budget. Most of our deficit is due to high expenditures, such as foreign subsidies.

Do you see anything in this year's tax proposals that would stimulate business?

The passage of this present tax bill would have an effect on business, but I wouldn't say it would prove an adequate stimulus. It includes some minor incentives, but it doesn't go far enough as presently constituted. The taxation of profits in foreign countries is questionable. If it hadn't been for profits earned abroad, our economy would have been adversely affected in the past.

As for the tax-credit plan, I don't think it is enough of an incentive for plant expansion. It's a one-shot thing. What we really need is a continuing program.

Do you think companies are being driven to invest in oversea manufacturing because of high wages in this country?

Yes, I think so. It largely depends on the industry and particularly the product line. If you are in a proprietary position you would have no problem because, even with increased labor costs, you are able to increase your prices. But when you are in a highly competitive industry, particularly with foreign manufacturers, your costs go up but you can't raise your prices and remain competitive. So there is a real squeeze on profits. Many such industries are being forced overseas, taking jobs out of the United States into foreign countries.

A number of manufacturers have gone overseas and are importing substantial amounts of equipment back to the United States for distribution. They are taking advantage of labor rates which are about 25 to 30 percent of what they are in this country. And productivity abroad is just as good, if not better, in certain areas.

How is your own business doing?

Our sales are running ahead of last year by about 10 percent. We had earnings per share of 16 cents in 1961. In our fiscal year which has just ended we had a substantial increase. We are projecting a further rise for the year ahead.

Do you think business in general will follow the pattern of your company?

I don't believe that business in general is following that pattern. Our pattern has been established by the changes we have made in our operations. Now we are looking for products or developing products that will have higher profit margins and getting away from the conventional high labor content products of our industry.

Do you think the stock market is forecasting a business slump?

According to some studies, the stock market tends to lead general business turns by 6 to 9 months. But I don't think what's happening now is really indicative of what is going to happen in 6 to 9 months.

You think that, rather than forecasting the future, it is reflecting things that happened in the past?

That is part of it, yes. I think we're seeing an adjustment.

Is there a chance the stock market situation might have a serious impact on consumer buying?

It could, particularly where smaller investors start taking a beating.

The stock market is perhaps reflecting the future less than it has at other times. But these gyrations are serious because they could lead to a serious lack of confidence in the economy.

Do you think a business recession is developing?

I think we can talk too much about a recession. We can convince ourselves that something is going wrong with the economy. If the fear becomes widespread then people begin to retrench. If it reaches a point where they stop spending, then you are bound to get a downward curve in business.

Actually I think we can probably talk ourselves out of a recession as quickly as we can talk ourselves into one.

You talk with many corporate executives. How would you sum up their attitudes about business?

The feeling of most businessmen today is one of optimism. We are and will continue to move ahead, to grow and expand, to do everything that will lead to further progress. We are assuming the same progressive and aggressive role that enabled business and industry to make this country the great world leader it is today. We face the future with optimistic expectations.

The executives I talk with are all optimistic.

Civic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 10, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the annual conference of the Military Government Association was held at Hartford, Conn., on Saturday, June 15, 1962. An interesting and helpful program was presented. One of the outstanding presentations was an address by Col. William R. Swarm, commandant of the U.S. Army Civil Affairs School, Fort Gordon, Ga. Colonel Swarm is one of the Army's most experienced officers in civil affairs, and one of the most knowledgeable officers in the Defense Department's program in civic action, which has come into such prominence within the past few years.

On account of the important role of civic action in the program of our Defense Department, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Colonel Swarm's address be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIC ACTION

(By Col. William R. Swarm)

Distinguished guests and members of the Military Government Association, I am honored to appear again before this important association containing so many old friends and comrades in arms.

There is some quirk in American nature which makes us peculiarly receptive and adaptive to slogans and catchwords. Often their origin is unknown or forgotten and, not infrequently, the same words mean different things to different people.

I am going to discuss one of these expressions and its concept, not because it is new but because it represents one of the most emphasized programs in the Defense Department today and still is subject to frequent misinterpretation. The term is "civic action." It is of particular interest and significance to civil affairs officers and enjoys a place of special prominence in the lexicon of cold war.

At our meeting last year Col. Bob Slover, who is one of the most knowledgeable exponents of civic action, gave a talk on the same subject which was scholarly and to the point. At the Civil Affairs School we developed a section in the new operations manual, FM 41-10, on civic action organization and operations. Only recently Department of Army issued a new definition. In spite of all this, I find officers differing occasionally on what civic action actually entails.

Part of the confusion stems from the fact that, while the activity per se is as old as warfare, the specific designation, "civic action," is of relatively recent vintage and is a coined term.

Actually, civic action, from the first, has been nothing more than one aspect of civil affairs operations as practiced within the U.S. Army. It has its historical counterpart in our military history, most notably in the opening of the West when Army units surveyed and mapped, constructed roads, strung telegraph wires, assisted in building railroads, worked on river and harbor developments, raised public health standards, and maintained order and security.

Because the term civic action is relatively new and because its exponents and practitioners have adopted considerable latitude in scope, a certain amount of diffusion in meaning cannot be avoided. There are, however, some common criteria:

1. Civic action is performed by military forces.
2. It is used in joint cooperation and coordination with civil authorities, agencies, or groups.
3. It uses military manpower, equipment, facilities, and resources.
4. It is used with a view toward securing direct economic improvements and social advances in the civilian community.
5. And, it promotes mutuality of military-civil respect, understanding, and rapport and develops concomitant national consciousness and political-economic stability.

In most of the new and developing countries, the military forces may represent the cornerstone of political stability. In several of them, in fact, government actually is administered to a considerable extent by the military. Regardless of the degree of military participation in political matters, the defense establishments in the less well developed areas possess latent capabilities for internal development of greater real value than the more conventional role of defense against external hostile encroachment. They have trained administrators, technical specialists, and a reservoir of disciplined manpower. They have transportation, engineering, and communications equipment, hand tools, stockpiles of supplies, and control over land and facilities, all adaptable to civil as well as military support.

Civic action operations may either be directed by central governments, be voluntary organizational efforts on a local basis, or a combination of both. The techniques are substantially the same. Primary dissimilarity rests with the origin of the activity. Operations predicated upon a national plan usually entail specific projects, central funding, authorization to use available resources, and joint participation with other governmental agencies. Voluntary activities on the local level, while perhaps encouraged by national governments, are conducted with minimal expenditure of funds and supplies. In both cases, interference with combat missions is avoided, but, in some of the developing nations, these constructive projects are more important to internal security and stability than finesse in fire and maneuver.

The fundamental tenet of any successful civic action program is civilian self-help. The military organization may have a proportionately higher share of trained manpower, equipment, and funds, but the civilian base in any country has vast numerical superiority and greater overall resources in land, raw materials, facilities, machines, and equipment. Security forces can provide incentive, guidance, training, and support from organizational resources. They can undertake specified projects, beyond the capabilities of civilian agencies, and can assist in selected civic ventures, but the greatest accomplishments will be achieved where military planning, administrative ability, and technical know-how are used as the primer to stimulate self-aid programs in the civilian communities.

Because of the nature of civic action activities, civil affairs units with their complement of functional specialists, who cover the gamut of political, economic, and social experience and education, are best qualified either to conduct civic action operations or to provide professional guidance for host country agencies. Within the limitations of their areas of specialization, technical service personnel are also adapted to action or advisory roles.

I don't wish to overemphasize the potentialities of combat troops in the civic action field, however. Because counterinsurgency is being strongly stressed throughout our Defense Establishment, there is a tendency to oversimplify in the rush to get on the bandwagon. It is generally accepted doctrine now that insurgency can be prevented, or at least the possibility of it reduced, by economic reforms, social progress, and political equity. Where insurrection is present, the best method of securing population fealty and control necessary to separate populations from insurgents is to place greater emphasis on the general public welfare. Bear in mind, though, that civic action is far more than mere "do goodism." An essential part of every civic action program is the tying of projects together into a logical and effective plan that can be exploited through media of civil information. The citizen must believe that his military forces and the government they represent are in his public service and are, consequently, worthy of his support.

Unskilled military personnel have a marked relative competence to undertake low level projects in such matters as public health, public works, and food production in primitive societies, but realistic analysis will demonstrate the superficiality of an approach which leans too heavily on these low level skills.

For instance, a medical corpsman can dress simple wounds, act as a midwife, promote sanitation methods, eradicate disease vectors, or pull a tooth. I would be the last to deny the value of this type of aid, as long as it is recognized that it is not a patent cureall. Sole reliance on limited technical proficiency courts the danger of adverse propaganda and a boomerang of ill will.

In the superstitious atmosphere of primitive societies, technical practitioners work in a mixed atmosphere of guileless native skepticism and a reputation for endowed magical talents. If competency is proved wanting, the skepticism turns to scorn and the credit to anger.

Perhaps one of the most effective means of spreading the gospel of civic action is through mobile training teams. In the past couple of years civil affairs teams have been dispatched to Indochina, South America, and the Far East. Similar teams are scheduled or are being considered for utilization in other countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Wherever these teams are sent they work with host military forces and other agencies of Government in planning activities, organizing operating staffs and units, and setting up training programs. They make recommendations regarding coordination with the various indigenous agencies of Government and between U.S. advisory groups and representatives of other U.S. governmental bureaus.

The program has not been completely lacking in problems. A number of MAAG's and missions have shown some reluctance in requesting teams. The Active Army has a shortage of personnel possessing requisite functional ability and desired knowledge of languages. In spite of these problems, achievements have been outstanding, particularly in recent months when the two CA USAR groups and four companies, called to active duty last October, have been available as a source of personnel. Those units possess personnel with both language and functional qualifications. I sincerely hope that some provision is made at an early date to authorize the use of individuals on a voluntary basis for these teams from the civil affairs reserve structure.

I won't go into details on team operations. Perhaps a few words about the activities of one team will be illustrative. In January a team composed of one 8104 generalist, Maj. Ben Safar from the 95th CA group, a public works, and a public health officer went to a South American country for a 3-month tour of duty. The team was received enthusiastically and had little difficulty in discovering areas for a recommended program of initial projects. Although the emphasis in civic action is on "low cost, no cost" operations, the team members found that any plan for that country would be handicapped from the onset without modest funding assistance, because of the general economic straits of the country. Fortuitously, Secretary of Defense McNamara visited Headquarters Cincarib at the same time the team was in the area. He was so highly impressed with the team's activities and recommendations that not only will some U.S. assistance funding be made available, but Major Safar has been assigned to the MAAG in the country on a permanent change of station to continue and expand the program developed by the team.

We at the Civil Affairs School have been supporting civic action to the maximum. Although our staff and faculty have been continually understrength, six officers from the school have participated on teams in the past 2 years. It was the result of a recommendation by the mobile training team headed by Lt. Col. Russ Jones, now on the Conarc staff, that a G-5 staff position was established on the Military Assistance Command in Vietnam. That position is now filled by Lt. Col. John Beebe, who, himself, earlier had played a big part in setting up a civil affairs school on Taiwan and was my assistant commandant at the school. Maj. Loyal Swick, who still is at the school, set up a program in Guatemala which was so outstandingly successful that it is considered something of a model for other Latin American areas.

All the teams except one have had intensive briefing and orientation seminars at the school before their departure. These briefing periods reflect the pooled experience of other similar teams and the latest information we possess on the areas in question. While they are on the ground, the teams maintain contact with the school, and we fill any requests they make upon us for information and guidance. Upon their return, they are debriefed to add to our reservoir of cumulative experience.

Although my remarks have been concentrated primarily on civic action operations, I would be remiss if I didn't touch briefly upon some of our recent accomplishments at the school and in the civil affairs area B headquarters, which I also command. They back up the civil action and counterinsurgency programs.

The six USAR CA units all passed their Army training test and attained a deployment readiness posture. They have participated with distinction in Logex, maneuvers, and field exercises of joint proportions. A number of personnel from these units, some of whom have voluntarily extended beyond their August release date, have been assisting with the preparation of lesson plans and the conduct of instruction. They have turned out over 30 area studies, are carrying on a language training program, and have assisted the 95th Civil Affairs Group in its revision of contingency plans. In field operation, they have been used on several mobile training teams, are assisting with counterinsurgency instruction at For Bragg, and are filling various augmentation staff slots.

A new TD recently was approved for the school which raises its authorized officer strength from 22 to 57. When those spaces are filled, the school will be able to accomplish its mission properly and independently for the first time in its history.

We take some modest pride in our accomplishments in the school during the past year. Our new operations manual, FM 41-10, has just arrived from the printer. The first draft of a revised joint manual, FM 41-5, has been written. Student input trebled over last year's quota. Our career course has been radically modified to meet the requirements of the cold war. We have conducted special courses for the civil affairs detachments of the recently organized counterinsurgency forces. One such organization now is on Okinawa. A second is being readied for Latin America, and additional units, oriented toward other areas, will be developed.

We have scored a resounding first by developing the initial cold war course in the Armed Forces and have graduated one class. Besides an assist from the reserves, we were aided in the course preparation by the international relations department of the University of South Carolina, which is headed up by Dr. Dick Walker, well-known cold war lecturer and writer.

With respect to this course, I might mention it was the subject of a laudatory editorial in the Atlanta Constitution, which, however, chided the Army somewhat for being dilatory in developing instruction of this nature. As you all well know, the civil affairs organization and civil affairs operations occasionally encounter strongholds of resistance both within the Army and among civilian agencies.

Within the Armed Forces there are some dedicated and influential officers who feel that military forces are intended for combat and related functions only and that civil affairs activities should be reserved for occupation duty during a general war. It is interesting to note that this school of thought overlooks both the history of our own Army and the urgent press of current events. We are faced with an astute opponent. Most of the Communist victories have been achieved by political and economic warfare propaganda, subversion, and insurgency. Our rockets, bombers, artillery, tanks, and conventional forces and tactics provide a reasonable deterrent to general conflict, but we can lose this contest through piecemeal erosion if we don't exercise our potential to meet his subtleties with tactics and operations suited to the politico-economic nature and environment of the struggle.

New nations and emerging countries with old problems of hunger, disease, inadequate housing, undeveloped resources, administrative inefficiency, political rivalry and opportunism, and emotional international hatreds represent nearly two-thirds of the world. That is the battleground, and the warfare being conducted today demands constructive emphasis on the civil affairs functions. President Kennedy has taken cognizance of this on several occasions by urging the armed forces to stress utilization of their latent talents to work with local populations in social, economic, and political efforts necessary to reduce the causes of insurgency and counter Communist subversion. At the same time, the pattern of conflict in Laos and Vietnam has tended to reorient the thinking of some of our detractors.

Resistance to military participation in matters which smack of politics and policy are not confined to internal opposition. Despite the fact that we have demonstrated our ability to present instruction on U.S. policy and Communist techniques, and the fact that our military forces throughout their history have been involved in national policy implementation, we still meet opposition among some representatives of civilian agencies. They question our competency, fear a weakening of civilian preeminence over the military, and foresee duplication in assistance efforts, proliferation of funding, and threatened employment tenure. Their fears are unfounded. No one in our Defense Establishment desires any reduction in civilian primacy. I have not encountered anyone who took that position in my varied 20 years in the civil affairs field. The primary role of the State Department to conduct foreign policy, including the administration of assistance programs, is clearcut. Civic action and, more broadly, civil affairs in the cold war are collateral efforts which take advantage of inherent capabilities of military organizations which are not available, or available to lesser degrees, in civilian agencies.

Military forces possess administrative ability, technical skills, dual-capacity equipment and facilities, and manpower. They are dispersed in cantonments located in grassroots locales and are more heavily concentrated where real or incipient insurgency is present. Furthermore, any military organization has a built-in capability for field subsistence and self-security not possessed by civilian organizations. In a word, the civil affairs of the military combats the Communist weapons of political subversion and economic instability.

I hope I have reduced the smoke content of the atmosphere somewhat in this consideration of civic action. The activity is here to stay, whatever its designation. The debate may run on for some time over organization, mission, and proponency, but this much I want to reemphasize—civic action is an aspect of civil affairs operations, the same type of operations for which we have made ready, functionally and directionally, for the past 20 years— always fully supported by the MGA.

Thank you.

Statement by Mrs. Gordon B. Desmond, Secretary of Federation of Homemakers, Before Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare Appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Gordon B. Desmond of Arlington, Va., the secretary and one of the charter members of an organization known as the Federation of Homemakers, dedicated to protecting the homes of our American citizens, appeared before the Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare Appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 15, 1962, to present her organization's position on the need for appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration.

As I believe Mrs. Desmond's statement may be of vital concern to our fellow Americans throughout the Nation, I welcome this opportunity to insert it in full in this RECORD so that it may be thus available to all:

STATEMENT BY MRS. GORDON B. DESMOND, SECRETARY OF FEDERATION OF HOMEMAKERS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Ruth Desmond, secretary of the Federation of Homemakers, a nationwide organization of public-spirited housewives. The federation's officers welcome this opportunity to present the views of a representative group of housewives on behalf of an adequate appropriation for the consumers' agency—the Food and Drug Administration.

This federation was incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia as a nonprofit organization by concerned homemakers who previously had attended hearings on both the Food Additives and the Chemical Preservatives Acts. These founders were convinced housewives must be informed of the chemical treatment virtually all foods now receive and of the potentially harmful cumulative and synergistic effects which might result from ingesting residues of economic poisons, preservatives, additives, dyes and other synthetic substances in and on food. These informed housewives could then communicate their views on the need for better food legislation and its enforcement to their congressional representatives.

It is the finding of our members that housewives have the right to knowledge of the risks their families may be taking because of modern developments in farming and processing foods since it is the responsibility of homemakers to make decisions and selections when marketing. Without knowledge of treatment and without accurate, specific, and informative labeling of processed food items—housewives are unable to make intelligent selections at the grocery stores.

Therefore, it seems necessary that housewives have information about the responsibilities and financial needs of FDA in enforcing food, drug, and cosmetic legislation. Federation members are aware that although budget appropriations for this agency have increased greatly these past 5 years—so that the recommendations of the 1955 Citizens Advisory Committee have been substantially fulfilled—these increases have not been substantial enough to carry out effectively the new duties placed upon it by recently passed food legislation.

The passage of the Miller Pesticide Act in 1954 placed a heavy burden upon FDA. This agency has to decide, as a result, whether tolerances are to be permitted or denied newly developed farm poisons certified by the Department of Agriculture. Then FDA must develop methods of detecting said residues on farm produce and fruits. It is a matter of record that FDA has not always a means of detecting residues of new economic poisons for which it establishes tolerances. The Cranberry case is an excellent illustration of this strange situation which presently still exists. Federation officers attended and participated in the public hearing on the cranberry crisis where it was brought out by representatives of the cranberry industry that Aminotriazole had been used on many other crops—such as apples and pears. Testimony disclosed that until a month before the public hearing FDA scientists had no way of detecting residues of this weedkiller so extensively used. Testimony also revealed that research by its manufacturers proved only 10 parts per million could cause thyroid cancers in rats fed Aminotriazole. At the time of this public hearing Aminotriazole had been used at least 2 years by farmers. A frightening realization. It is our understanding that subsequent research by Russian scientists has shown that Aminotriazole is also capable of causing liver cancers in test animals. At the Cranberry hearing, Federation officers urged that the Department of Agriculture exercise greater caution in the future in certifying farm poisons. It was evident to federation members that the thousands of combinations of certified poisons places an impossible inspection burden upon FDA.

A study of the records of the Aramite case was not reassuring to Federation officers. This miticide was given a zero tolerance by FDA scientists The developer protested and a scientific committee was appointed to study the controversy. Although this first committee to study Aramite realized that long-term animal tests of this miticide must be carried out and recommended same—it nevertheless established a tolerance of 1 part per million for Aramite over the continued protests of FDA. Two years later a second scientific panel decided that there should be no tolerance at all for Aramite—since animal tests proved it caused cancers of the bile duct in dogs and liver tumors in rats. Aramite, the only effective miticide at that time, had been used extensively on a wide variety of fruits and vegetables. This is not a conforting reflection for consumers—that a miticide capable of causing cancers in dogs and liver tumors in rats was permitted to be used on a wide variety of farm products for more than 2 years. We ask, Did the first scientific committee exercise judgment and responsibility when they permitted a tolerance for this miticide over the protests of FDA and before the required long-term animal tests had been made?

Because of the foregoing, federation members are hopeful that Congress will restudy the Miller Pesticide Act in the light of its record. We think it appropriate to point out that 8 years after passage of this Pesticide Act certain district offices of FDA are still without the delicate equipment required to detect residues of pesticides. Why? Eight years after passage of this Pesticide Act, FDA is able to check only one-third of 1 percent of interstate shipments of produce and fruits for excess residues of pesticides—even when most pesticides are regarded as dangerous and some are known to be lethal. This federation has recently inquired of the director of the State Department of Agriculture for California, Mr. Paul, what percentage of produce and fruits California checks for excess pesticide residues and learned that no such records are made. Too bad, when California employs thousands of tons annually of economic poisons on its commercial farms. Mr. Ward Ross, managing director, Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation of Madison, Wis., when testifying before Chairman FOGARTY and his committee this year reported that the State of Wisconsin has no facilities for testing for pesticide residues. It is to be presumed that many States still do not have this expensive but necessary equipment and the facilities and trained men to determine if pesticide residues are present in foodstuffs in excess amounts (and in many instances in unpermitted and decidedly dangerous amounts). This is not a reassuring situation for the captive consumer to ponder.

Many federation members are conscientious wives, mothers, and grandmothers. They wonder if it is possible to guarantee (because of unpredictable weather conditions, application problems, and the human element) that insecticide sprays and powders will spread evenly and remain only in the permitted tolerance levels on harvested crops, even if directions are followed exactly. Such a guarantee that tolerances have not been exceeded would be most reassuring to anxious housewives. Should not baby foods, canned goods, frozen vegetables and fruits, milk, cream and butter, and no doubt many other food items not listed here, carry guarantees that pesticide tolerances for these products have not been exceeded? If this guarantee is impracticable—perhaps impossible to carry out—then it seems wise to drastically reduce the number or types of farm poisons certified by the Department of Agriculture—in the best interests of consumers. Despite the lack of FDA inspectors and scarcity of equipment and facilities for carrying out detection—the practice seems to be to increase the amounts and varieties of economic poisons used in farming. Who ultimately profits?

If FDA's 1962 budget had not received an administrative cut of more than $1 million in the interests of governmental economy, this agency had expected to check 1 percent of the annual 2,500,000 interstate shipments of farm goods by mid-1962. This specific budget slash meant that 58 new men were not hired and trained by FDA for this critically needed inspection of farm goods. If this proposed budget request for FDA is approved by the Congress, then the agency hopes to realize its goal of inspecting 1 percent of our Nation's interstate shipments of farm produce by mid-1964. Such dangerous poisons are now being used in farming that one would expect the Congress to demand that FDA check at least 10 percent of these interstate shipments. Most Congressmen have families taking these risks, too.

We wish to praise FDA for a magnificent job of seizing and destroying filthy, decomposed, unfit foods annually—and also foods processed under unsanitary conditions. Many individuals are spared serious illness because of this alertness by FDA. The March 1962 Report on Enforcement and Compliance noted 1¼ tons of California lettuce were found to bear residues of DDT and toxaphene in amounts exceeding the safe tolerance set by Federal regulation. This makes consumers wonder if additional contaminated shipments of this commodity escaped detection. FDA reports seizures of celery with parathion residues from several States. Cabbage has been discovered to contain excess residues of DDT. Once tons of frozen spinach, also contaminated with DDT, were seized by alert FDA inspectors before it reached the retail markets. We feel much like Representative Fogarty who is quoted as saying: "When I eat vegetables and fruits, I wonder if I am lucky in getting a bite of that one-fifth of 1 percent the FDA had money and manpower to inspect."

It is appropriate here to remind this committee that the Chemical Preservatives Act of 1959 placed an additional burden upon FDA inspectors since it permits the postharvest treatment of farm produce and fruits with pesticides, fungicides, fungistats, and so forth, to increase shelf life. If the crates containing such farm products are not labeled as to such postharvest chemical preservative treatment—FDA inspectors face an almost impossible task in discovering the chemicals used. This was brought out at the public hearing on this bill through questions by Representative Dingell of Michigan.

In 1958 Congress passed the Food Additives Act which added to the responsibilities of FDA. Although certain responsible scientists, among them Dr. William Smith of Englewood, N.J., a cancer researcher, advised limiting to a minimum the additives needed for processing foods and then giving these few permitted additives and preservatives exhaustive scrutiny to determine their safety for use in foods for humans—this advice was not heeded. The result of this Food Additives Act is that several thousand additives are now used in and on foods—and Congress has generously extended the time of many manufacturers to prove these frequently unnecessary additives are safe in the amounts used. Some of these new additives appear to be used solely to replace nutritious food items in processed foods. This type of substitution increases our surpluses of certain food products—especially dairy goods.

The late Sir Edward Mellanby, who proved Agene, at that time used to mature and bleach flour, caused convulsive fits which killed when fed to dogs in bread, pointed out in his Sanderson Well Lecture "On the Chemical Manipulation of Food," appearing in the British Medical Journal of October 13, 1951, that it is relatively simple for chemists to develop processed foods but that possibly there were only 12 persons in the world with the background and experience to evaluate the effect of such food fabrication upon humans when ingested over a period of years. He, therefore, urged great caution in adding newly invented chemicals to food supplies.

No doubt many more housewives would be disturbed and protest at the risks we are presently taking as a result of our Food Additives Act of 1958 which permits so many additives not yet proved safe to be used in processed foods and would not have embraced so wholeheartedly convenience food items were it not for the assurances in women's magazines that all is fine in the areas dealing with this Nation's food supplies. Sometimes physicians and Government officials reply to questions addressed to these magazines—that all is well—no need for concern because an adequately equipped and staffed FDA is watching out for consumers' safety. These trusting readers have no idea of the cramped quarters and lack of modern equipment some FDA scientists endure. One eminent physician and nutritionist in an article appearing in the Farm Journal, February 1961, stated the poisons are not in the food or water but in the pens and tongues of food faddists. The record of FDA seizures certainly discredits this particular article.

When Federation officers appeared at the color additives hearing before Chairman Oren Harris of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, their statement pointed out customary animal tests for chemicals and dyes used healthy, mature animals who were fed a bland diet in which the chemical was usually incorporated. This did not appear to be a satisfactory way of determining the safety of a substance to be eaten by people young and old, sick, well, and pregnant—some taking medication. We felt this manner of testing inconclusive since the total impact upon living creatures or potentialism was not considered. Later at a hearing before this same House committee on the merits of the Delaney anticancer clause, Dr. Harold L. Stewart, of the National Cancer Institute, raised this same issue—the need to test additives and dyes upon animals using the conditions humans cope with.

The need to test chemicals with pregnant animals was brought out when Time, February 23, 1962, carried a harrowing account of grotesquely malformed newborn babies—the result of use of a supposedly harmless sleeping pill by women in their early stages of pregnancy. Kevadon previously had been regarded as being completely innocuous and in many countries was sold over the counter. Fortunately here, FDA scientists permitted this sleeping pill tranquilizer to be used only experimentally. This sleeping pill tragedy is an excellent corroboration of the theory of the late Sir Edward Mellanby and we quote from his previously mentioned lecture:

"Even when such chemical substances have passed through a battery of tests from the point of view of toxicology, unexpected harmful results have often ultimately been demonstrated."

Less than 2 years ago nearly a hundred thousand people in the Netherlands were stricken and many hospitalized as the result of eating margarine containing a new additive. Federation officers read the full account in a report by the Migros Co-Op of Switzerland. This illness was also mentioned in our local co-op newsletter. Strangely, local newspapers never even mentioned this remarkable news story.

During the Eisenhower administration, great concern was expressed at the lack of muscular coordination of many American children. Youngsters were encouraged to participate in games and sports events. President Kennedy has encouraged greatly accelerated physical fitness programs in the public schools. Now all citizens are exhorted to be more active physically. Some of us wonder if it is also hoped that strenuous exercise will help burn up the toxins caused by eating so many food chemicals.

When the U.S. Senate administered a punitive cut in FDA's meager 1962 budget, it was impossible for this agency to hire and train additional personnel to ascertain if food processors were using only the specified amounts permitted for the various new additives. This was a great loss healthwise, we believe, for the public. We ask—was FDA injured by this punishment or were consumers the ultimate victims?

Federation officers and members attended and participated in the public hearings conducted by FDA to establish label regulations for hazardous household products. Early in the hearings it became evident that certain segments of this industry were unwilling to comply with a strict interpretation of this new act. Federation members were shocked at the uncooperative, defiant, and finally threatening attitude of certain representatives. Even when the report of the Suburban Hospital Poison Control Center of Bethesda, Md., was read to these industry representatives they disputed the figures and refused to regard turpentine or kerosene as lethal substances when swallowed by children. The Washington Post, in covering this rebellion in its Sunday edition, August 6, 1961, by Warren Kornberg, said this: "Turpentine, in doses down to half an ounce, have been known to be fatal. * * * Once it gets into the bloodstream, it does its deadliest work through damaging the brain, causing coma and convulsions; entering the lungs—causing chemical pneumonia; entering the kidneys where it can produce blood in the urine."

Only last October the Washington Post carried an account of the tragic and unnecessary death of a 15-month-old girl from drinking liquid floor wax. Later FDA issued two releases of deaths of small children. The first, a girl of 6, died in awful agony from drinking soldering compound—the second from drinking Thinzet. Grief-stricken parents state none of these products carried warning labels of "Danger—keep out of the reach of children"—otherwise they would have exercised greater caution and probably avoided these dreadful deaths. A federation member mailed in a clipping from the Monticello, Ind., weekly newspaper about the death of a 16-month-old boy from drinking furniture polish. He swallowed the polish on Monday and died in a hospital on Thursday.

At the public hearing on labeling regulations for dangerous household products—this federation went on record that the first objective of FDA should be consumer protection. This should be its paramount concern. If this consumer agency is to fulfill its role as protector of consumers—it seems obvious that church organizations, veterans' groups, women's clubs and housewives must be informed of its vital duties, financial needs and obstacles to carrying out its responsibilities in order to give it moral support.

An editorial in Chemical Week, December 2, 1961, exhorts businessmen and captains of industry to start at the grassroots to educate political candidates to the needs of industry. Business executives were encouraged to make at least one annual trip to consult their Congressmen. It seems only fair that Members of Congress should also hear the side of wives and mothers—the housewives of this country. This is why we are here today to express our concern about the ultimate effect of recently passed food legislation and to plead for a substantial increase in the 1963 budget for FDA.

Before concluding—this federation wishes to state that it hopes the plans for the proposed new Institute of Environmental Research progresses smoothly. Even with smooth sailing financially—it will be many years before the building is completed and functioning at top efficiency. In the meantime consumers and especially small children are being subjected to grave risks from environmental cancer hazards due to a great extent to our modern way of life. It seems sensible to us that the Congress earmark a substantial increase now for environmental cancer research. We also suggest that an acknowledged authority of the causes of environmental cancers, Dr. Wilhelm C. Hueper, Chief, Environmental Cancer Section, National Institute of Cancer, head this vastly expanded program. Dr. Hueper's superior education and remarkable experience admirably suit him to capably fill such a responsible position. Further, Dr. Hueper is on record that people should be shielded from the effects of carcinogens whenever it is humanly possible to do so. It was Dr. Hueper who proved through tests on dogs that beta-naphthylamine causes bladder cancer. For this humanity owes him gratitude. Many lives have been spared as a result of such proof. In the opinion of this federation Dr. Hueper is worthy of being included in the exclusive list of 12 scientists able to evaluate and appraise the effects of residues of additives, pesticides, dyes and industrial wastes and pollutions on humans.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving us this oportunity to be heard.

(NOTE.—After presenting this statement, federation officers have learned that as of this date scientists have not been able to produce malformations on experimental animals who have ingested Kevadon, the sleeping pill capable of producing grossly malformed new born babies. Varieties of pregnant animals have been tested but so far their offspring has been normal. The warnings of Sir Edward Mellanby should be heeded.)

Young Birmingham Woman Overcomes Family Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, I have been most disturbed to read in our Washington, D.C., papers extensive accounts of crimes and criminals. The widespread criminal activity in the District is indeed appalling. But Mr. Speaker, equally appalling and, I believe, one of the causes for this high crime rate, is the penchant many have for blaming society for the crimes committed. It is an old story now to read accounts of the difficulties and the hard life that a murderer or rapist has had. He was poor, underprivileged, and he had trouble in school. Society is responsible for this situation; thus, society is to blame for the crimes committed, the argument goes. This argument and attitude is nonsense.

There are people in our society who have limited opportunities and that is undeniable but it appears to me that the evidence that people can rise above family and social situations they are placed in is well established. There are many startling historical examples of this. On the same day that the Washington papers were filled with accounts of the difficulties and hard times of a rapist, with a criminal record spanning many years, there appeared in the Birmingham Post-Herald, a newspaper published in my district, the account of a promise Geraldine Dillashaw made nearly 2 years ago. In January of 1961, when Geraldine was 22 years old, her mother and father were killed when a freight train crashed into a pick-up truck. Nine children were orphaned by this wreck and Geraldine, the oldest, pledged at that time:

> We are going to stay together, definitely.

I should like to point out that although the responsibility of a large family was thrust upon her, she did not seek aid from public agencies nor did she put up the younger children for adoption, as she could easily have done. She went on with her work and she has kept her family together. It shows, Mr. Speaker, the importance of individual responsibility and individual initiative.

Geraldine has since married and is now Mrs. Charles Naish.

I think the Members will be interested in the Post-Herald article, which is as follows:

SISTER KEEPS HER PROMISE, FAMILY STILL LIVING TOGETHER

(By Tom Dygard)

Geraldine Dillashaw is keeping the promise she made the day her mother and father were killed.

"We're going to stay together, definitely," she said.

She meant herself, then 22, and her four younger brothers and four younger sisters—all orphaned when a freight train crashed into a pickup truck near here in January 1961.

Another brother, 2-year-old John David, died in the crash with his parents.

SHE MOTHERS EIGHT

Geraldine made the promise to keep the children together while she stood in the corridor of a hospital, not far from rooms where two brothers and a sister lay injured—the survivors of the accident.

Geraldine is now Mrs. Charles Naish, wife of her high school sweetheart, expectant mother—and mother to her four brothers and four sisters.

They live together, the 10 of them, in the small frame house that Geraldine and her husband bought when they were married a year ago.

"It's a little crowded with all of us living here," says Geraldine, "but when you come from a family of 10 children, you're used to being crowded a little bit now and then."

ONLY ONE BATHROOM

Charles, her fiance at the time of the accident and her bridegroom 6 months later, takes the built-in family in stride.

"He bears up better than I do," says Geraldine. "He's more patient with the children than I am."

Geraldine and her husband sleep in one of the bedrooms. The four boys—Edward, 21; Sammy, 19; Larry 14, and Freddie, 9—sleep in another. And the four girls—Annie, 18; Brenda, 16; Judy, 11, and Debra, 5—sleep in the other bedroom.

There's only one bathroom, "but it's not really so bad," Geraldine explains. "I get some of them up earlier than the others in the morning."

A large table, big enough for all 10 members of the family, is jammed into the kitchen.

"We've only got eight chairs," Geraldine says, "but it doesn't matter because Edward and Sammy usually aren't home in time for dinner, and they eat later."

BILLS MOUNT UP

Edward and Sammy, the older boys, add a couple of paychecks to the one brought home by Geraldine's husband, an offset press operator. Edward is a routeman for a dairy and Sammy works in a gasoline station.

Although it's not as bad as it might be, the bills mount up for a young couple starting married life with eight children.

Most of the immediate financial benefits of the accident—a little life insurance and some accrued vacation pay from the father's job as a millwright—went to keep the family together at the old Dillashaw home in the 6 months before Geraldine and Charles were married.

A settlement with the railroad also helps with the upkeep of the children.

The washing and the house cleaning, the shopping and the cooking, and the loving care for eight children make a full-time job—and then some—for a girl barely out of her teens and married only a year.

But the weight of keeping the family together doesn't show in Geraldine's face.

ASKS NO HELP

She's an attractive blonde, cheerful, and self-confident, reigning over a houseful of well-behaved children. She's looking forward to adding another child—her own—to the household in December.

And she's obviously more than a little proud of the way she and her brothers and sisters have stood shoulder to shoulder—together—in the wake of the family tragedy.

"Nobody's helped us, and we haven't asked anybody for help," she says. "I figure that what I can't do for them can just go undone. I don't think we ought to be obligated to anybody."

Right after the accident, when Larry, Freddie, and Judy still were in the hospital, a young couple offered to adopt Judy and Freddie.

"I didn't listen to them," says Geraldine. "We had to stick together."

Series of Enlightening Articles on State History and Heritage Is Continued by Respected West Virginia Author and Historian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginia historian and publisher Phil Conley is the author of a series of enlightening articles which have created among our citizens an increased interest in significant events of the past.

In his writings, Mr. Conley discusses important personalities, meaningful dates, and historical points of interest to be found in the Mountain State. The series, which has been well received in our State has also attracted the favorable attention of citizens in other areas, and has brought richly deserved recognition to the author.

I request that the four most recent installments of the series "Know Your State" by Phil Conley, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the installments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BEGINNING OF OUR PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

(By Phil Conley)

The schoolmaster made his influence felt early in the pioneer settlements of West Virginia. George Washington, at the age of 16, on his first surveying trip into what is now West Virginia, noted in his journal that on August 18, 1748, he established a mark at the "schoolhouse old field." This was in the South Branch Valley, possibly Pendleton County. The time was 22 years after Morgan Morgan, the first white settler in the State, had built his home at Bunker Hill.

The early schools were crude affairs. Classes were held in homes, abandoned buildings and churches. They were taught by itinerant pedagogs who charged a small sum for each pupil and who usually "boarded" free with the parents.

The first school of higher learning was established at Shepherdstown in 1785. What is claimed to have been the first college founded west of the Alleghenies was Randolph Academy. It was located at Clarksburg in 1787, the year the Constitution of the United States was drafted in Philadelphia.

Soon after West Virginia became a State on June 20, 1863, the people began making plans for a free school system. On Wednesday, January 27, 1864, the West Virginia Legislature being in session at the temporary State capitol at Wheeling, the senate passed a resolution requesting the house to concur in the election of a State Superintendent of Free Schools at 11 o'clock on Tuesday, February 16, 1864. On the date agreed upon, the house nominated Prof. Andrew F. Ross, of Ohio County and Prof. William R. White, of Marion County. Mr. White was elected for a term which was to begin June 1, 1864. He continued in office until 1869.

On January 13, 1866, Mr. White made a report to the Governor in which he claimed there were 133 schoolhouses in the State which had an average value of $303, or a total value of $40,299. The salary of the State superintendent of schools was $1,250 annually. The average monthly salary of male teachers in Wheeling was $139 and of female teachers, $42. In other districts the average salary for male teachers was $34 and for female teachers, $22. In the first school year which began on June 1, 1864, the State distributed to counties for local schools $67,350. That year there were 431 school teachers and 15,972 pupils. At that time the population of the State was 396,000.

William K. Pendleton, the fifth State superintendent of free schools, served 1 year, 1873, and summed up the progress of the school system under the first constitution as follows:

"Reviewing our progress in the noble efforts of the State to provide for the free education of the whole people, we have reason for our profound gratitude at our comparative success. With a million and a quarter invested in school property; 3,000 schools in actual operation, and three-quarters of a million annually contributed to run them; 90,000 children under intellectual and moral training; a number of graded and high schools; 4 normal schools in vigorous operation, for which we are annually expending, out of the State treasury, over $8,000; a university on which we bestow over $16,000; and other private and corporate institutions, among them 1 college largely endowed, and through its 400 graduates enjoying a national reputation. West Virginia may well be proud of her position in this highest expression of a people's patriotism and enterprise. Within less than a single decade there was, outside of Wheeling, scarcely a free school in the State."

MINERAL SPRINGS

(By Phil Conley)

There are many medicinal springs in West Virginia. They constitute one of the State's most valuable natural resources.

White Sulphur Springs, 140 miles east of Charleston, is the greatest inland watering place on the North American continent. The acreage comprising this resort was patented by Nathan Carpenter in 1774. But prior to that time Indians, as well as white people, had bathed and drunk the medicinal waters found there. Many of this country's most noted people have visited White Sulphur, among them Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Webster, Calhoun, and Patrick Henry. Gen. Robert E. Lee once had a cottage there, where he lived part of the summer. People from all over the world have visited this noted spa.

Berkeley Springs is about 3 miles from the Potomac River in Morgan County. This place was first known as Warm Springs, then Bath, and later the present name. Washington wrote in his Journal on March 18, 1747, that he had visited the "famed Warm Springs." These springs were in the large tract of land owned by Lord Fairfax who gave the property to the Colony of Virginia so that the waters might be free to the public. When West Virginia became a separate State, she came into possession of the springs. After the Revolution, Washington built a cottage there and his brother Lawrence spent nearly a year there on account of his health. The springs have a capacity of 2,000 gallons a minute, with a uniform temperature of 74°. The State has a 5-acre park which surrounds the springs. It also maintains a sanatorium there.

Pence Springs are located 12 miles east of Hinton. The waters have curative properties for kidney, stomach, and liver disorders. Some years ago a commercial company began bottling the water and shipping it to distant markets. The old hotel was acquired by the State and is now a female penal institution.

Webster Springs were discovered by J. E. Hall before the Civil War. The town is the county seat of Webster County and is 63 miles southwest of Elkins on the Elk River. It is 2,000 feet above sea level and has long been known as a health resort.

Old Sweet Springs is in Monroe County. James Moss built the first house there in 1760. The first patent for the land was granted to William Lewis, brother of General Andrew Lewis for whom Lewisburg was named. The springs flow from the base of Potts Mountain. The water has a temperature of 72° to 76° and is described as "of a tonic character, mildly cathartic and alterative, valuable in cases of debility and in many forms of dyspepsia and functional diseases of the stomach and bowels." At one time this place was visited by prominent people from this country and abroad. Some years ago, during the administration of Gov. M. M. Neely, the State acquired the hotel and converted it into an old folks' home.

Salt Sulphur Springs is on Indian Creek in Monroe County, about 14 miles from Fort Springs.

Red Sulphur Springs is also on Indian Creek in Monroe County, about 12 miles from Lowell.

Capon Springs is on the east side of Cacapon River in Hampshire County. The Indians called it "Kakapon-se-pe," meaning "a river of medicine waters."

Shannondale Springs are about 5 miles east of Charles Town in Jefferson County.

Green Sulphur Springs are in Summers County. Blue Sulphur Springs are in Greenbrier County.

There are a number of other springs in West Virginia which are not as well known as the ones listed here.

The springs may be classified as alum springs, iron springs, magnesia springs, salt springs, sulphur springs, and lime springs.

THE BEGINNING OF OIL PRODUCTION

(By Phil Conley)

The North American Indians found oil seeping up through cracks in the earth. They used it for medicinal purposes long before the white man came to this country. The early white settlers also used oil for rheumatic and other muscular pains.

In 1849, Samuel M. Kier, a salt merchant, began marketing medicinal oil as a sideline. Ten years later the Petroleum Rock Oil Co. was formed in New York. It hired E. L. Drake to drill an oil well near Titusville, Pa. He struck oil on August 28, 1859, at a depth of 69½ feet. This well is credited with being the first oil well drilled in this country.

Just 59 days after the Drake well came in, a well was struck at Burning Springs in Wirt County, W. Va. It was called the "Eternal Center" because it was thought the oil pool of the world had been found.

The oil industry actually began in West Virginia about 1810. Bushrod Creel owned a farm on Hughes River. He found oil exuding from the sands. He collected some of it and took it to Marietta, Ohio, where he found a company that would sell it for him. It was labeled bank oil. It was recommended as a cure for all pains and aches. His oil sold for 33 cents a gallon. Creel soon found the demand was greater than his supply. He dug deeper into the river banks. These diggings were carried on for about 45 years.

During the Civil War, 100,000 barrels of oil were stored in barges in the Little Kanawha River at Burning Springs in Wirt County. On May 9, 1863, 6 weeks before West Virginia became a separate State, Gen. William E. Jones, commanding a Confederate army of about 1,500 men, raided the Burning Springs oilfield and burned the barges. That night the light of the burning oil was seen at Parkersburg, 40 miles away. General Jones also destroyed the machinery around the wells.

Very little was done in the oil field after the Jones raid until after the Civil War. But after Appomattox, there began a scramble for leases. In April 1876, former Gov. William E. Stevenson, of Parkersburg, reported to the West Virginia Commissioners to the Centennial Exposition that there were 292 oil wells in the State that produced on the average of 3 barrels a day or a total of nearly 900 barrels.

Parkersburg was the chief oil market. Here was erected the largest refinery in the United States at that time—named for Johnson N. Camden. When John D. Rockefeller was organizing the Standard Oil Co., he dealt with Camden, John V. Rathbone, and others who had taken an active part in producing oil in Wirt and other nearby counties. The refinery at Parkersburg was the largest one owned by the Standard Oil Co. at that time. It had a capacity of refining 200 barrels a day.

In 1878, the production of oil in West Virginia was 180,000 barrels. Six years later the production had declined to 90,000 barrels. The early facilities for drilling wells limited the depth to possibly 300 or 400 feet. This was not deep enough to reach the large pools of oil.

Near the close of the century many fields had been opened—Mannington, Sistersville, Monongalia, Harrision, Doddridge, etc. The initial well drilled in the Sand Fork field in Lewis County was completed in 1900, the largest oil well ever drilled in West Virginia. It was known as the Copley Well No. 1.

The peak of oil production in West Virginia was in 1901 when 14,177,126 barrels of oil were sent to market.

The development of the oilfields in West Virginia was a boon to farmers who received millions of dollars in royalties. This industry also added to the economy of the State by supplying work for drillers, pipeline workers, taxes, and in hundreds of other ways.

The quality of the oil found in West Virginia is rated as the best produced in the world and commands the highest market price.

THE BEGINNING OF NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION

(By Phil Conley)

One of the most valuable natural resources found in West Virginia is natural gas. The earliest explorers and settlers came upon gas escaping from fissures of rocks and in some instances bubbling up in stream beds.

What is said to be the first reference to gas was made by a traveler in Tucker County about 1750 who related that he had discovered one of the curiosities of the Western World. He said that he came upon a stream "four poles wide and knee deep."

In the middle of this stream "there was a constant bubbling of water as if a blowpipe was at work at the bottom. The wind came up with a smell similar to that of stonecoal fire. The guide waded in, held the lock of his rifle near the bubbling part of the surface, and pulled the trigger. It flashed, and that instant a fire was blazing on the surface of the water as large as a yard square and 2 feet high."

The most noted "burning spring" was on the bank of the Kanawha River about 6 miles east of Charleston. One of the first explorers in this State, Matthew Arbuckle, reported seeing it in 1773. The following year John Floyd and a group of other surveyors came upon this spring, and Thomas Hanson wrote in his Journal, "April 15, 1774. We proceeded 14 miles down the river, passing by the burning springs—which is one of the wonders of the world."

In 1775 Samuel Lewis, surveyor of Augusta County together with Leonard Morris, surveyed the tract of land on which the springs were located for George Washington and Gen. Andrew Lewis. A patent was granted for the land which was signed by Thomas Jefferson, Governor of Virginia.

Washington referred to this tract of land in his last will, "The tract of which 123 acres is a moiety was taken up by Andrew Lewis and myself, for and on account of a bituminous spring, which it contains, of so flammable a nature as to burn freely as spirits, and nearly as difficult to extinguish."

There have been many stories told about Washington's travels in West Virginia. He never visited these springs. When he came down the Ohio River in 1770 to Point Pleasant, he traveled a short distance up the Kanawha and then returned. When he died he owned about 33,000 acres of land in this State. This he received for services in the Indian wars.

There were other "burning springs" located near Elizabeth in Wirt County on the Little Kanawha and Hughes Rivers. This territory was rich in oil and gas reserves.

The first great flow of gas in the Kanawha Valley was struck in the city of Charleston near the end of the present Brooks Street in 1815. Capt. James Wilson drilled a well here in an effort to obtain salt. When he did not find brine at the usual depth, he swore he would drill until he got salt or the infernal region. Soon after this the driller struck a gas well that caught fire from an open grate. It burned to a great height and was put out with great difficulty.

It seems strange that Charleston was in the midest of a great natural gas field and yet a large plant was erected to produce artificial gas. When the writer was a small boy his father worked at this place which was located on the site where the Appalachian Electric Power Company's office building now stands.

In 1841 William Tompkins, in drilling a salt well a short distance above the "burning spring," struck a large gas well. Up to that time wood and coal had been used as fuel to evaporate the water in the production of salt. But Tompkins, without any precedent to go by, used pipes to carry gas to his furnaces. This was the first time natural gas was used for manufacturing purposes, not only in West Virginia, but in the United States. It was not long until Dr. John P. Hale and others followed the example set by Tompkins.

The writer's father was a cooper who made barrels for a salt company at Salines (now Malden). He said that before the Civil War, slaves were used to mine coal for fuel in the furnaces. A large man would get down on his hands and knees, place his head against a car and push it in and out of the mine.

Starting from the incidental development of gas wells in the Kanawha Valley, wells have been drilled in more than half of the counties in the State. In recent years deep wells have been drilled with exceptionally good results. They sometimes are drilled as deep as 5 miles.

A handy man, Billy Morris, invented a bit that made deep drilling possible. This bit was called "jars." It was a link that prevented the bit from becoming stuck in the rock formation. Morris Street in Charleston was named for him.

The peak of production of natural gas was in 1917, with 308,617,101,000 cubic feet. This may be exceeded when more deep wells are drilled.

For many years West Virginia produced more natural gas than any State in the Union. This natural resource has been a valuable asset to the economy of the State.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Minnesota Weekly Irks A.T. & T.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 11, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article—published on August 10 in the Washington Post—entitled "Minnesota Weekly Irks A.T. & T." The article was written by Jack Anderson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Minnesota Weekly Irks A.T. & T.

(By Jack Anderson)

(Note.—Drew Pearson is touring the Balkans. In his absence, his column is written by his associate.)

Apparently no critic is too small, no opposition too trifling to escape the ire of the communications goliath, American Telephone & Telegraph, which has its eye simultaneously on outer space and Circle Pines, Minn. (population, 2,789).

The object of A.T. & T.'s irritation in Circle Pines is gentle Andy Gibas, who publishes a weekly newspaper called Circulating Pines. By his own count, he has 1,100 subscribers, gives away another 400 copies free.

But Andy discovered what a great howl a small pinprick can cause when he printed an anti-A.T. & T. editorial.

"In the past 7 years," the editorial began, "American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (the Bell System) has overcharged the long-distance phone users a billion dollars. But this is going to look like peanuts if A.T. & T. succeeds in getting the Government to hand over its communications satellites."

This brought swift retaliation from Northwestern Bell, the local A.T. & T. subsidiary, which sent representatives into Circle Pines to talk to the town's business, civic, and religious leaders about their weekly newspaper.

The Bell task force was led by tall, genial Joe Cervenka, the company's public relations chief for Minnesota, who explained to this column: "We have a right to state our case to others in the community."

Cervenka acknowledged that he had put Andy's editorial on the teletype to Northwestern Bell's headquarters in Omaha and A.T. & T.'s headquarters in New York City.

DAVID AND GOLIATH

Here is the amazing sequence of A.T. & T.'s pressure on little Andy Gibas, a tale of a modern David and Goliath:

Shortly after the offending editorial appeared, Cervenka phoned the Circulating Pines office and ordered the telephone ad dropped from the next edition. He must have thought better of this, for he showed up later with a substitute ad and explained that he had merely wanted to make a change.

Cervenka also phoned Andy and suggested that, if he were interested in his newspaper, they had better have a talk. At this confrontation, Cervenka accused Andy of printing untrue and libelous statements about A.T. & T.

What particularly upset Cervenka was the claim that A.T. & T. had overcharged its long-distance users a billion dollars.

Andy's spitfire wife, Grace, later supplied the source of this information. It had been taken, she said, from a House speech by Congressman Emanuel Celler, New York Democrat.

"Congressman Celler is not a friend of ours," replied Cervenka. "Now I understand. The trouble is you read the wrong things."

The Bell man's next step was to check at the Minnesota Newspaper Association for information on possible backers who might own an interest in Andy's paper. Somehow, he came up with the name of Ernest Madsen, and promptly made contact.

"We were curious to know whether this financial backer felt like the Gibases did," Cervenka explained to this column.

But it turned out that Madsen owned no part of the paper, that it belonged totally to the Gibases. (To keep it solvent, Andy is obliged to work by day as a chemist while his wife gathers the news.)

A.T. & T. INVASION

Finally, A.T. & T. launched its invasion of Circle Pines. Cervenka called upon Mayor Gerald Pehl, former Mayor Carl Eck, town councilmen, and other leaders. His assistants interviewed Andy's friends and neighbors.

Altogether, Cervenka insists they saw no more than 15 people. But reports reaching Gibas indicate the whole community must have been canvassed.

One who didn't like Cervenka's insinuations was the Reverend Harris Jesperson, pastor of St. Mark's Lutheran Church in Circle Pines. He told this column that Cervenka went so far as to imply the Gibases were pro-Communist in their attitude.

"If you are insinuating the Gibases are Communists and all that rot," the pastor lectured Cervenka, "you had better forget about it right now."

More easily influenced were Mildred Huse and her son, Gordon, who run one of the town's two leading grocery stores, Gordon's Market. They stopped advertising in the Circulating Pines after Cervenka's visit.

Gordon Huse, who answers to the nickname "Buz," assured this column that Cervenka hadn't suggested an economic boycott.

"We didn't want to get involved, so we dropped our advertising," explained Buz.

But Andy and Grace Gibas aren't easily intimidated. They struck back in a front-page editorial.

The questioning of friends and neighbors "gives us a very uneasy feeling," they wrote. "Something like the Russians must feel when they discover the secret police are making inquiries * * *.

"But the real puzzler is this: Why doesn't A.T. & T. want the satellite giveaway talked about? Why is it afraid of criticism?"

A Proposal To Increase Job Training Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 11, 1962

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few months ago, a workshop on equal opportunities for minority groups was held in Los Angeles, Calif., as part of the second biennial California Conference on Apprenticeship. Mr. Eddy S. Feldman, managing director of the Los Angeles Home Furnishings Mart, presented a paper entitled "A Proposal To Increase Job Training Opportunities."

Congress this year, as in previous years, has been greatly concerned about the manpower problems which face our Nation in the decade ahead. We have sought to fashion progressive legislation, such as the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Our committees have been concerned with the operations of the Department of Labor's apprenticeship and training program. With this background, I commend Mr. Feldman's perceptive comments to the attention of my colleagues and others who are interested in this problem. I ask unanimous consent that the paper be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Proposal To Increase Job Training Opportunities

(By Eddy S. Feldman)

We cannot any longer be complacent about discrimination in training opportunities wherever it may exist. Nor can we any longer be complacent about discriminatory practices in the selection of applicants for training if, in fact, these do exist. But if these discriminations do exist—as we must agree they do—then we must probably review our attitudes about the voluntary nature of the participation in apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs.

I should like to suggest here that such a review is in order and to present a proposal which could, if endorsed by this conference and if ultimately adopted by it, lead to the effective expansion of training programs and provide so many training opportunities that discrimination would not be the serious matter that it is now.

At the outset, it seems clear that in order to increase apprenticeship and on-the-job training opportunities for minority groups there must be an increase in the total of all job training opportunities for those who qualify.

There are plenty of laws on the books these day, both Federal and State, which are designed to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the apprentice and industry, improve the working conditions of apprentices, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment." [1] That is to say, there are numerous training programs, or at least provisions for programs. For example, at the Federal level we have the Fitzgerald Act [2] and at the California State level the just-quoted Shelley-Maloney Act.

And there are laws by which government, Federal and State, has attempted to develop on-the-job training programs for nonapprenticeable occupations. Illustrations are the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962,[3] and the recently enacted California Labor Code, section 3093, which provides that the California Apprenticeship Council in cooperation with the department of education and employment "may foster and promote on-the-job programs other than apprenticeship." Furthermore, both Federal and California law provide subsidies through the payment of unemployment insurance benefits while training is being accomplished.[4]

Besides the training program and subsidies while training, government has contemplated that the apprentices and trainees may even be put to work—on a voluntary basis—on government projects.

On public works and defense projects the laws provide that apprentices must be in training under appropriate apprenticeship standards under written agreements. References to legislation contemplating the hiring of apprentices and trainees are cited in the footnotes.[5]

The trouble is that in terms of our discrimination problem (and, indeed, of the employment of more trainees) none of these provisions, comprehensive, urgently needed and well financed as they may be, goes to the heart of the problem of discrimination in training opportunities. The reason they do not is because the problem is misconceived. The problem is not so much to dream up ways to combat discrimination as it is to create adequate numbers of on-the-job training opportunities for the trainees. When the job opportunities are competing for the applicants because there are so many openings as contrasted with the applicants competing for the opportunities, we shall see that discrimination will quickly enough subside. The problem, I repeat, is the creation of job opportunities.

Now the depressing fact is that employers—government and private—actually use only the minimum number of apprentices, if they use any at all. This is the situation which must be changed. Yet, how is this to be accomplished when it appears that government itself has failed to assume leadership in the employment of apprentices and trainees in the letting of public works, public service and defense contracts? Is it not absurd for government on the one hand to promote apprenticeship and on-the-job training for private industry, while, on the other hand it fails to engage in apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs itself?

I suggest, therefore, that there can be created more on-the-job training opportunities by making the utilization of apprentices and on-the-job trainees in public works, public service and defense projects mandatory.

More precisely, I suggest that there should be mandatory hiring of one apprentice or on-the-job trainee to every five journeymen employed in any given occupation used in the completion of any government contract for public works, public service or defense projects.

Footnotes at end of speech.

I appreciate that this suggested change will transform the voluntary character of apprenticeship and other on-the-job training to a mandatory system. It is quite true that this change does some violence to our traditional attitudes concerning apprenticeship and on-the-job training. But I submit that tradition is not helpful in this instance. The case for altering tradition is pressing and the price is right. (Incidentally, the monetary cost of implementing this proposal is zero.) And the effect will be to initiate immediately the training of people to work and live in this increasingly automated society requiring special skills.[6] At the same time the creation of thousands of new apprenticeship and on-the-job training opportunities will reduce the occasions for discrimination.

A 1-to-5 ratio is suggested because it seems to be in line with actual practice throughout the United States where effective apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs exist. Collective bargaining agreements could permit a smaller ratio of trainee to journeyman, or even a larger one,[7] but the law would be binding if there is no collective bargaining agreement or if the agreement is silent on the matter. The matter of ratio is not the crucial one. It will only become so when there are more apprenticeship and on-the-job training opportunities available.

The phrase "in any given occupation" is used because the change must not be limited to apprenticeable jobs. It must cover the whole spectrum of job classifications including nonapprenticeable occupations and, say, "blue collar" positions under civil service systems.

Perhaps these suggestions might be effectuated by executive order [8] which would direct the training conditions which are to be inserted into government purchase orders and subsequent contracts. However, because there may be some question as to the validity of such executive order it would seem that legislation at both Federal and State levels is appropriate.

Government is the object of the suggested changes because, not only will its own practices be changed thereby, but the example which government furnishes will have a profound effect on the practices of all other employers, either unilaterally or through collective bargaining.

The mandatory widening of training opportunities in the field of public works, public service and defense projects goes to the heart of the discrimination problem by expanding the number of training opportunities. Thus there is swiftly accomplished the reduction of discrimination in placement for training, and the reduction of discrimination in selection of applicants for training.

Of course, there will have to be joint labor management and apprentice training committees established to administer the immensely enlarged training programs which would be created by adoption of these suggestions. We should have no trouble in making up or expanding these committees, however, in view of the vast body of experience and experienced personnel which has been developed in the long history of apprenticeship training in this country.

The principle of a mandatory ratio of trainee to journeyman is recognition in the field of training of the inadequacy of present practices to cope with the fantastic technical and social changes taking place in the structure of our economy, and of the need to replace the skilled personnel leaving their skills through death and retirement. Admittedly the transition from a voluntary system to a mandatory one is a sharp transition. Nevertheless, the problem is a vast one which demands not simply more lip-service, but positive, forthright, vigorous and appropriately directed action.

---

[1] California Labor Code, sec. 3071. This quotation is taken from the California Apprenticeship Labor Standards Act, ch. 4, division 3 of the California Labor Code. It is also known as the Shelley-Maloney Apprentice Labor Standards Act of 1939. (See California Labor Code, sec. 3089.)

[2] 29 U.S.C.A. 50–50b.

[3] Public Law 87–415, Mar. 15, 1962, approved Mar. 16, 1962. Sec. 204(a) of this shall encourage, develop, and secure the adoption of programs for on-the-job training needed to equip persons selected for training with the appropriate skills. The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent possible, secure the adoption by the States, and by private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor organizations and other industrial and community groups which he determines are qualified to conduct effective training programs under this title of such programs as he approves, and for this purpose he is authorized to enter into appropriate agreements with them." (Under this law, it should be noted here, we are about to embark on a monumental training and retraining program which will be turned into a dreadful waste of public funds and national energy if a creative program of establishing job opportunities is not pursued.) (See also the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87–27, May 1, 1961, 42 U.S.C.A., ch. 28, sec. 2513 et seq.) Par. (d) of this section provides: "The Secretary of Labor shall arrange to provide any necessary assistance for setting up apprenticeships, and to promote journeyman and other on-the-job training."

[4] California Unemployment Insurance Code, secs. 1266–1273 (1961). Sec. 1266 declares: "Experience has shown that the ability of a large number of the population of California to compete for jobs in the labor market is impaired by advancement in technological improvements and the widespread effects of automation and relocation in our economy. It is the policy of this State to assist such individuals by providing unemployment compensation or extended duration benefits during a period of retraining to fit them for new jobs and thus avoid their being forced to remain in a job classification where work opportunities no longer exist or are diminishing." The related Federal provisions are fund in the Area Redevelopment Act, cited in footnote 3, above, at sec. 2514. (See also the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 cited in footnote 3, above, at sec. 203.)

[5] At the Federal level the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, 40 U.S.C.A. 276a et seq., applies to every contract in excess of $2,000 to which the United States is a party in the construction, alteration or repair of public buildings or public works. The Davis-Bacon Act was extended to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, 23 U.S.C.A. 101 note, by 23 U.S.C.A. 113. (See also the National Housing Act, as amended, 12 U.S.C.A., 170 et seq; the Hospital and Construction Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. 291 et seq. (providing Federal grants to the States to be used in construction of public and private hospital projects); the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. 1401 et seq; School Construction in Areas Affected by Federal Activities, 20 U.S.C.A. 631 et seq. (authorizing the sharing by the Federal Government with the States of the cost of constructing, remodeling or improving school facilities under a grant-in-aid program); the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act, 1951, 42 U.S.C.A. 1591 et seq. (providing for housing in certain areas for defense workers and military personnel); the Federal Defense Act of 1950, 50 U.S.C.A. App. 2551; and the

Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, 41 U.S.C.A. 35–45 (providing maximum hours and minimum wages in contracts between any U.S. agency and suppliers in any amount exceeding $10,000).) California public works projects are covered by the California Labor Code, sec. 1777.5: "Nothing in this chapter shall prevent the employment of properly indentured apprentices upon public works. Every such apprentice shall be paid the standard wage paid to apprentices under the regulations of the trade at which he is employed, and shall be employed only at the work of the trade to which he is indentured."

[6] Michael, Donald N., "Cybernation, the Silent Conquest," Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1962.

[7] See, for example, the collective bargaining agreement between General Motors Corp. and the United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO dated Sept. 20, 1961; 140 of this master agreement provides for a ratio of 1 apprentice to every 8 journeymen, allowing variations of up to 1 to 5 at local facilities under certain circumstances.

[8] See Executive Order No. 10925, signed by the President, Mar. 6, 1961, 25 F.R. 1977, effective Apr. 5, 1961, which directs that all Government (Federal) contracts shall include a clause which provides that the contractor may not discriminate against any employee or applicant because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Saturday, August 11, 1962

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate debated space communications satellite bill (cloture petition filed).

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15126–15148

Bills Introduced: Two bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3634–3635. **Page 15126**

Communications Satellite: Senate debated H.R. 11040, to establish a commercial communications satellite system.

Senator Mansfield presented motion to bring to a close debate on the bill.

Pending at recess was Gore amendment (to committee substitute) providing for negotiations with foreign countries respecting establishment of satellite system, the Long amendment (to bar any communications common carrier from owning stock in the communications satellite corporation) having been withdrawn. **Pages 15148–15212**

Program for Monday: Senate met at 9 a.m. and recessed at 6:06 p.m. until 10 a.m. Monday, August 13, when it will continue on H.R. 11040, space communications satellite bill. **Page 15215**

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—D.C.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearing on H.R. 12276, fiscal 1963 appropriations for the D.C., with testimony from Walter N. Tobriner, D.C. Commissioner; Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, Engineer Commissioner; Harold L. Aitken, Director of Highways and Traffic; Dr. Carl F. Hansen, Superintendent of Schools; John M. Riecks, Assistant Superintendent of Schools; James A. Blaser, Director, Department of Buildings and Grounds; William D. Heath, Executive Director, Motor Vehicle Parking Agency; George A. England, Director of Motor Vehicles; Norman W. Pierson, Director of Vocational Rehabilitation; David V. Auld, Director of Sanitary Engineering; Schuyler Lowe, Director of General Administration; and Dr. Frederick C. Heath, Acting Director of Public Health.

Testimony was also heard from Rex H. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

APPROPRIATIONS—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1963 budget estimates for military construction, receiving further testimony in behalf of funds for Air Force construction from Maj. Gen. A. M. Minton, Director of Civil Engineering; J. R. Gibbens, Directorate of Civil Engineering; and Col. J. C. Carmichael, Office of the Surgeon General; and other Air Force officials.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, August 13, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Appendix

Democracy and Wisdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal recently took the chance to show the danger of a democracy undermining itself, quoting the words of Lord Macaulay who foresaw in the experiment of American democracy a self-degenerating process which would, in striving for its lofty goals, fall short through its very effort. The Journal editorially pointed to the shortcomings of Macaulay's thoughts along these lines, examining in some detail the strength which our society derives from the free enterprise economy which we follow; it also noted the points at which our experiment seems to have given Macaulay's theory some credence, where we have injected into our society unnecessarily the hand of government. The editorial deals, as an example, with the current veterans' pension fight. No one in the Congress opposes giving the veterans of World War I or of any war in which the future of America was at stake the help they need. But need must be the key and although this editorial does not spell this out—chiefly because it turns to other subjects—I am sure that this is the sense of its message. I should like to place this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: THE SPREADING ROT

"I have long been convinced," wrote Lord Macaulay more than a hundred years ago, "that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both." He had in mind specifically American democracy, which he was sure would go under in our century if not in his own.

Macaulay is neither the first nor will he be the last to indulge in headshaking about democracy as a political system. There is a good deal of headshaking going on in this country right now. For our part, though we are congenitally skeptical of either predictions or pat historical analogies, we must confess we too sometimes wonder.

Several circumstances have thus far combined to confound Macaulay's prophecy. The most obvious is that this country has never been a pure democracy, as the fact that it is a republic plainly announces. Popular but representative government, with the ingenious checks and balances of our own system, is a powerful deterrent to mob rule and ruin, just as it was meant to be.

Moreover, American capitalism functioning in political liberty has worked a miracle Macaulay did not foresee. It has brought an unprecedented degree of material well-being to the people generally. And not only material; it has produced a highly literate, intelligent and civilized electorate—something never even attempted in the democracies of antiquity.

Yet, despite such bulwarks, disturbing echoes of Macaulay's forebodings can be heard plainly enough today—not least in the Congress of the United States.

What is one to make, for instance, of the proposed additional pension for veterans of World War I? This subsidy would total $11 billion over the years and benefit chiefly the veteran who doesn't need it. It is so cynical a grab that it is opposed by all the major veterans' organizations, by the chairman of the House Veterans' Committee and by almost all Congressmen in their hearts. But the fear of offending veterans is so great in Congress that it may quite possibly be enacted.

This in microcosm is what has been happening on a vastly expanded scale. Big and little groups of people have concluded that the Federal Government is, after all, a free lunch; that the Treasury of all the people can be plundered, seemingly without end, for the presumed enrichment of this or that interest. And the thises and thats are multiplying like rabbits. Almost nobody any more goes without a subsidy.

Now the undeniable degeneration of America's political and economic institutions is not, in our view, primarily the fault of the public at large. Plenty of local governments are corrupt, but in their own communities people continue to behave responsibly, building their hospitals and churches and schools and, even more important, raising their educational sights for the sake of their children.

The trouble is that it becomes increasingly difficult to act responsibly as the Federal Government encroaches more and more on all local governments, communities and individuals. We personally have talked with many farmers who would like to see the whole Federal subsidy-control apparatus scrapped, but as long as other farmers are taking their handouts they will take theirs too.

Strictly speaking, that is not a very admirable moral attitude, but it is understandably human in circumstances that seem beyond the individual's control. And so the rot spreads through the land until almost everybody figures, Who can stop Washington? And if it insists on pouring it out, why not get in on the gravy?

For it is the Federal Government that not only makes it possible for the rot to spread but actively and, these days, increasingly encourages it. Whether it is the White House demanding that the people submit to compulsion for yet another handout, or the Congress passing yet another boondoggle, there is only one word for it. The word is "demagogy."

And when demagogy finally combines with a general willingness to be bought, things may get beyond the power of even our powerful political and economic institutions to check. The danger today arises not from those democratic institutions but from their perversion.

The people and their institutions are resilient and capable of withstanding much abuse; as we say, they have until now defied Macaulay's words of doom, and we hope they will go right on doing so. But that is no reason for anyone, from Washington to the last subsidized farm and business and household, to be complacent about his warning:

"When a society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand; or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th;—with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your "Huns" and "Vandals" will have been engendered within your own country."

Support Developing for Herbert Hoover's Proposal for a Council of Free Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, ever since Herbert Hoover, speaking on his 88th birthday at his birthplace in West Branch, Iowa, originated the proposal for a Council of Free Nations, to achieve those results which the United Nations appears unable to accomplish, support for this imaginative new proposal has been rapidly developing. Former President Hoover has indeed presented a constructive challenge to free world leaders who are weary of endless debate, successive vetoes, and timid retreats and who are determined that freedom shall not perish through neglect.

Among the many who are commenting favorably on the Hoover proposal is Ralph De Toledano in his King Syndicate column on August 11. For the information of the country and the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERBERT HOOVER AT 88

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Herbert Hoover celebrated his 88th birthday on Friday at his birthplace in West Branch, Iowa—a town he left at the age of 10 with "two dimes in my pocket" and "the suit of clothes I wore." Today, long past the travail of an unconscionable political campaign against him, he is perhaps the most loved man in America. And he can look back at a remarkable career of distinguished service to his country. His contributions over the years have been many and invaluable to the common good.

But Mr. Hoover is not one to look back. In a birthday speech at the dedication of the Herbert Hoover Presidential Library in West Branch, he looked ahead to the Nation's—and the free world's—future, proposing a way to maintain peace with honor. And he offered wise words of encouragement to those Americans who look at the state of the world and despair. Mr. Hoover has never had the rhetorical flash of some of his Presidential successors. But in his words there is an eloquence in simplicity which flows from the sincerity in which they are uttered.

Noting that "the Communist leaders, for 40 years, have repeatedly asserted that no peace can come to the world until they have overcome the free nations," Mr. Hoover stated with justice that they have used the United Nations to "provoke conflict"—thereby destroying its usefulness as a vehicle for keeping the peace.

He quotes Woodrow Wilson, a President he served and admired, at the time the League of Nations was launched. "A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations," Wilson warned. "No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith with it or observe its covenants." The League of Nations foundered on Fascist duplicity just as the United Nations is being made important by Communist subversion.

Mr. Hoover offers an alternative—and one to which most Americans would subscribe were they given the chance:

"The time is here when, if the free nations are to survive, they must have a new and stronger worldwide organization. For purposes of this discussion, I may call it the Council of Free Nations. It should include only those who are willing to stand up and fight for their freedom. * * * When the United Nations is prevented from taking action, or if it fails to act to preserve the peace, then the Council of Free Nations should step in." This, Mr. Hoover believes, "is the remaining hope for peace in the world."

Then, turning to those who foresee a decline and fall of American civilization, Mr. Hoover said: "The mightiest assurances of our future are the intangible spiritual and intellectual forces in our people, which we express not by the words 'United States' but by the word 'America' * * *. It reaches far beyond the size of cities and factories. It springs from our religious faith, our ideals of individual freedom and equal opportunity * * *. It rises from our pride in great accomplishments of our Nation and from the sacrifices and devotion of those who have passed on. It lifts us above the ugliness of the day. It has guided us through even greater crises in our past. And from these forces, solutions will come again."

The Council of Nations Mr. Hoover proposes is one of those solutions, and it should be heeded by those who have hitched their wagons to the sputtering star of the United Nations. There would be differences of opinion in that Council, for free men will never agree on everything. But it would still be a unified force, solidly based on a consensus of freedom and rid of the dead weight of neutralism and the subversion of Communist diplomacy. The Council could speak with a voice that would make the Kremlin tremble. It would have behind it the moral and military power which Communists understand.

But such a Council cannot be created without the strong and persistent demand of the American people. Many hands must beat at the doors of Congress and the White House before Mr. Hoover's proposal is given even the most cursory consideration. It will take an organized effort before the men of Washington lay it before the leaders of the free world and urge its implementation. The demand for the Council would in itself have a salutary effect on the bickering members of the U.N. General Assembly.

My own proposal is the creation of an organization to be called Americans for a Council of Free Nations. If enough Americans wrote to Mr. Hoover offering their support, that organization could become a reality.

Regents' Prayers in New York Schools—Resolution Adopted by the American Legion Auxiliary Department of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include a resolution adopted by the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Mississippi, during its convention on July 7, 1962.

This resolution expresses sentiments and views with which I am in full agreement regarding the recent opinion of the Court on the regent's prayer in New York State. I commend it to the consideration of all Members of the House of Representatives:

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States by it's decision of June 26, 1962, ruled that use of the regent's prayer by the public schools of New York was a violation of the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas the President of the United States has expressed his agreement with the Court decision, admonishing the people of America to respect it; and

Whereas the vast publicity regarding this decision has created the impression in the minds of our citizens that the schoolchildren of this Nation will be prohibited in the public schools of our land, from interceding to the Supreme Being for protection for themselves, for their parents, for their teachers, and for America, and that it will deny them the privilege of publicly acknowledging within their school group their belief in, and their dependence on God; and

Whereas the United States of America is a Christian Nation and such a decision is completely foreign to their customs and beliefs and is repugnant to them; and

Whereas thousands of America's stalwart sons have given their lives for "God and country": Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mississippi Department, American Legion Auxiliary, join the Mississippi Department, American Legion, in their protest of such an un-Godly environment which could dangerously imperil our Nation and, that we memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation that will rescue the Constitution of our Republic; and be it further

Resolved, That legislation be enacted by Congress that will confine the Supreme Court to act only in the judicial field and not take unto itself legislative authority; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress enact laws restraining the executive division from usurping powers not assigned to it by the Constitution of the United States of America: Thereby assuring the citizens of this Republic that they have a government: "Of the people, for the people and by the people" that it may not perish from this earth; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the Governor of the sovereign State of Mississippi, the president of the senate, and the speaker of the house of representatives with a request that at the next session of the legislature, be it special or regular, a request be made by them to the Congress of the United States for legislation to be enacted that will forever keep the judicial and executive departments confined to their own fields; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the officials of both branches of the U.S. Congress, to Senator Jim Eastland, Senator John Stennis, to the six Representatives of Mississippi, and to the press.

Legislative Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Congress—at this late stage in its session—still has a tremendous amount of work to accomplish.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to discuss some of the issues still confronting us.

I ask unanimous consent to have certain excerpts from my text printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS, WEEKEND OF AUGUST 11 AND 12

Friends, this is your senior Senator Alex Wiley.

I welcome this opportunity to report to you once again from Washington.

Unfortunately, the legislative wheels of Congress have been grinding exceedingly slow. Consulting their crystal balls, the political diagnosticians are offering differing excuses for the slow progress.

Realistically, however, there is still legislation pending in major fields, which require the consideration of Congress, including: Revision of U.S. international trade policy; changes in our tax laws; consideration of the farm bill; and a variety of other bills.

In recent days, progress oflegislation in the Senate has been jammed by the talkathon on the U.S. communications satellite program.

This legislation, if enacted, would establish a private corporation—subject to appropriate governmental regulation—for a satellite communications system.

What would this mean to Mr. and Mrs. Wisconsin—and to all America? A broadening of our news-education-cultural horizons (as reflected in early United States-Europe television exchanges via Telstar); including possible direct home reception from Telstar-type satellites (now being explored by the television-communications industries); opportunity to shift the overheavy traffic on existing radio, telegraph, telephone, and other conventional channels to the satellite system; and ultimately, dramatically improved—and perhaps less costly—telephone, radio, television and other communications at home, as well as around the globe.

Recognizing the significance of this program, the Senate—in my judgment—should move ahead on this legislation.

Fundamentally, there is a responsibility for careful and thorough analysis and evaluation. Blockading even consideration of the proposal by talkathons, however, results: In a serious roadblock in establishing of the communications satellite system; and a holdup of consideration of the great backlog of important legislation still pending in Congress.

To attempt to break the deadlock, the bill is committed for a 10-day period to the Foreign Relations Committee—where it is now under consideration.

In the interests of moving ahead on the satellite program—of significance nationally, internationally, and as a U.S. triumph in the cold war—the Senate, in my judgment, should speedily, and expeditiously, get this consideration of the bill underway.

Normally, the Congress—at mid-August—is winding up this session. As things look now, however, this workload may require the session to extend into early fall.

Naturally, there will be some Members—1962 being an election year—eager to get back to political hustings. However, the challenges are too great—and the times too critical—for just politically expedient consideration of the agenda of significant legislation. Consequently, we will need to stay on the job until the work of the Congress is effectively finished.

Merit Pay for Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, on Wednesday morning, July 25, an editorial entitled "Merit Pay for Teachers."

As a former teacher I believe that this would be a great step forward to the educational system of this Nation should this plan be adopted. This editorial is so timely I would like to bring it to the attention of the membership of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

MERIT PAY FOR TEACHERS

Almost all public school teachers are paid on formula of two factors, the degrees they have earned, and the number of years they have taught. After several years of experience they use up all the steps there are and thereafter it is a one-factor formula, increasing their pay only when another degree is obtained.

Every person who has attained the age of 10 knows there are ordinary teachers and good teachers, but most efforts to pay extra for extra good teaching have been defeated. Organizations of teachers are strongly opposed to any increase unless it is equally shared by all under the degree-experience formula. There are some difficulties in getting impartial rulings on who is entitled to merit pay raises.

For one reason or another, there are very few merit pay plans for teachers in operation after years of talking about it. And that is what puts Midland, Tex., in the news.

Midland is a city of about 70,000, over the hills north of the Pecos River. There are 650 school teachers. They begin at $4,180 with a college degree, and have been adding $100 a year for experience. Experience will add $125 this fall.

Last year 65 of these teachers were paid an additional $100 to $300 for merit. The merit increases will be $125 to $500 this fall.

Most interesting of all, the Midland merit plan has demonstrated a working method for 3 years.

George McGovern and Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished former colleague in the House of Representatives, Hon. George McGovern, has resigned as director of food for peace, to offer his service directly to the people of his native State that he loves so dearly, South Dakota.

He seeks to become the U.S. Senator from that great State, and in this I wish him well.

But my purpose now in addressing the House is not to explore the new horizons that lie ahead for George McGovern and for his friends and neighbors back in South Dakota, but, instead, to praise the quality of this young man and deeds already accomplished. I am certain that my feelings in this are shared by other Members of this body.

George McGovern's name now is known around the world. His name is associated with food for hungry people.

Soon after John F. Kennedy took the oath as President of the United States some 18 months ago, he appointed this son of South Dakota as the food for peace administrator. In this limited span of time he has brought world attention to the purpose and meaning of this program. He has spread the gospel that America's great abundance—surplus, if you will—of food is not a curse, but a blessing. He has dedicated himself to the proposition that by using our great abundance to feed the hungry around the world we can strengthen the prospect and the assurances of world peace.

George McGovern was our colleague here in the House for a number of years. He served with distinction on the Committee on Agriculture, of which it is my privilege and honor to serve as chairman. He impressed all of us as a forward-looking, careful-thinking young man with great energy, and he dedicated his exceptional abilities to the people he represented in South Dakota, particularly to the farm families of that great agricultural State.

In this service with the Committee on Agriculture he became aware of the problems related to our accumulating food and fiber stores, which are beyond our needs in the United States, and he saw clearly the opportunity for the use of this abundance to promote the cause of peace around the world.

President Kennedy made a natural and fortunate choice when he appointed him as Director of food for peace.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my object here to deliver a campaign oration for our former colleague, in his new undertaking, but I do want to say this:

By his leadership in alleviating hunger and misery abroad, contributing to economic development in underdeveloped countries, and in winning America millions of friends across the seas, backed by the ingenuity and industry of our farmers, George McGovern has served his country well.

I think that we may confidently expect to rely upon him for leadership in other great undertakings for many years ahead.

George McGovern is a devoted and dedicated public servant. By the splendid manner in which he discharged the duties of his high office while serving here in Congress he endeared himself to his colleagues and to his countrymen.

Let Us Put First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the persuasive case for corn as our national floral emblem has had an eloquent spokesman over the years in Miss Margo Cairns.

Miss Cairns, in the following article, gives new evidence of the enduring contributions which corn makes to our national welfare.

The article follows:

LET US PUT FIRST THINGS FIRST

Four nations in Europe and two in Africa have issued stamps honoring maize or corn, our priceless American native plant. These foreign stamps point glaringly to the fact that the United States—conceived, nourished, and prospered by corn—has overlooked history and gratitude by not commemorating our true heritage.

Jamestown: Three attempts were made by the English to colonize in that virgin paradise. Then, in 1607, reliance on the native grain was learned and led to success.

Plymouth: Every schoolchild knows the story of the Pilgrims—blown far off their course, landing on a bleak coast at the beginning of a rigorous northern winter—and their survival due primarily to Indian corn.

The Revolutionary War: It was to reach the rich cornlands beyond the Appalachian Mountains, denied them by King George's decree of 1763, that forced the struggle between the colonists and England.

Today State after State is being honored with a commemorative stamp, but which came first—the States or the life-sustaining grain that gave them birth? And the patriots, immortalized in marble and assembled in Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol, were not all these fed and nourished by the grain from our native American plant? There would have been no United States of American as we know it today had it not been for maize, Indian corn.

Russia, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, San Marino, Egypt, and the Republic of South Africa have each issued a handsome stamp in praise of maize, the Creator's gift to the Western Hemisphere and found nowhere else before 1492. To Asia Minor, now almost a desert, and the lands watered by the Nile, was given wheat. To the vast lands of Asia went rice. But to the Americas came the gift supreme—maize.

Maize, Indian corn, is the foundation of our history, traditions, economy. Today, in many forms it enriches the lives of every American. To it is credited our high standard of living. Maize may well be called the stone which the builders rejected and now has become the head of the corner.

President Kennedy recently said: "I consider history to be a source of strength to us here in the White House and to all the American people and anything which dramatizes the great history of the United States is worthy of the closest attention and respect by Americans."

In this spirit, let us put first things first.

Let a commemorative stamp honor the original American, maize—corn, acknowledging that it is woven through the warp and woof of our history and our national life.

Health Care in St. Louis County: How Medical Care Is Guaranteed to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the article I am placing in the Record under unanimous consent contains information which should be widely disseminated throughout our land, and indeed abroad. But it will not be. Why will it not be? Because it is untrue? Because it is not news? No. It is true. It is real news because it tells a story almost diametrically opposed to the story that many Americans uninformed, or worse still, propagandized on the subject, have never heard.

Why will it not be told? Because powerful people in this land are determined that people shall believe differently on this subject. Powerful people in the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are determined that the American people shall not know the truth of what is going on in the field of health care for the aged. Not one iota of publicity has been given out by the Department of HEW on the great advancements in recent years in the field of health insurance or what has been done by private groups, local and county governments and State governments. If the Department pleads innocent to charges that they have denigrated the Kerr-Mills Act, the Department cannot plead innocent to the charge that it has done nothing to dispel the false and vicious charges leveled against the Kerr-Mills Act by the COPE of the CIO–AFL and the Forand committee and by its silence lent weight to these charges.

At least by placing this article in the Congressional Record it will have some additional readership. It is an encouraging sign to see the truth finally reaching the people on the subject of health care for the aged in spite of the powerful efforts to suppress it.

The article follows:

[From Today's Health, July 1962]

How Medical Care Is Guaranteed to All

(By Howard Earle)

One afternoon last July a man walked into the offices of the St. Louis County Medical Society in Clayton, Mo., a St. Louis suburb. His voice and his manner denoted extreme nervousness as he explained he was in need of immediate medical attention but could not afford it.

"I know you have a plan to help those 65 and over," said the man. "I thought maybe there was some way you could help me even though I'm not half of 65."

Edgar J. Mothershead, executive secretary of the St. Louis County Medical Society, explained that the past 65 plan did not hold rigidly to age limitations.

"Qur purpose," said Mothershead, "is to make certain that no one needing medical care goes without it because of inability to pay. I'm sure we can help you."

Last fall, a mother came to the offices of the Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association in Oakland, Calif., across the bay from San Francisco. She asked to see Mrs. Muriel Hunter, a qualified social worker employed full time by the association.

"My husband and I moved to Berkeley recently," the woman explained. "I was told by the doctor who attended me when I had my last baby back East that I should have a hysterectomy, but I delayed it. Now I'm in a great deal of misery. Things haven't been going well with my husband and we just can't afford my operation now. The pastor at our church said you folks here could help me."

"No one has ever come to us needing medical attention and not received it—regardless of their ability to pay," answered Mrs. Hunter. "I'm sure you will be no exception."

The man in Clayton and the woman in Berkeley are not isolated cases of guaranteed medical care by the medical profession. Across the Nation, county and city medical societies have established formal and informal programs to assure adequate medical care for all regardless of their ability to pay. Some societies have inserted advertisements in local newspapers pointing out that no one need go without medical attention because of inability to pay. Some societies depend upon the Kerr-Mills law to supplement their own programs to care for those who need help. The American Medical Association, while supporting all the programs, also is cooperating with the Blue Shield Plan to set up a special inexpensive medical and surgical care insurance program for those 65 and over.

The past 65 plan of the St. Louis County Medical Society is unique in that it establishes something similar to a discount card which a qualifying member presents to the physician upon each visit. The card specifies the percent of reduction from regular fees the patient is to receive. For instance, if the card calls for a 50 percent reduction, then a $4 office visit would cost the card holder only $2. Similarly, a 75 percent reduction would reduce the cost of the visit to only $1. Discounts as high as 90 percent have been authorized by the Society.

Establishing the discount rates to patients is the responsibility of Mrs. Robert Opal, who was trained by the St. Louis Credit Bureau to check credit records and determine, through interviews with the patients, their ability to pay. There is no embarrassment or uneasy moments. Actually, Mrs. Opal completes an interview in little more than half an hour, but many applicants feel so relaxed they turn the sessions into reminiscences of their histories.

"I had dreaded coming to see you," one elderly woman told Mrs. Opal as her interview neared an end. "But, my gracious, in the short time I've been here I feel like you are an old family friend."

Sometimes a patient is referred to the society by member doctors. The county society includes physicians in both the county and city of St. Louis. Some patients are referred by their pastors or friends, or have read about the work in their local newspaper. When referrals are made by those other than physicians, the applicant is given his choice of doctors. If he has none, Mrs. Opal refers him to a physician in his own neighborhood.

The plan was put into effect in the latter part of 1960 after Dr. Charles Miller headed a committee which originated the procedure. The program came as a result of a preponderance of the doctors in the society desiring to offer those past 65 low-cost medical care while preserving the right of the patient to choose his own doctor.

"We though we would be swamped with requests for rate reduction cards," said Mothershed, "but surprisingly only 108 cards were issued during 1961, the plan's first full year of operation."

A card is issued for 12 months, after which the case is reviewed by Mrs. Opal. If the financial status of the patient has remained unchanged, the card is renewed for another year. If there has been a change, the percentage of reduction is lowered or increased as the change dictates. Sometimes the patient's situation is so improved that renewal of the card is not requested.

"We find our plan is proof that the medical profession does not knowingly permit anyone needing medical care to go without it," emphasized Mothershead. "More than 400 of the county's 450 physicians are members, along with most of the druggists, who fill prescriptions at reduced rates when cards are exhibited by the customers. The great majority of our card holders are those past 65, so those in the medical profession not participating are mostly the obstretricians and pediatricians."

The St. Louis County Medical Society has received inquiries about its past 65 plan from more than 60 other medical societies throughout most of the States. Mothershead is not certain whether any other societies have inaugurated the St. Louis County plan but many, he says, have made rather exhaustive studies of the entire program.

It would be misleading to hail the past 65 plan as an entirely new idea. The society recognizes this fact, pointing out that "doctors, for years, have been charging undisclosed 'less than regular' fees when patients are unable to pay regular charges." In fact, a majority of physicians, especially specialists, set aside a certain amount of their time for charity practice. However, under the past 65 plan the patient will be told how much less he is paying than the physician's regular fee, and he carries a card enabling him to receive the same reduction from all physicians and druggists participating in the program.

Although they achieve the same objectives, there is little similarity between the St. Louis County Medical Society's past 65 plan and the Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association's program.

"Nobody in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties goes without medical care because of inability to pay," declared William K. Scheuber, executive secretary of the association. "Our program is geared to guarantee adequate medical care to all, and it does."

In the case of the woman needing a hysterectomy, Mrs. Hunter interviewed her to determine if she would be eligible for surgery in the county hospital at county expense or could be cared for at State expense, or through some other welfare agency. The interview brought out that the woman and her husband were practically without funds and unable to pay even a portion of the cost of her needed surgery. Unfortunately, she did not qualify for any kind of welfare or other aid.

"We certainly will not let you go without the medical attention you need," Mrs. Hunter explained to the woman. "You go home and I will call you later. Be prepared for immediate entry in the hospital when I call."

After the woman left, Mrs. Hunter contacted the county hospital and made arrangements for a bed, use of the operating room, and other facilities. Then she called one of the area's outstanding surgeons and cited the need. There were no questions. The surgeon gladly volunteered his services.

"She has never had the county hospital or any physician turn her down," explained Scheuber. "We have 100-percent cooperation from everyone in the medical profession. We're proud of our record in bringing adequate medical care to all, without regard for their financial status."

The Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association has an impressive record of keeping the patients' needs the foremost objective of the medical profession. In the early 1950's, the association set up a day-and-night telephone-answering service and an emergency doctor-dispatching program. Once these twin projects were in operation, the association advertised in the local newspaper that medical service would be provided around the clock and made available to anyone, regardless of ability to pay.

Many medical societies do not find it necessary to set up any special program to care for the indigent. "We have an understanding among our members whereby anyone unable to pay, or anyone without means of paying the regular fee, either is attended without charge or at a fee based upon ability to pay. But we just don't talk about our good samaritan work. We know there are some less fortunate than others, and our doctors take care of them without fanfare," reported the chairman of a county medical society in downstate Illinois.

Last year, the American Medical Association submitted a questionnaire to local medical societies throughout the Nation, asking what type of medical programs the societies have to provide care for the needy. The survey revealed that as of the first of this year more than 70 percent of the societies had some "specific" program to assure medical services to all. Some were specified as formal and others as informal programs. Many didn't claim an actual program existed but pointed out that individual society members gave medical care to the indigent with no thought of remuneration.

"We have always handled this problem individually," wrote one society chairman. "It is handled quietly. We do not feel a need to do it otherwise. No individual in this county has been denied medical care because of his inability to pay."

Another society chairman wrote: "Every one of us sees patients every day for whom we know we will not receive pay. We don't talk about it—we just do it. That is and always will be part of the doctor's job."

Finally, this terse reply: "In small communities this is no problem, except to the doctor. We take care of people who are sick whether they can pay or not."

Results of the survey emphasized that doctors are reticent to publicize guarantees of service, fearing they will be flooded with requests from free-loaders. However, societies with formal programs report requests were about the same as expected, and more often less than expected.

The survey also disclosed that some doctors are unaware that some people feel they are denied care because of lack of funds. They show a blithe unconcern about the problem, feeling quite convinced nobody goes without care who needs it because they take care of the indigents among their own patients. Some societies have sought to rectify this veneer of indifference by advertisement in local newspapers.

In Ohio, the Jefferson County Medical Society inserted an advertisement in the Steubenville Herald-Star stating that the Society knew of no one who had been denied needed medical care because the person could not afford it. An expression of opinion was asked. The advertisement brought two replies, neither asking for medical care and neither citing any cases where needed medical care had not been adequately provided.

In Illinois, the Belvidere Republican published a statement last March 8 by the Boone County Medical Society. The statement asserted, "If you have a misunderstanding with your doctor that you can't resolve in discussion with him, you can take the problem to our county medical grievance committee.

"Because this grievance committee exists, you never have to feel alone or helpless or without recourse in a dispute with your doctor. Our grievance committee is your grievance committee—set up to hear both sides of a doctor-patient dispute and to settle it as fairly as possible.

"If you have what you think is an honest complaint against a doctor, don't just tell your neighbors about it, tell our grievance committee. Contact either the president or secretary of the Boone County Medical Society by writing him. Give him as much detailed information as possible and give him your name and address."

The grievance committees of medical societies were originally established to investigate and rectify complaints of overcharges and any injustices which might be proved against society members. They also have been active in guaranteeing medical care to all regardless of ability to pay.

Clifton Reeder, M.D., chairman of the grievance committee of the Chicago Medical Society, says the committee learned of only one case last year of a physician refusing to care for a patient.

"The only case that came to our attention," said Dr. Reeder, "was that of a patient who collapsed in front of a clinic door and the doctor refused to care for him. It is safe to say that doctor will not pull such a stunt again."

Dr. Reeder pointed out that even with Chicago's increasing population, complaints are much fewer than they used to be. He interprets the decrease in complaints as a demonstration of the effectiveness of the grievance committee.

The Chicago Medical Society has one of the best emergency call services in the country. Its emergency medical service was established to guarantee the availability of doctors any time day or night. There are 275 doctors on the Chicago and Cook County Emergency Panel. They serviced more than 13,500 patients in 1960. Another 2,500 patients called but before the emergency doctor arrived the patients had contacted their own doctors who arrived to provide the needed medical care.

The Emergency Medical Service telephone number is listed on the inside front cover of the Chicago telephone directory under "Doctor," along with the police and fire department numbers. The medical society maintains personnel at the answering service 24 hours a day. When an emergency call is received, the name and address of the caller is recorded and the doctor on the panel living nearest the caller is dispatched to the emergency. The Emergency Medical Service eliminates complaints against the medical profession that "you can't get a doctor when you want one." It also is a part of the machinery across the country which guarantees medical care to anyone.

It is becoming customary throughout the country now for doctors to display plaques in their offices asking patients to discuss fees so the patient will know in advance what fees for various services will be. Both doctors and patients are urged by the American Medical Association to discuss cost where sizable amounts are involved. The program is another facet in the medical profession's guarantee that anyone needing medical attention will receive it, although the main purpose of fee discussion is to insure a continued happy relationship between patient and doctor when medical bills pile up. The contention is that by knowing costs in advance the patient is less likely to complain later.

The New York County Medical Society has no formal program for reduction of fees to the indigent such as developed in St. Louis County or Alameda-Contra Costa Counties. A spokesman for the New York County Society said that, aside from the large amount of work the individual doctor does for which he receives no fee, care of the indigent is well provided for under public assistance, the city hospitals, and through the Kerr-Mills law.

The Kerr-Mills bill became a law October 1, 1960, and as of January 1, 1962, 38 States had availed themselves of the advantages of the medical care measure. The bill provides Federal funds to those States which want to establish medical assistance to the aged (MAA) programs. The purpose is to provide care for those aged persons who are able to meet all normal living expenses except the cost of a major or prolonged illness.

The second part of the Kerr-Mills law provides matching funds to States desiring to improve the scope of medical benefits for aged persons who are on the State's old-age assistance (OAA) rolls. In addition to those States taking advantage of the measure, nine others had OAA medical programs which they considered adequate to provide necessary health care for those over 65. Two other States, before enactment of the Kerr-Mills legislation, had assistance programs at the local level which included medical care. And Alaska, while presently developing State medical care programs, had much of the medical care provided by the U.S. Public Health Service prior to statehood.

Shortly after the first of the year the president of the American Medical Association, Leonard W. Larson, M.D., pointed out that the quick acceptance of the Kerr-Mills legislation by the States contradicts statements by the measure's critics to the effect that the program can't and won't work.

Briefly summarized, the Kerr-Mills law authorizes the States, with Federal funds added to their own, to furnish medical care to all needy and near-needy citizens over 65. The medical care provided includes hospital and home nursing care, services of physicians and specialists, and practically everything else necessary for adequate health care.

Meanwhile, surgical and medical care benefits for persons over 65 are wrapped up in a new low-cost health insurance plan offered by Blue Shield. The plan was developed by Blue Shield and approved by the American Medical Association. It must be accepted by the State medical societies before becoming effective. However, State societies are approving the plan.

To qualify, a person must be over 65 with an annual income not exceeding $2,500. The combined yearly income of husband and wife must not be over $4,500. There is no limit on the net worth of each person. The premium is $3.20 a month per person and $6.10 monthly for husband and wife. There is a 180-day waiting period before the policy becomes effective.

The policy provides for surgery, wherever performed, including multiple procedures and oral surgery; anesthesia service when ordered by and administered by a physician, other than the attending physician or his assistant; in-hospital medical care covering physicians' visits to hospitalized patients for

70 days per admission. There must be a 90-day interval between discharge and readmission; medical care in nursing homes, covering physicians' visits in a licensed nursing home at one visit a week for 13 weeks following discharge from an acute hospital; radiation therapy, including treatment for all conditions requiring use of X-ray, radium, and radioisotopes; X-ray examinations for hospitalized bed patients and for outpatients if needed in the initial diagnosis and treatment of injury; laboratory and pathological examinations for hospital patients; and prolonged detention, when constant and prolonged bedside attendance by a physician is necessary.

Commenting on the plan, U.S. Senator JOHN TOWERS, Republican, of Texas, said: "I am delighted to know that the medical profession and hospital administrators have suggested a voluntary rather than a compulsory plan to attack whatever problem exists among our aged in meeting their medical care costs."

The plan constitutes another of the programs either sponsored directly or cosponsored by the medical profession to make certain that no one in need of medical care goes without it because of inability to pay medical costs.

Economic Change Affects Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensburg, Ind., Daily News:

ECONOMIC CHANGE AFFECTS INDIANA

During the 10 years ending in 1960 Indiana has experienced a definite change.

In 1950, the population of the Hoosier State was 59.5 percent urban and 40.1 percent rural.

The percentage figures had changed by 1960 to 62.4 percent urban and 37.6 percent rural.

In part, this has been due to expanded job opportunity in Indiana, which now has approximately 11,000 manufacturers, processors, and wholesalers.

Another contributing factor has been mechanization of farming, which has brought about larger agricultural operations and increased output per farmer.

Rural counties, as a whole, have tended to decline in population, whereas urban counties have gained. This trend may be changed to some extent through the development of more industry in Indiana county-seat cities. The number of nonfarmers, those living on 10 acres or less, has increased during the past 10 years.

In 1960, Indiana ranked eights in the Nation in the field of manufacturing.

In area, Indiana is 38th in size in the Nation. However, the strong agricultural economy of the State is reflected in the fact that Indiana placed eighth in recipts from farm marketings.

In total income, the Hoosier State ranked 11th in the Nation, the same as its rank in population. In per capita income, Indiana ranked 22d in the Nation. Its per capita income of $2,198 in 1960 compares with a national per capita of $2,242.

Illustrative of the growth of the Indiana economy is the fact that in 1962 the State has 1,400 more manufacturers, wholesalers, and processors than in 1958.

The rating of the Hoosier State in several industrial fields is: First in musical instruments, prefabricated buildings, biological products and morticians' goods which include caskets; second in veneer mills, book printing, storage batteries, and wood office furniture, and third in steel production aircraft equipment, pharmaceutical preparations, refrigeration machinery, and motors and generators.

It is a major manufacturer, too, of mobile homes, radios and television sets and their parts, household furniture, automobiles and trucks and their parts, railway equipment, structural clay products, and metalworking.

In line with new manufacturing technology, the 10th directory of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, captioned the "Indiana Industrial Directory," includes for the first time such special product classifications as missile components with 18 companies, automation equipment with 8 companies, and propellants with 1 company. It also reflects significant expansions in the electronic and plastics industries.

Recent statistics all underscore the point that the present era in Indiana is one of dramatic economic and social change. Expansion in industry is closely paralleled by progress on the part of the agricultural segment of the State's economy.

Independence Day of the Central African Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Central African Republic, David Dacko; and His Excellency, the Ambassador of the Central African Republic to the United States, Jean-Pierre Kombet, on the occasion of the second anniversary of the Central African Republic's independence.

On August 13, 1962, in the heart of the African Continent, 1 million citizens of the Central African Republic celebrate the anniversary of their national independence. Slightly larger in area than France, this country covers a vast rolling plateau between the Congo and Chad Basins. The area, formerly known as Ubangi-Shari after its two principal rivers, became a French territory in 1894 and a half-century later its peoples became citizens of France. During the summer of 1960 the Central African Republic became a free and independent nation, as did several other former French territories. Its Constitution proclaims the nation's "attachment to the rights of man, to the principles of democracy and of the self-determination of peoples."

President David Dacko, a former teacher and one of the world's youngest heads of state, is leading his people on the road to economic and social development. Increasing recognition of the significance of this newly independent nation is indicated by the fact that the Heads of State Conference of the Afro-Malagasy Union convened in Bangui, capital of the Central African Republic, this past March. The Afro-Malagasy Union includes the Central African Republic and 11 other French-speaking African nations.

President Dacko and a national development committee are striving to coordinate the industrial growth of their country, whose beginnings include the building of a cement factory, plans for a railroad, and programs for the development of hydroelectric power. Efforts are also being made to strengthen the cultivation of cotton, which along with coffee and peanuts provide the main bases for the nation's economy. The educational system of the country is being broadened. We congratulate the people of the Central African Republic on the second anniversary of their independence and salute them for the great tasks in which they are engaged.

REA's 5-Millionth Hookup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, early last month, to be present when a miracle happened, and to participate in a ceremony which symbolized one of the most constructive accomplishments of the American people and their Federal Government.

Out in my State of New Mexico there lives a rancher named John McGuffin. John, and his wife Margaret, and her 87-year-old mother, Mrs. Margaretha Walter, have lived, for the last 20 years on a 12-section spread in a remote red sandhill area of blue sage and broomweed. John McGuffin runs about 90 head of cattle. His place is 30 miles from the nearest town—Tatum—and his nearest neighbor is nearly 5 miles away.

Until last July 2 these three sturdy people lived a life which would shock a good many average Americans. For the most part they went to bed with the chickens, because their only means of illumination after dark was kerosense lamps and lanterns. They used water sparingly, because it was pumped for them by a none-too-reliable windmill. Television was something they had heard about but could not use, because they did not have electricity. Refrigeration was not for them. They kept some beef and fryers in a locker plant at Tatum, and when they wanted to indulge in these delicacies, John McGuffin had to make a 60-mile round trip. Despite crippling arthritis, Mrs. McGuffin scrubbed the family laundry clean on an old-fashioned washboard, and smoothed it with sadirons heated on wood-burning stoves. Their means of communication were negligible, because they had no telephone, and their participation in the broader life of the country and the State was minimal.

The McGuffins and Mrs. Walter are proud, substantial, even heroic American citizens. Independent and resourceful, they met and mastered the challenges of their isolated life, and accepted its special burdens without complaint.

Last July 2 a miracle happened on the McGuffin ranch. The Lea County Electric Cooperative, of Lovington, N. Mex., ran a line 3½ miles out to the McGuffin ranch, and its was electrified. This was the 5-millionth electric hookup to be made by REA-financed rural electric systems. At the same time the Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative—another REA borrower—installed modern dial equipment in the McGuffin home. Within minutes the McGuffins found a whole new way of life, and I was proud to be present, along with REA Administrator Norman M. Clapp and others, at the happy ceremony which marked this occasion. Today, for the first time in their lives, the McGuffins have abundant light and power. They have refrigeration. They have modern kitchen and laundry equipment and appliances. They can communicate. They live safer lives. Their horizons have broadened enormously.

To me, the electrification of the McGuffin ranch is a symbol of governmental responsibility and private initiative at their very best. Back in the philosophy of the Rural Electrification Administration is the principle of area coverage. And it was through the application of this principle of area coverage that the McGuffins finally were able to get electricity. The Lea County Electric Cooperative serves the town of Lovington. In such a populous area the consumer density is relatively high. For some distributors in the electric industry this would mean attractive profits. But REA-financed rural electric cooperatives do not work on the profit principle. They use the relatively high revenues from the populous areas to help offset the cost of extending electric service to the more remote sections. That's what area coverage means. John McGuffin will not have to dip down into his own pocket to pay for those lines which reached out to his remote ranch. He will pay only a modest bill each month.

I believe it will be a source of considerable satisfaction to many of us in Government to know that this 5-millionth hookup of a rural consumer by an REA-financed rural electric cooperative is a symbol of far more substantial achievement. It is a curious fact that, when the REA program first got underway some 27 years ago, many people thought there was no need for it. They said that all the farmers who needed electricity were getting it. At that time only about 11 percent of U.S. farms enjoyed central-station electric service. Today over 97 percent of U.S. farms receive central-station electric light and power, and systems financed by REA furnish service to more than 50 percent of the Nation's farm and other rural establishments.

This service is made possible through self-liquidating Government loans, and in the fall of last year the U.S. Treasury received the billionth dollar in repayment of the principal of these loans. Not only did this represent $172 million in principal payments ahead of due dates, but it was in addition to nearly a half-billion dollars paid in interest.

It should not surprise us to know—but I think that we should note—that the dimensions of the rural electrification challenge are changing. With 97 percent of the Nation's farms electrified the problem is no longer the simple business of running in a line and turning on the lights. The farm and rural resident has learned to live with electricity, and to rely upon electricity in doing his job. The power demands of farm and rural consumers double about every 7 years. This increasing consumer demand for power is a direct reflection not only of the substantial progress of farm and rural people in the United States, but of their attainment of ever-higher standards of living. The pressure of rural electrification is liquidating underprivilege in the remote sections of the Nation, and releasing a constructive dynamic into the economy and the culture of our land, in which we all share.

A quarter-century ago those who said this job did not need doing, were wrong. Today, those who say it is done are equally wrong. It is not done; it is only begun. Certainly the Rural Electrification Administration stands well up among those felicitous mechanisms of Government which contribute simultaneously, importantly, and consistently both to the economic and cultural stability and progress of our Nation.

Economy or Servitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the wording on the cover of the Virginia Masonic Herald.

I am glad to do this at the suggestion of Mr. C. E. Copley, of Richmond, Va., who is desirous of having the quotation from Thomas Jefferson brought to the attention of all of the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the wording was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(The Virginia Masonic Herald, official organ, Grand Lodge A.F. & A.M. of Virginia, July-August 1962)

ECONOMY OR SERVITUDE

"I place economy among the first and the most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with prepetual debt. * * * We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. * * *

"If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

—Thomas Jefferson.

Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Leon Macon, editor of the Alabama Baptist, published by the Alabama Baptist State Convention, wrote several editorials regarding the decision of the Supreme Court. These articles appeared in the Alabama Baptist under dates of July 5 and July 12.

I believe that Mr. Macon's articles are of such importance and are written with such an objective viewpoint that I would like to insert them in the RECORD at this point as I feel that they are very enlightening and certainly do much to enable one to better understand the situation with respect to the separation of church and state and how the Court's decision reflects upon it:

SCHOOL PRAYER DECLARED UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The New York Board of Regents had ruled that the following prayer be uttered at the start of each schoolday: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

Any pupils who did not want to join in the prayer could abstain.

A group of Unitarians, Jews, a member of the Society for Ethical Culture, and one nonbeliever, had appealed to the Supreme Court the New York State court's ruling upholding the prayer. The Supreme Court declared that the Constitution is violated by any legal requirement that a public school teacher lead her pupils in prayer.

Those Supreme Court Justices voting in favor of this decision declared that it is no part of the business of the Government to compose official prayers for any group of American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by the Government. It was argued that any such legislation which requires students to recite a prayer, although undenominational in napower, prestige, and financial support of the Constitution. It was argued that "When the power, prestige and financial support of the Government is placed behind a particular religious belief, indirect coercive pressure is placed on religious minorities."

We should all thank the Supreme Court for this decision simply because such a required prayer is using the Government to establish religion in our public schools. This is in direct conflict with the first amendment which guarantees that there shall be no laws passed regarding the establishment of religion.

We do not believe this ruling forbids prayer in any of our public institutions, the House or the Senate in Washington, or in any of our schools, however, it could lead to this. It is a ruling against the State's requiring a legal prayer to be prayed in our schools and if this stood, then the Federal Government could come in and take over all of our public schools and enforce its will on what is now a State and local prerogative.

For the sake of the separation of church and state, we should all be very happy that this legal requirement for a religious observance in public schools was not upheld.

If we ever have Government-established prayers, this will be used as a precedent by those who want the Government to support their schools with tax moneys. Any emotional reaction against this Supreme Court decision is ill-founded for there is by far more danger to the separation of church and state than any other consideration.

We have our churches in which to teach our children their religious practices and beliefs, and trying to use some State agency to accomplish what the church ought to be doing is a confession that one's particular church program is ineffective. This is a warning for all of our churches to become vitally concerned about all the people and, therefore, to strengthen their program of reaching people for Christ and spreading the gospel among all the people.

There are forces today which would like to see our public schools forced by law to practice religious rites. (Prayer is a religious rite). This would give them precedence to appeal to in order to get Government moneys for their parochial schools. This ruling will do more than anything else to thwart the efforts of those who believe their religious schools should be supported by tax moneys.

RELIGION IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Baptists have always been stanch supporters of our public school system and of the separation of church and state. The public schools grew out of church schools in the early part of our country's history. The task got so large the churches could not handle it and it was turned over to the state.

The prayer required by the New York Regent's office was a written prayer and as far as Southern Baptists are concerned they have not supported this manner of praying. Then, it is not a Christian prayer because Christ's name is not mentioned in it and this is one of the reasons we should not be alarmed over the action of the Supreme Court in declaring this written prayer unconstitutional. Baptists believe in a clean separation of church and state and have endorsed and practiced the policy of training our young people, in the things of religion, at home and in the churches. We must continue to endorse this principle, for any breach of the separation of church and state only acts as a precedent for a wider breakthrough.

President Kennedy has stated that we would have to do more praying in our homes and churches and he is exactly right. If all of our people would be as consistent in their religious life at home and in the churches as they are in seeing that their children go to school, we would have no problem whatsoever in the matter of our young people being trained in the godly concepts.

This decision by the Supreme Court was not antireligion at all but was for the separation of church and state. Its decision applies only to this case and does not involve other cases where religion is involved. The American Civil Liberty Union is a small group of Americans composed of deists, atheists, and others who are taking a major role in trying to eliminate any mention of religion from our public schools. Although we do not believe any kind of religious practice should be required by law, it certainly has become a practice in America to mention the fact of God and relate learning to Him. We do not believe any legislation should be passed eliminating any mention of God in our schools. If Christmas observances, Bible readings, the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and baccalaureate services in our schools are declared illegal, this may be the greatest boon to our churches that has happened recently. There has been too much of a tendency to turn over to some organized secular group the religious observances, teachings and practices of our society. These things can be handled simply and effectively and, at the same time, observe a complete separation of church and state, by the churches inviting graduating classes to one of their services and have them as honored guests. No mention of the school needs to be made, but the occasion would have a better effect because it would be linked with the church. Many of our Baptist churches are honoring their graduates and any of the other graduates who would like to attend, by having some special service in their churches for them. We are supposed to get our religious training and practices in our churches and then go out as individuals into all areas of secular life and permeate it with our Christian living. We frankly state that our people have not been impressed enough about taking their religion into their businesses, social life, politices and other secular areas. At no time should we use the state as a crutch to hold the churches up and to perform their duties.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND LEGALLY REQUIRED PRAYERS

Now that the emotional reaction to the act of the Supreme Court which declared unconstitutional a New York City law requiring a written prayer to be rendered in the public schools each day has ebbed somewhat, we can look more clearly at this decision. In commenting on this decision at a press conference President Kennedy pointed out that this was in violation of the first amendment and that people had their homes and churches in which to pray and that this was the place where the children should be taught to pray. He agreed with the Supreme Court by stating that this required prayer was an establishment of religion in a public institution and that our Constitution forbade this kind of law.

We commend President Kennedy for his loyalty to our way of life in America which is safeguarded by the Constitution. He is showing more intelligence toward the principle of separation of church and state than some other Presidents who have preceded him. From all the positions he has taken in office thus far, he has proved himself to be a loyal American Catholic, which means he is loyal to his church in its religious functions and loyal to the American Constitution. This same thing is true in other countries. Since about 1880, until De Gaulle came to office, the majority of Frenchmen were loyal French Catholics. This meant they were loyal to their church, but wanted the hierarchy kept out of politics and its function limited to religious duties. We believe there are many American Catholics and we would not hesitate to vote for any American Catholic. It is the Roman Catholic we have to beware of for they are extremely loyal to Rome and its claims concerning its rights to be supported by the state and to receive special favors from it.

We believe all of our people should express their appreciation to President Kennedy for his loyal American stand.

There is evidence that those who want to have financial support from the state desired to have this prayer left legal in order that they might point to it as a precedent for getting tax moneys for their own parochial schools and other institutional work.

Any further efforts to reestablish such a law as the New York Board of Regents had will be a mistake. Any efforts to add amendments to the Constitution to overrule the Supreme Court's decision will be a very fatal step toward destroying separation of church and state and eventually religious liberty.

The very fact that two Cardinals and many publications of their group have condemned the Supreme Court's action in this vital area creates a suspicion that they wanted this prayer kept legal for some reason of their own, for they certainly do not believe in public schools or in the prayers non-Catholics might pray. All of us will be better off if we continue to oppose any kind of legal requirement regarding religion in our public agencies.

This was a decision which involved only one case and does not prohibit voluntary prayer in any of our schools, legislatures, or public hospitals, nor does it forbid using inscriptions which refer to God on legal tender.

Let us not be blinded to the efforts of others to achieve their goal of destroying the separation of church and state by making our position indefensible in other areas.

This decision makes it very clear that neither Federal nor State funds may constitutionally be used for the support of parochial schools. We should be very thankful for this decision for it will act as a bulwark against the efforts of religious leaders to get tax moneys to support their church school programs.

The Crime Problem in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleague, Representative FRANK BECKER and, I am sure, the other Members of Congress, the feeling of concern for the crime problem here in the District.

I do not share, however, the feelings of the Washington Post that the sex offender, housebreaker, and three-time rapist who attacked Representative BECKER's aid while she prayed in her church, is the "unfortunate" victim of that tragic event.

Last Friday, I sent them the attached letter and I look forward to their reply with great interest. When I receive it, I will make it available to all the Members.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1962.

THE EDITOR,
Washington Post
1515 L Street NW.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with both interest and a growing sense of confusion, your recent editorial, "Community Failure."

Prior to that time, my heart and sympathies had gone out to the young secretary of my colleague, Representative BECKER, as the unfortunate victim in the recent stabbing in her church. Your editorial, however, describes the three-time rapist and housebreaker as the "unfortunate" party and, like Niobe, you weep for him and not for her.

If there is, indeed, a misfortune here, it is that this animal who has failed in his role as a social being has been allowed to vent his perversions on at least three women and the misfortune is theirs, not his.

You have, in your ultimate sentence, called for the "kind of constructive program that is needed" without defining the program you have in mind. I would like to know the details, with specific reference to your stand on allowing the police to do their job of making Washington clean and putting it in order before it becomes, even more explicitly the Casbah of America.

Sincerely yours,

JOE D. WAGGONNER, Jr.

Resolution Urging Federal Authorities To Require Northeast Airlines To Continue Its Scheduled Flight Services in and Out of the Municipal Airport of the City of Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, airline service in New England, as it affects the smaller communities, has steadily deteriorated year by year until we have reached the point where the city of Lawrence, Mass., with some 71,000 inhabitants in the city proper and several thousands in the suburbs, finds itself in danger of losing service altogether.

This important manufacturing center at one time enjoyed through, nonstop service to and from New York City. That service has been removed and once-a-day shuttle service that makes several stops in Massachusetts and Maine has been substituted. In fact, earlier this year Northeast tried to even eliminate the shuttle service.

This, incidentally, is the same airline company that is seeking the support of the New England delegation in Congress in its bid to be permanently awarded air routes between New York and Boston and Florida.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, recognizing the great danger to the economy and welfare of the Commonwealth should air transportation further dry up, has asked the Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board, through a formal resolution, to take appropriate action to require Northeast to continue serving the Lawrence area, and I insert a copy of the resolution herewith:

RESOLUTION URGING FEDERAL AUTHORITIES TO REQUIRE NORTHEAST AIRLINES TO CONTINUE ITS SCHEDULED FLIGHT SERVICES IN AND OUT OF THE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT OF THE CITY OF LAWRENCE

Whereas the Northeast Airlines has submitted a petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board requesting permission to terminate certain scheduled flights in and out of Richard F. Condon Airport in North Andover, the municipal airport of the city of Lawrence, thereby terminating service for the Lawrence area; and

Whereas hundreds of thousands of dollars of city, State, and Federal funds have been expended in recent years in the enlargement and improvement of said airport, and the Federal Aviation Administration has approved recent expenditures for the development of the airport; and

Whereas the record of airline passengers served from 1952 to 1958 justifies a longer trial period of service by the Northeast Airlines, which company has not fairly tried to promote business in the Lawrence area, particularly in promoting air mail and air freight, nor tried to evaluate the potential of air passenger business in the Lawrence area, notwithstanding the fact that over $2 million has been invested in new facilities at the Lawrence airport during the years 1958–61 on the basis of the resumption of services at said airport by the Northeast Airlines; and

Whereas the suspension of service requested by Northeast Airlines was tentatively allowed by order of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which order was later withdrawn, at which time the Civil Aeronautics Board stated that Northeast Airlines should resume its original schedule of service out of and into the Lawrence airport until the entire matter of Northeast Airline service in the New England area, including Lawrence, be reviewed at a regional airport meeting to be held in August of the current year; and

Whereas it is not in the public interest to allow Northeast Airlines to discontinue flight service at the Lawrence airport, no other substitute service being available: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States and the Civil Aeronautics Board to take such action as may protect the interests of the people of the Lawrence area, and to require Northeast Airlines to continue its services at the Lawrence airport; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, to each Member of the Congress from the Commonwealth, and to each member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Senate, adopted, July 26, 1962.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Philadelphians Defend America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of attending the commissioning ceremony of the U.S. ship *Barney*—DDG–6—on August 11, 1962, at the Philadelphia Naval Base. The commanding officer, Comdr. Joseph J. Doak, Jr., U.S. Navy, is a Philadelphia native who was appointed to the Naval Academy by former Congressman Leon Sacks from the First District of Pennsylvania. The executive officer, Lt. Comdr. Ralph J. Reeder, U.S. Navy, is also a Philadelphian who lives in the present Fifth Congressional District represented by the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., of Philadelphia. This district has been changed by reapportionment and is the new Fourth Congressional District in which I am a candidate for reelection to the 88th Congress. The ship was built by the New York Shipbuilding Corp. of Camden, N.J., which is right across the Delaware River from the Philadelphia Naval Base.

The show was therefore run by Philadelphia, starting a Philadelphia commanding officer, a Philadelphia executive officer, a commission at the Philadelphia Naval Base and a construction across the Delaware River.

I wish to extend my best wishes to the Philadelphians who will defend America and work to keep the world at peace.

Family Financing Discussed in Terms of Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about fiscal myths, real or imaginary. Myths, old or new, are often fascinating in contemplation but may produce dire consequences in operation.

The following parody on some myths, theories, and fundamentals relative to governmental fiscal policy amused me immensely. I woud like to share with my colleagues this piece written by Harry Ferguson and distributed by United Press International.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article as it appeared in the Holland, Mich., Evening Sentinel:

FAMILY FINANCING DISCUSSED IN TERMS OF FEDERAL BUDGET

(By Harry Ferguson)

(NOTE.—Here is a light-hearted discussion of family financing in terms of the Federal budget.)

WASHINGTON.—So OK, I shouldn't have socked her in the eye us being married 10 years with almost no trouble but she's off on this kick about running our budget the way the Government does and when she says I gotta ask for a pay cut to pump money into the economy I let her have it.

She's reading this magazine where it says a woman called Elizabeth Rudel Smith is Treasurer of the United States and signs her name on dollar bills and she says she always knew women was smarter than men and from now on she is going to run our budget.

I got the Yankees at Cleveland on the TV and Donovan has this three and two count on Maris in the top of the fifth with no score and two on so I don't pay much attention when she sticks this piece of paper in front of me and says sign here.

Soon as I sign I can see we're in hock to the building and loan for a thousand bucks and she says, "this is deficit financing and what is good for Uncle Samuel is good for us." I says "what's wrong with our budget now, hundred a week take-home pay which takes care of the mortgage and the installments on the TV and the car and even $5 bucks a week for the savings bank, but she says, "its a balanced budget and under some conditions it's a 'clesshay' to say a balanced budget is good." I says " 'clesshay' or no 'cleeshay' what's the sense of borrowing dough when you're doing OK as is," and she says "make up your mind whether you want to drop anchor or sail on."

So Saturday I'm out in the yard to look at the vegetable garden and nothing ain't been planted and I asked her about it and she says she paid the Elliott boy next door $5 smackers not to plant our vegetables and I says "that's crazy," and she says, "if you don't take acreage out of production you have uncontrollable surpluses and who do you think you are Orville Freeman or Ezra Taft Benson maybe?"

So I'm in front of the TV Thursday night having a beer and humming along with Mitch when she turns it off and says, "We got to talk about balances of payment and it can't wait for the program to finish," I says, "What the hell is balance of payments?" And she says, "It's money going out of the country and coming in and am I just going to sit there listening to Mitch while the U.S. stock of gold is drained away?"

I says, "She and I ain't got no gold to be drained away," and she says, "Ha, ha, that's what you think," and she opens up this box and pulls out a bracelet and necklace and I says, " 'Migawd,' how much did you pay for them?" She says, "420 smackers," and I starts yelling bloody murder and she says, "Shut up, I suppose you would rather see this gold drained away to the Bank of England or one of them Swiss places." I says, "I got just one question to ask," and she says, "Ask not what your country can do for you but what can you do for your country," and slams the door on the way to bed.

So couple days later I'm thinking about going fishing and maybe spending a week of the vacation up in Canada. She says, "No dice on Canada," and I says, "Why not," and she looks at me like I'm a dumb cluck and says something about the external flow of funds. I says, "I don't know what that is but I'm going fishing in Canada." And she says, "You can't spend money in Canada. What we got to do is get people from Canada to come down here and spend money."

I says, "Whose fishing trip is this and who says I can't go to Canada?" and she says, "Shut up, I already spent the fishing trip money," and I says, "For what?" She says, "I sent it to Yugoslavia as part of our foreign aid budget and here you want to go upsetting the balance of payments by running off to Canada when the Commies got to be stopped." I says sarcasticlike, "Sure women is smarter than men but it has been my feebleminded impression that you can't stop the Commies in Yugoslavia because they already own it, and how about that, Madam President?" You can tell she has been reading some books or magazines or papers because she gets a dreamy look in her eye and says, "Who knows when a tiny crack in the Iron Curtain will grow into a gateway to freedom?"

Come the first of the month I says to her, "What about the bills?" and she says, "Everything is OK and taken care of," and I says, "I am not a nosey man but I happen to be the guy earning this money and how's about me seeing the budget?" She says, "There's no use you looking at it because it ain't one of them 'cleeshay' budgets and you wouldn't understand." I says, "Maybe so, but I got a bad feeling we're in the hole what with paying off the building and loan at $98 bucks a month and keeping our gold away from the Swiss yodelers and not planting vegetables and looking for tiny cracks in the Iron Curtain."

She says, "I'll betcha never heard of lifting the debt ceiling," and I says "No" and she says, "well the great United States of America does it all the time and borrows some more money and right now the debt ceiling is $300 umpteen billion if you would like to put that in your pipe and smoke it."

I says, "Thank God you can't get your hands on the withholding or I would have tax trouble with the great United States of America and anyway what has $300 umpteen billion got to do with us?"

She says, "I went to the building and loan and told the man what Mr. Dillon said to Congress about raising the debt ceiling and then I says to the man how about a little raising of the debt ceiling for me and he says why certainly madam would another thousand be all right and just have your husband sign here."

I says, "I ain't gonna sign," and she says, "You better if you know what's good for you because you're going to ask for a pay cut and we gotta have a higher debt ceiling."

I screams, "I ain't going to ask for a pay cut and has she gone clear off her rocker," and she says, "calm down because the Government is thinking about cutting taxes to pump some more money into the economy and that's just like the Government asking for a pay cut." I says, "the only thing I'm going to pump is my fist into your kisser," and that's the true story of why I let her have it after 10 years of matrimony.

Taxes Going Up or Down?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of discussion has been centered recently on the subject of a tax cut—and I believe this evening we find out what decision the administration has reached after launching this discussion. Unnoticed in this discussion is the fact that while there may be a tax cut in the offing, there is certainly a tax increase coming, in fact it has been scheduled.

The Washington Daily News of August 9 reported on this increase. This increase is due in the social security tax and, as the article notes, the increase will be a dollar a month.

I am placing this article, explaining the tax increase that is sure to come, in the RECORD:

TAXES GOING UP, BUT DEFINITELY—REASON: SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Robert Dietsch)

It was during still another congressional discussion on the economy and the effects of a tax cut that Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, brought up an unpleasant reminder: Taxes may not go down next year. But they definitely are going up.

What the gentleman from Missouri was saying—and he is among the majority who will have to be shown the desirability of a quickie tax reduction—is that social security taxes are going up an additional $12 a year.

HOW

This is how the increase works out:

We now pay on the first $4,800 of income. Present rate is 3⅛ percent for employed persons (paid both by employer and employee). This has meant a maximum tax bill of $150 a year for a jobholder.

On January 1, this rate goes up to 3⅝ percent, for a maximum tax bill of $162. As in the past, payments will be withheld.

Self-employed persons now pay 4.7 percent on the first $4,800 they paid themselves, or a maximum of $225.60. This rate goes up to 5.4 percent, or a maximum of $259.20.

It was only last January 1 that social security taxes had their latest rise. The rates are geared to building up adequate reserves.

People-to-People Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of Tuesday, August 7, 1962, includes a report on the university people-to-people movement, originated by my good friend Bill Dawson, a student at the University of Kansas.

Bill Dawson, together with Rick Barnes and Rafer Johnson, have done an outstanding worldwide job of organizing a massive student exchange. I have had independent reports from personal friends of mine in Western Europe of the impact this program is making, and am pleased to include the Christian Science Monitor feature, by Bodfrey Sperling, Jr., at this point, for the benefit of my colleagues here in the Congress:

REPORT FROM THE MIDWEST: PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE FRIENDS

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

KANSAS CITY, MO.—A little more than a year ago a young man at the University of Kansas became concerned over the way foreign students were treated on his campus. As he saw it, both the university and the campus community (Lawrence) should do much more to bring these visitors into the everyday flow of life in America.

This column has previously contained some references to that Kansas University student, young William Dawson: How he and some other students banded together as a welcome committee for the foreign students at Kansas University; how they combed both Lawrence and the State for summer jobs for these visitors, how they found people in Lawrence who would open their homes to the foreign students, how they put in motion all sorts of activities (discussion groups, trips to farms and factories, etc.) as a means for ending the ghetto life of many of these students.

Other students on other campuses have been conscious of the needs of the so-called international student. What makes Bill Dawson unique is that he soon envisioned this as a national program, one in which every college would see to it that the most is made of this great opportunity to mix and make friends with these students from many lands.

Dawson's first step was to sell this as a national project to the people-to-people program, chairmanded by Dwight D. Eisenhower and headquartered here in Kansas City. Under people-to-people auspices Dawson and fellow Kansas University student Rick Barnes, together with Olympic decathlon champion Rafer Johnson, have been carrying on a great organizational drive throughout the country. In 6 months' time these are the results:

The program is now operating in 23 States with more than 600 colleges and universities participating. As a secondary part of the activity 350 "student ambassadors" from 14 Midwestern colleges are currently touring Europe, calling on European graduates of American colleges and spending much time in the homes of European families.

How did this happen so fast? Letters to the Governor of a State, signed by Eisenhower, preceded the visit of Dawson, Barnes, or Johnson. The letter asks the Governor to invite a student representative to attend an organizing conference at the State capitol—the invitations to go to every college and university president in the State. These presidents are asked by the Governor to select a campus leader as the college representative. Then, at the conference, each representative is given a detailed plan for action on his campus.

Thus, very quickly, progress is being made to integrate the some 70,000 foreign students now on American college campuses.

Already these college representatives have reported 4,800 invitations from families to visiting students for weekends, dinners, parties, etc. And there have been 1,000 invitations to visiting students to live with families, free of charge, as "members of the family."

A restaurant owner "adopted" two Philippine students. A fire chief arranged for two students to live at the fire house at no cost. At the University of Kansas 24 fraternities and sororities supplied either free rooms or free meals to at least one visiting student each. And so it goes.

Writes Demitrius Papageorgiou, a student from Greece: "Before people-to-people came to my school, I had never been in an American home. I spent all my vacations on the campus. Now I can go home and tell my friends how Americans really live instead of how I imagined they live."

Another visiting student, Wael Kahaleh, from Syria, writes: "Without my summer job I could not have stayed in school. I shall never forget the kindness of my people-to-people friends."

And a Cyprus student, Costas Kleanthous: "Talking with my people-to-people friends helped me learn and understand the attitudes and customs of all kinds of Americans. It also gave me a chance to explain the culture, customs, and problems of my country to them."

The New Deal-Fair Deal Tradition Versus the Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on August 12 the New York Post published a brief but important editorial which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. This editorial included the statement of former President Harry S. Truman concerning the proposed giveaway of our communications satellite system. The former President has once again, with characteristic frankness, raised his voice to protect the interests of millions of American taxpayers.

I commend the following editorial to my colleagues in both bodies.

MR. TRUMAN COMMENTS

Harry S. Truman is a master of the American idiom. The other day he put his talents to good use in an extraordinarily succinct summary of what is involved in the administration's proposal to give the communications satellite system to the big corporations:

"I don't think the President understands the bill. The damned Republicans and some Democrats are trying to give away public property. The public spent $25 billion or $30 billion developing satellites and the communications system ought to be publicly owned.

"The Republicans will give away everything if you don't watch them."

Progress in Government Financial Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, two separate items lead to the conclusion that at long last some progress is being made in the fight to bring about more businesslike practices into Government operations. The resulting savings to the American taxpayers will be felt for years to come as we benefit more and more from these improved methods of accounting and Government purchasing.

Elimination of overlapping waste and duplication in defense supply operations has for years been of great concern to the Congress. Since World War II and the passage of the National Security Act in 1947, committees and individual Members of both the House and Senate have repeatedly stressed the need for integrating the procurement and supply activities of our military services so as to put an end to the needless and inexcusable waste and duplication in this area of defense spending.

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and the House Government Operations Committee and the Joint Economic Committee have all noted that not only was there a failure to correct duplication of functions and activities in the existing organization structures of the military services, but a more serious failure to recognize that the structure of the military departments had not kept pace with the vastly increased importance of support—supply—activities.

The Hoover Commission was keenly aware of this as reflected in the opening comments of its report on "Business Organization of the Department of Defense" which also pointed out that inadequate recognition was given to the impact of new military support demands on the resources of the Nation, industrial and natural as well as available labor force. The Hoover Commission recommended several programs to reduce costs and to increase efficiency including compliance with congressional mandate to integrate common supply and service activities of the military departments, and improvement of financial management and control.

Under Public Law 84–863, which I introduced in the House of Representatives, major progress has been made to implement this last program, not only in the Department of Defense but throughout the Government.

The Bureau of the Budget has informed me that following the enactment of Public Law 84–863, they initiated a long-range financial management improvement program. This governmentwide effort was directed toward effective implementation of the legislation. When the program began, the 1957 budget included cost budget presentations for just four appropriations. In contrast, over two-thirds of the appropriations items in the 1962 budget—representing 412 accounts—were presented in terms of cost. Those accounts covered programs involving about $35 billion in budget expenditures and $16 billion in trust fund expenditures. In the 1963 budget, about 25 more appropriations were converted to the cost basis. Good progress is continuing.

Looking just at the Department of the Army, we see that improved accounting systems have been put into effect to some degree in the accounts of the Corps of Engineers, operations and maintenance, military construction, and property accounting. Cost based budgeting is now complete for operations and maintenance, and military construction.

Similar improvements can be noted in the Departments of the Air Force and Navy.

During the past month, I have been more than pleased to read Secretary of Defense McNamara's report on the Defense Department's costs-reduction program and an article about the new single Defense Supply Agency which he established. The article appears in the Review, published by the National Defense Supply Association.

The Secretary's key to increased efficiency and economy is the reduction in operating costs through integration and standardization of supply operations and through this, the elimination of overlapping and duplication in existing supply systems of the military services. His chief means of accomplishing this was the establishment of a single Defense Supply Agency reporting directing to him.

What Secretary McNamara has done is in keeping with the often-expressed intent of the Congress, and almost exactly in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The savings resulting directly from the Secretary's action is estimated at $750 million for fiscal year 1963 alone, and he has estimated that within 5 years the annual savings in the Department's supply operations will be at least $3 billion.

Certainly this program of the Secretary of Defense deserves the wholehearted support of the Congress and the American people.

Every effort must be continued to bring about further savings wherever possible so that our Defense Establishment, and every other agency of Government, will get the fullest value for each tax dollar spent and the American people, who must pay these bills, will know their money is being used wisely and for the purposes for which the Congress directed.

Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials point to Secretary McNamara's actions, and I ask that they be printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 13, 1962]

TRIMMING OFF DEFENSE FAT

Much has been said and written about strengthening our defense posture through improvements which necessarily involve huge expenditures. Not enough has been said, however, about measures being taken to increase defense strength without adding a penny to the soaring military budgets. In fact, the miracle of more arms at less cost is being achieved by the simple process of ridding the Defense Department of budgetary fat in the form of administrative overlapping, conflict and other waste. President Kennedy's recent praise of Defense Secretary McNamara for this dollar-saving fitness program was thoroughly justified.

That the fat-trimming operations are of no mean proportions can be seen from the President's comment that within the next 5 years a total of $3 billion can be cut from the defense budgets, with savings of $750 million estimated for fiscal 1963. And these savings will be effected without touching any funds earmarked for missiles, ships, planes, or other military equipment. On the contrary, more dollars will be made available to put more muscle into America's defense structure.

The area in which the fat-slicing program will be concentrated is one in which the Hoover Commission found gross and senseless waste of Federal funds, namely, in the field of logistics. Carrying out an authorization by Congress under the Curtis-McCormack legislation, Secretary McNamara has taken steps to consolidate and coordinate defense buying, selling, and distribution of supplies. This move, recommended by the Hoover Commission, by the Controller General and by various public and private committees, already has eliminated much duplication of procurement among the military agencies.

Mr. Kennedy stressed that 70 percent of defense appropriations go for logistics, the military term for such varied activities as purchasing, construction, operating depots, and bases, maintenance, transportation and communications. This is indeed a fertile field for waste, as numerous congressional inquiries have shown, and consequently it is also a fertile field for effecting substantial economies. And Mr. McNamara is especially well qualified to put the sprawling Defense Establishment on a more efficient, businesslike basis of operation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 9, 1962]

MCNAMARA'S STRONG HAND

Defense Secretary McNamara is making hay for the taxpayers.

After 17 months in office, he is managing the biggest military program in peacetime. Yet he now can account for $750 million which wasn't spent, but would have been spent under old pre-McNamara methods.

He thinks his new systems can save $3 billion a year within the next 5 years, without stinting. Judging by the long record of waste and mistakes which have been common in defense spending since the big war—and before—this probably is a modest guess.

Although the job of revamping the way the Pentagon is run is complex and no doubt frustrating, Mr. McNamara's policies are simple enough.

He doesn't think mere spending will make the country strong militarily. He thinks it is even stronger if it doesn't buy what it doesn't absolutely need. And what it buys should be obtained at "the lowest possible cost."

These are ordinarily used business practices, but they haven't exactly permeated the Defense Department, or any other part of the Government. Efficient practices are even more important in the Defense Department, because it spends the most, and because every wasted dollar and every man sitting on his haunches is the same as a dollar or a man surrendered to the enemy.

This is Charlie Wilson's old "more bang for a dollar" theory, at which some anti-Wilson partisans used to scoff. Only Mr. McNamara has refined it, put some punch in it, and apparently is making it stick.

It is indeed, as President Kennedy said, "vital" to maintain a military force competent to keep us secure. But also, he said, "it is vital to our economic health that we operate this force at the lowest cost possible." That second vital point has been too much neglected.

Elvis Stahr, who has just quit his job as Army Secretary (under Mr. McNamara) to get back to his earlier career as a university president, has given out a "now-that-I'm-out-of-office" interview. He said Mr. McNamara is the "ablest" but he feared the Defense Department was being overly centralized. His idea seemed to be that when Mr. McNamara is gone there won't be another like him to run the place.

We think this is a risk the country well can afford. Mr. McNamara is one of the best things that has happened to Washington since the national debt was small enough for all of us to understand. If he can get this sprawling apparatus to working right, it may become a habit—and we really will get "more bang for a buck."

Human Rights—What Are They?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be asked to vote on the proposal to permit the purchase of U.N. bonds.

It is well for us from time to time to examine the various facets of the U.N. and a recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune casts an interesting light on a matter which should be given considerable public attention.

I submit for the RECORD the editorial entitled "Human Rights—What Are They?" which appeared in the August 9 edition:

HUMAN RIGHTS—WHAT ARE THEY?

Dr. Jose Miro Cardona, who was Castro's first Premier but is now head of a Cuban revolutionary council in opposition to his onetime boss, thought to do something about the miserable conditions under which political prisoners are confined in Cuban dungeons. So he lodged an appeal with the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations.

That august body, which some years ago drew up an ambitious "declaration of human rights," answered Miro's plea with the staggering statement, "This Commission on Human Rights recognizes that it does not have the faculties to make any declaration in relation to human rights."

That could mean that the Commission does not have the ability, the power, or possibly the brains to say or do anything useful about human rights, and that any effort on its part to do so would be sterile and without result. If so, what is its reason for pretending to be in business at all?

Honors for Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been enriched from time to time in having among its leaders men who can, from any criterion, be called great. One of these is Herbert Hoover. No recognition can be too great for the work Hoover has done for his country and for the world. An editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 10 expresses the deep feelings which America feels for the former President and senior statesman. I wish to join with the Globe-Democrat, the two great universities of the St. Louis area and, indeed, with every American in honoring Herbert Hoover and celebrating the 88th birthday of this great man.

The editorial follows:

HERBERT HOOVER AT 88

Today, one of the truly great men in the history of the world, Herbert Hoover, humanitarian and former President of the United States, celebrates his 88th birthday at his birth place in West Branch, Iowa, where he will dedicate the Herbert Hoover Library which will house most of the papers of his Presidency.

Missouri will have at least a small part in honoring this great citizen when two great Missouri universities, Washington University and the University of Missouri, confer on President Hoover his 87th and 88th honorary degrees, part of the sum total of honors unequaled in history.

The two Missouri awards have special significance in that this is the first time either university has ever broken its ancient rule of conferring an honorary degree away from its own campus. Our State honors itself by honoring Mr. Hoover.

The Hoover Library is but one of many benefactions of the former President. Another is the justly famed Hoover Institution of War, Revolution and Peace on the campus of Stanford University, which has the world's greatest collection of documents bearing on the seeds of war and revolution and the prospects for peace.

Perhaps President Hoover's greatest service is his work of unparalleled brilliance in feeding the starving nations of the world following the close of World War I and for several years thereafter, and his similar efforts following World War II.

There are literally hundreds of thousands of persons—perhaps millions—in friendly countries and enemy lands who are alive today because of Mr. Hoover's herculean aid programs in those periods of unparalleled crisis.

Of almost equal importance is the brilliant concept and administration of the

Hoover Commission, whose task forces have saved an estimated $5 billion over the past 15 years by making Government more economic and efficient.

For all of his services on behalf of his fellow man, Herbert Hoover has never accepted one cent of compensation and has turned all of his salaries over to charity.

At 88 the "Chief," as he is known to his legion of friends and admirers, is hale, hearty and vitally alive to the needs of his Nation and the world. He puts in a prodigious daily schedule of writing, editing and conveying his views—a routine which would tax the energies of far younger men.

The American people congratulate Herbert Hoover on this noteworthy birthday and wish him many, many more. Most of all, the Nation he has served so long and so well rejoices that the "Chief" has been spared to see the universal esteem and admiration of all mankind in which he is held today.

Never has one man been so unjustly accused in earlier times. Never has any man's wisdom and service been more fully recognized and hailed than that of Herbert Hoover.

Nuclear Test Concessions and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following statement, recently issued by Governor Rockefeller of New York, is of great import to all our people.

The nuclear test concessions made by this administration may be dangerous in the extreme.

The Governor asks many questions which are all deserving of an answer. It is well to remember that the U.S.S.R. has never been impressed by weakness, but does respond to strength. Every concession we have made has been met by further and harsher demands.

The Governor does well to bring all this to the attention of the American people now. Tomorrow may be too late.

NUCLEAR TEST CONCESSIONS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Nelson A. Rockefeller)

With the Atomic Energy Commission's announcement on August 6 concerning the resumption of Soviet nuclear testing, I am compelled by conscience and a sense of public responsibility which is rooted in my deep concern for the national security to speak out at this time.

I feel all the more compelled to do so because our Government seems to be in the process of making decisions in regard to this matter, which may well prove to be irrevocable, with virtually no public discussion of the facts and issues involved. I feel a subject as important as this in terms of our national security deserves full discussion. To discuss the subject intelligently requires a detailed analysis.

On August 5, the Soviet Union exploded a nuclear device reported to be at least 40 megatons. This was preceded by a number of similar Soviet tests during the previous week, according to the AEC announcement, and these tests have since continued.

During the same time period, the United States concluded its own test series except for two or three high altitude tests which could not be carried out because of the failure of equipment. The President has announced that he would make a decision about holding these after the launching pad for the missiles has been repaired.

There have been persistent reports that the United States is preparing a new proposal for a test ban embodying substantial concessions. The President has said that instead of international control posts on Soviet territory, we are prepared to accept "national control posts" (which means Soviet-manned control posts) under some undefined form of international supervision on Soviet territory. He has indicated that we are prepared to reduce the number of inspections of suspicious events contained in our previous plan.

I must express my concern about these developments. Of course, our leaders must do everything in their power to explore all honorable means for bringing about a peaceful world. However, in doing so, it is well to keep in mind a few basic principles:

(a) Our nuclear power—awesome as it is—has assured the peace of the world for the past decade and a half. The survival of freedom depends on our maintaining our relative nuclear strength and capability. If we fall behind, the future of freedom would be in mortal peril.

(b) While we must at all times show respect and consideration for world opinion, we cannot risk our security for ephemeral propaganda victories. For the security of those nations that form world opinion depends on our unimpaired strength.

(c) An agreement to ease tensions is highly desirable. But agreement for the sake of agreement must never become an end in itself.

(d) Our leaders have an obligation to inform the people fully and frankly of the issues involved.

With this as a background, I am impelled to state my concerns with respect to nuclear testing.

In his speech of March 2, 1962, the President explained why continued testing is essential for the security and survival of the United States. Antimissile defenses are complicated. We know that the Soviets are working on them. We cannot risk falling behind in this field, for to do so could be as serious as if we lost our strategic striking power.

The development of more efficient warheads requires experimentation. The same is true for tactical nuclear weapons.

In the light of the President's own statement that the test series would be confined to those explosions which were absolutely necessary in the interests of national security, I cannot understand the hesitation about completing the high altitude tests which originally were scheduled but which could not be carried out because of the malfunction of the Thor missile. Why should the failure of an experiment make it less necessary? What new factors cause us to hesitate to conduct a test considered essential 2 months ago? Is it wise to show so much hesitation in completing a test series forced upon us by the brutal Soviet abrogation of a moratorium which we ourselves had observed?

Beyond this immediate problem, there is the more serious question raised by new U.S. concessions about the test ban treaty itself.

In the last 18 months, we have moved steadily towards the Soviet position. We used to demand 21 international inspection stations within the Soviet Union. This number was reduced to nineteen early in the Kennedy administration. The President has now indicated that we are prepared to accept national (Soviet-manned) inspection stations under some for of international supervision.

What exactly does this mean? What has happened to change our earlier view, consistently held for 4 years, that national control posts and international supervision are incompatible? The American people are entitled to know the full facts.

We used to demand the right to inspect an adequate number of unidentified seismic disturbances. Early in the Kennedy administration, we agreed to limit these inspections to 20 out of perhaps 100 unidentified events of a certain magnitude. (The number of unidentified events is, of course, much larger if muffling is used.) Now the President has indicated that we are ready to consider further reductions.

The Kennedy administration has already accepted a moratorium of 36 months on all explosions below the threshold of dection, modifying the earlier proposal of having the moratorium last only until the test ban went into effect (somewhat less than 27 months). It has agreed to parity on the proposed Control Commission and to a Soviet veto over the budget of this Commission. Thus, the Soviets could wreck the inspection system by the simple device of refusing to vote funds.

We used to demand a joint research program for detecting underground explosions of a magnitude for which existing seismic equipment is inadequate. Nothing has been said about this, nor about testing in outer space for which detection is immensely difficult and for which no concrete plan has ever been agreed upon during the 4 years of negotiation with the Soviet Union.

This continual weakening of our position has been accompanied by a growing Soviet intransigence which has seen the Soviets withdraw many points already agreed to. This is no accident. Why should the Soviets accept any U.S. proposal when every refusal elicits a new U.S. offer? What is the penalty for obduracy and deceit when even after the Soviets abrogated the moratorium last year, we have continued to move toward the Soviet position? How often do we have to pay for the same Soviet agreement? In 1958 the Soviets agreed to international inspection—indeed, this was the prerequisite for negotiations on the test ban. The principle was not challenged for 3 years. It was withdrawn by the Soviets after the first series of concessions by the Kennedy administration in March 1961. Now the President has said that we are considering making further concessions to obtain Soviet agreement to a provision they had accepted 4 years ago.

The Soviet abrogation of the moratorium should cause us to demand new safeguards for a test ban treaty instead of weakening already inadequate controls. We do not know whether the Soviets tested secretly during the period of the moratorium—because we had no certain means of finding out. We do know that they must have prepared their test series for at least a year, while continuing to profess to be interested in a treaty. We also know that their research program must have been pushed for longer than that. During that period we refrained from similar preparations. There is no question that the moratorium enabled the Soviets to reduce the margin of our nuclear superiority considerably. This is another way of saying that over the past few years, the Soviets have moved at a more rapid rate in their nuclear development than we.

All of this should cause thoughtful citizens to ask the following questions:

(a) With respect to our own test series: In our short Pacific test series did we develop an adequate missile defense? Did we learn how to penetrate Russian defenses? Does the continued interplay between defense and countermeasure require continued experimentation? Do we need more basic information concerning missile defense? Will the lessons of the last test series lead to an urgent need for new information? Can our defenses be adequate without continued operational tests? Did we in our test series experiment with decoupling—the muffling of underground explosions in large cavities—in order to learn how the Soviets might evade a test ban treaty? Do we know all the answers on the effect of high-altitude nuclear explosions on our communcations systems—maintenance of which is essential for our military defenses to work?

(b) With respect to the test ban treaty: Is it safe for us to stop testing completely? What guarantees do we have that the treaty we are now proposing will *not* result in the Soviets breaking it as they abrogated the moratorium? What is to prevent the Soviets from using a treaty, as they used the moratorium, to prepare a new series? What safeguards do we propose to prevent secret preparations for such contingencies? What do we propose to do about underground testing in the low kiloton range for which existing seismic equipment is inadequate even if no decoupling is used? What about tests in outer space?

There has been considerable public discussions of improved methods to detect underground shots. On the other hand, a release from the Department of Defense dated July 7 mentions factors both helping and impeding detection:

(a) There appear to be substantially fewer earthquakes that produce signals equivalent to an underground nuclear explosion of given yield than had heretofore been expected. This helps detection.

(b) Detection methods using instruments in abandoned cased oil wells, using surface arrays of seismic instruments or employing ocean-bottom seismometers at great depths, have been explored. These methods have been known for 3 years. There has been recently real, though small, progress.

(c) It became clear that uncertainties of seismic travel-times can cause the location of seismic or nuclear events to fall outside the 75 square mile area which had been considered the area of uncertainty. This complicates inspection.

(d) It was found that alluvial soil muffles the distant seismic signal 5 to 10 times over a similar shot in volcanic tuff (the substance in which most of our early underground shots were fired), while salt or granite increases the signal by a factor of two. This adds a new possibility of evasion which has not yet been studied.

The helpful factors in detection are yet to be confirmed. But even if one grants that smaller numbers of confusing earthquakes and better instruments increase detection efficiency by a factor of 10 or more, the decoupling in a big hole and the cheap decoupling in alluvial soil are likely to continue to frustrate detection of small explosions. It continues to be highly probable that shots under 10 kilotons can be hidden and shots under 1 kiloton will escape detection altogether.

In short, weakening the proposals of March 1961 by the Kennedy administration even further seems to me to run a high risk of endangering our national security.

The problems of the nuclear age are real and grim. We have a duty to deal with them earnestly and with an awareness of their gravity. We must not be governed by considerations of short-term popularity nor become the prisoners of our anxieties. We must distinguish between the tactical and the fundamental. We need the courage to face the hard realities of our problems and to do what is necessary to preserve the peace and security of all free peoples.

For Some Times Have Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in 1935 the California Medical Association, a constituent member of the American Medical Association, adopted a resolution favoring legislation "to establish a health insurance system, mandatory as to certain population groups and voluntary as to certain population groups." The health insurance recommended by the California doctors in 1935 was not limited to the aged but was to be available to all persons unable "to adequately finance the cost entailed by illness."

In 1962, however, the California Medical Association was obediently in step with its parent group in opposing the very moderate health insurance program proposed in the King-Anderson bill.

The citizens of California, and indeed the Nation, well might wonder what led to the change of heart of the California Medical Association. The reasons for the group's 1935 position are all the more compelling today with medical care costs zooming upward out of sight of an increasingly large number of Americans, particularly among the elderly.

The subject is discussed in the following recent editorial of the Sacramento Bee which I now would like to commend to my colleagues:

FOR SOME TIMES HAVE CHANGED

"Whereas studies have shown the inability of a certain percentage of our population to adequately finance the cost entailed by illness; and

"Whereas because of this economic situation proper medical care is beyond the reach of this population group; and

"Whereas it has been established that this problem can be alleviated by the utilization of the insurance principle: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That legislation be proposed seeking to establish a health insurance system, mandatory as to certain population groups and voluntary as to certain population groups * * *."

This resolution was adopted not by a Communist convention, by crackpots or by those who would destroy the hallowed doctor-patient relationship but by the California Medical Association on March 3, 1935.

What occasioned the resolution was a bill pending in the legislature setting up a State health insurance system financed by employer contributions amounting to 5 percent of the wages of each employee.

This was in the midst of the great depression and doctors were suffering economically as were all other citizens. The California Medical Association resolution stipulated that "the patient shall receive adequate treatment and his physician shall receive adequate compensation."

Times have changed considerably since 1935, in many respects. But as constant as the passage of time itself is the fact that, now, as then, proper medical care is beyond the reach of a certain percentage of our population. Apparently this truth which the doctors recognized in 1935 somehow has escaped them in 1962.

J.F.K. Tries To Pack Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming majority of Americans believe in government of and by the people, as well as government for the people. Representative government is under attack today by a radical minority who would reduce the legislative branch to the status of a rubber stamp for nonelected bureaucrats. Our system of checks and balances is the most effective vehicle for advancing the cause of individual human freedom and opportunity.

The following article from a recent issue of the Minneapolis Star is a fine analysis of existing legislative-executive relationships in Washington:

J.F.K. TRIES TO PACK CONGRESS: HE PERSISTS IN REGARDING IT AN INSTRUMENT OF WHITE HOUSE

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Congress lacks confidence in the methods and measures proposed by the Kennedy administration—entirely aside from its annoyance with what it considers juniors in the White House who are trying to rehash and rerun old ideas as if they were brilliant new conceptions.

The Kennedy people are doing their best to innovate. But they progress slowly through the various prenatal stages and have not yet arrived at a maturity of ideas which could be described as truly modern. It is all the more discouraging that they do not know this but think that the revival of 30-year-old Rooseveltian methods and Keynesian doctrine is innovation because they have attached some different words to it.

Now it is coming to be Kennedy doctrine that the U.S. Congress is not representative of the people, is overburdened with conservative and rural representation and stands in the way of progress because of a hateful combination of midwestern Republican and southern Democratic Members.

In some circles it is accepted as divine truth that if there were a square deal in congressional representation there would be a vast upsurge in liberal sentiment in Congress. A detailed and careful study by the private publication, Congressional Quarterly, has exploded this myth. Furthermore, it simply is not true that rural representatives are always conservative, and city representatives always liberal.

What seems to be nearer to the mark about Congress, particularly the House of Representatives, is that it is under the control of its senior Members who have had many years of experience. They have dealt with many Presidents, considered many reforms, survived many crises.

President Kennedy has adopted an insupportable attitude toward Congress on the issue he chooses for a big national test, the medicare question. It is his contention that the Republicans and a handful of Democrats killed the bill; therefore it is necessary to replace the Republicans.

However, Mr. Kennedy passes over as not worthy of comment the central fact that Senator ROBERT S. KERR, the wealthy Oklahoma Democrat, led the opposition to medicare. Mr. Kennedy has been showering KERR with blandishments for a long time in an effort to charm the Oklahoman into support for Kennedy programs.

Nor does Mr. Kennedy comment on the opposition to medicare of the best man at his wedding, Senator Smathers, of Florida, of whom it is said that the only time he ever stood up for Mr. Kennedy was at his wedding. Incidentally, Smathers entered Congress as a young liberal and trod the ancient path onward to conservatism.

Mr. Kennedy's position is insupportable in other ways. He thinks that just a little swing toward the Democrats in the congressional election will change the whole atmosphere in Congress. This would change Senator Byrd or frighten Senator Talmadge?

But, beyond all these contradictions, the most insupportable aspect of Mr. Kennedy's position is that he can impose party discipline, as in the House of Commons, to force Congress to adopt his programs.

Congress is not and never was intended to be the instrument of the political party in power in the White House. It is a separate branch of the Government. It is not like the British Parliament and was never intended to be like it. Mr. Kennedy knows this well enough.

Yet, it is the persistent tone of the Kennedy administration that Congress is or ought to be the instrument of the party in power. And so it can be heard here that the way Congress works is out of date, its old men obstruct progress, it is overburdened with rural representatives, and the opposition party has got to be reduced in strength so that the Kennedy Democrats can prevail over the conservative Democrats.

All this grows from a misconception of the function of Congress, and of its real makeup.

This should be borne in mind when President Kennedy starts to campaign this fall to defeat Republicans who opposed medicare and elect Democrats who will support it, presumably ignoring both the Republicans who support medicare and the Democrats who oppose it.

West New Guinea Changes Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, certainly the problems that we continue to face in foreign affairs are magnified when action on the part of our State Department actually works against the best long-range interests of our citizens, our Nation, our allies, and the cause of freedom. I submit for the Record an editorial which I feel very effectively describes the circumstances surrounding the New Guinea controversy, "West New Guinea Changes Hands," which appeared in a recent edition of the Chicago Daily News:

West New Guinea Changes Hands

A plan has been worked out whereby Indonesia can take West New Guinea without fighting for it. But it was a near thing. President Sukarno of Indonesia seemed to prefer a fight.

There is no good reason why Indonesia should have West New Guinea except that Sukarno wants it to enlarge his misgoverened island empire. A transfer from Dutch administration to Indonesian merely puts a new face on colonialism. And in the long run the native Papuans will probably be worse off for the exchange.

The real gainers, in a materialistic sense, are the Dutch. New Guinea is no bonanza as a colony. It has cost the Dutch millions which can be more profitably used at home.

It is nonetheless a blow to Dutch pride to lose the last remnant of their East Indian empire. They were prepared to educate the stone age islanders, and eventually give them independence, rather than hand them over to Indonesia.

The compromise now worked out provides for a short period of United Nations trusteeship, followed by Indonesian administration beginning next May. Indonesia also guarantees a plebiscite by 1969 in which the Papuans can choose independence or annexation by Indonesia.

But it is too much to expect that Sukarno will consent to cut the primitive area loose once he has his hands on it. He is a rabid "anticolonialist" when the term applies to European nations, but is perfectly willing to acquire colonies of his own.

In any case, the Dutch are well out of it with a partial saving of face. And if Sukarno inherits more headaches than he bargained for, it couldn't happen to a more deserving guy.

The Crisis in Our Girl Scout Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include an article by Edith Kermit Roosevelt appearing in the Santa Ana, Calif., Register, Monday, July 2, 1962.

The article deals with the attempt to concentrate control of the Girl Scouts of America under one centralized organization, thus destroying the local control and authority heretofore governing the local Girl Scout councils. I think this movement is dangerous, and should be resisted by the local councils of the Girl Scouts of America.

The article follows:

Between the Lines: The Crisis in Our Girl Scout Movement

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

In its half century of life the Girl Scouts have become as sacred an image in our national life as motherhood or the flag.

Girl scouting offers a well-rounded program of activities for girls through high school age. Its national leaders proclaim the program rests on a foundation of dedicated workers. But the urge to collectivize and to wield arbitrary power which now characterizes our super-government has spread to this fine volunteer organization. It is leading to cases of bureaucratic mismanagement, a loss of local funds and even to walkouts by disgruntled local councils.

The "green umbrella" that is casting its shadow over girl scouting is council coverage, an obscure term which describes a scheme to consolidate the Girl Scout councils being aggressively promoted by the Girl Scouts' national board of directors.

The plan combines so-called small councils and lone troop councils into larger areas of jurisdiction—some of them embracing whole States, such as Wyoming and Utah. The national board has announced that the goal for "full coverage" is December 31, 1963, when it is hoped the number of councils will be reduced to 800.

How far the plan has progressed since 1945 when the "green umbrella" idea was first proposed can be seen by the fact that there were then more than 1,600 councils serving about half the present enrollment of more than 3 million Girl Scouts. Today, there are only 900 councils.

The national board has carefully smothered all publicity about the little spat between us girls. But communities all over the country—especially in the South and the West—are hot and bothered about what some Scout leaders call a "move to nationalize the country's youth movements."

In an outstanding series of articles in the Register, Mrs. Cora Ulrich gave a roundup of "green umbrella" battles taking place all over the Nation.

Councils with proposals to rescind "council coverage" include Scarsdale-Hartsdale in Westchester, N.Y., Oklahoma City and Oklahoma County, Stillwater, Olka., the Moore County Girl Scout Council Inc., Damas, Tex., and Glendale, Tioga, Anaheim and Newport Harbor in California. These councils have a deadline of July 2 if they wish their proposals to be placed on the agenda of the October 1963 Girl Scouts National Council meeting more than a year later.

What are some of the objections to "council coverage" voiced by local Scout leaders in Missouri, New Mexico, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota and elsewhere?

For one thing, there are distances involved in reporting to central offices.

Mrs. Harvey Walk, Girl Scout Council president in Anaheim, says that last year alone she ticked off 12,000 miles in her scouting activities, most of it just in Anaheim. Now they want to absorb Anaheim under a "green umbrella" which would embrace Whitter as well.

Secondly, under the plan local councils no longer will have boards of directors. The administration will be turned over almost entirely to paid trained professionals. But wasn't the Girl Scouts founded on the claim that scouting is voluntary?

In the past much of the scouting activities were financed by the sale of cookies and calendars, but a costly big central bureaucracy has changed all that. In 1960 the national budget figures reached $6,174,928.

The little troop treasuries are being drained to pay salaries for a professional staff and office expenses. In 1960 the National Council received $3,572,801 in membership dues. But of this sum $1,613,509 went for field services. Program planning and personnel training, which might be claimed to benefit troops, eventually amounted to $1,239;287.

Can those who oppose decisions by the national board make their views known? At present, the national council can only make recomendations to the national board of directors. When adult scouters all over the Nation question the policies central headquarters in New York send out the word they are being reactionary. The June issue of the Leader, official Girl Scout magazine, asks these loaded self-test queries: "Are you against change? How long since you tried a new flavor of ice cream?"

But some council leaders agree that "concentration of power kills liberty." A spokesman for the Camp Fire Girls Inc. in New York told this writer that 21 Girl Scout Councils in Oklahoma, Texas, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, and Kansas have transfered their programs to the Camp Fire Girls lock, stock, and barrel "because they wished local autonomy."

A constructive middle ground proposal has been initiated by the Ramsey, N.J., Girl Scouts Council, Mrs. Joseph Sage, council president, said her council had initiated a proposal for consideration at the national meeting which would: Allow existing councils who meet traditional national criteria to keep their charters as long as they so desire; assure that no council should forcibly be required to join enlarged or changed jurisdictions unless the local voting membership wants to do so; provide that the national board create a plan for and encourage the establishment of voluntary intercouncil cooperation.

As Mrs. Sage expresses it: "Dissenting councils have no objection to making the Girl Scout program available to every girl in the United States. They do object to the enforced change of jurisdiction centralization of power, finance, communications, training, and services."

Do American parents believe that the green umbrella scheme will help their children develop the self reliance that has been a tradition in the Nation's scouting program?

Taxes 162 Percent Higher Than in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Greenfield, Ind., Daily Reporter:

Taxes 162 Percent Higher Than in World War II

Congressman Earl Wilson, of the Indiana Ninth District, is among the most vocal of our current Washington Representatives, and, judging from what he says and writes, much that he sees doesn't please him.

This week he goes at quite a length concerning the increase in Federal taxes, particularly as they effect Hoosiers. He says in part:

"Your Federal taxes last year were 162 percent higher than during the peak World War II period 19 years ago, and they are going to go even higher next year. Think of it. Federal taxes have been raised an average of 8.5 percent every year for the past 19 years, and they're climbing higher every day.

"Despite the fact that the average Indiana family of three paid out $1,393 in Federal taxes last year, the Government ended that year almost $7 billion in the red. This simply means that your higher taxes still didn't pay all the bills. It also means higher taxes next year to pay higher interest on your constantly growing Federal debt, as well as more taxes for more socialistic programs.

"The facts of this taxation treadmill are these, and they are corroborated by the Internal Revenue Service: Indiana taxpayers last year paid Uncle Sam a total of $2,173,706,624.67—this was over $85 million more than was collected in the previous year and illustrates the constantly escalating tax bite taken out of your dollar.

"It is just as certain as 'death and taxes' that this Federal tax payment must be raised again next year. Hurried, prodded, whipped, and driven by the fuzzy-brained liberal thinkers of the New Frontier, the Government will spend more money this year than last. This means higher taxes. It is already estimated that the average family of three will pay $250 more in taxes next year as a result of this 'squandermania.'

"Where are we headed? To know where we are going we should first study where we have been. 'What is past is prologue' is written on the facade of the National Archives here in Washington, and it details the disgraceful squandering of tax money over the years. In 1944, the peak wartime year of World War II, a total of $807,012,292 was taken out of Indiana in Federal taxes. Last year's total Federal collection was $1,366,690,331 above that 1944 figure—an increase of 162 percent in 19 years. The enormity of the increase becomes even more apparent when you recall that in 1944 we were paying for the most expensive war in history. Yet while we are now ostensibly at peace, it costs 162 percent more to run the Federal Government. Back in 1944 the average Hoosier family paid Federal taxes of $230 per person. Compare that to today's peacetime load.

"This is the record of the past. The forecast for the future is clear. If taxes increase another 162 percent in the next 19 years, Indiana's Federal tax load will rise to $5.5 billion—over $3,600 per year in Federal taxes for the average family of three (based on current census figures).

"This will not happen because either national bankruptcy and ruin will have occurred or the people will have revolted at the polls and refuted the big spending policies of the ultraliberals.

"The only alternative to the financial chaos that is inevitable if we continue as at present is a tightening of the Federal budget and a return of fiscal sanity to Government administration. This will come about only when the people protest big spending to a degree sufficient to replace the big spenders with leaders of frugal fiscal temperament. Until that happens the Washington watchword will continue to be 'send more so we can spend more.'

"Thrifty legislators can halt this ever-growing, ever-demanding monstrosity I call Government by bureaucracy, but they must be men who will stand on principle, who will listen to the people back home, and who will not knuckle under to convenience or pressure. They must refuse to rubber-stamp every socialistic idea that pops out of some intellectual's head."

Dirksen Denies Ike Ate Evidence of Estes Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Billie Sol Estes case has again demonstrated that Texans do things in a big way whether it is name-dropping, kiting assets, storing grain, demonstrating the follies of the cotton law, bragging of political influence, or a multitude of other aspects of human behavior. The case has many strange and mysterious aspects but none more mysterious than the case of the Eisenhower cow.

I submit for your attention a newspaper story from the Bakersfield Californian of August 8, 1962, dealing with this incident:

Humor Columnist's Story: Dirksen Denies Ike Ate Evidence of Estes Gift

Washington.—Senate Republican leader Everett M. Dirksen today read the Senate a denial of a humor columnist's report that Billie Sol Estes gave Former President Eisenhower a gift steer.

The Illinois Senator read the text of a letter from Bryce N. Harlow, an Eisenhower administration White House aid, denying there was any such gift.

The letter referred to columns by George Dixon on July 3 and July 18. Harlow said he thought Dixon "had tongue in cheek" when he referred to the gift and said the animal was slaughtered and eaten at the Eisenhower farm when Estes came under Senate scrutiny.

But Dixon stood by his columns.

"A congressional leader close to Dirksen was there when the steer was delivered to the Eisenhower farm," he said. "I'm denying the denial," the columnist told a reporter.

Are We Headed in the Wrong Direction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, many people today are concerned about our Nation's future.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in the Saturday Evening Post, appeals to all Americans, regardless of their political affiliation, to give some thought to the road ahead. Because serious minded Americans are thinking about the years ahead for our country and because Mr. Eisenhower has drawn such a clear-cut picture, under unanimous consent I am making his remarks in this article a part of today's Congressional Record, as follows:

Are We Headed in the Wrong Direction?

(By Dwight D. Eisenhower)

In recent months some of the newspapers have at times referred to me as on the the spokesmen for the "loyal opposition." It is an ancient and honorable term, derived from the British, and I like it. I like it because it suggests that in a free political society—such as we have in this country—a citizen may be patriotic, sincerely loyal to his country and the Government, and at the same time oppose strongly many of the measures of the party in power.

On several occasions during the spring and early summer months—at press conferences and in speeches—I have voiced my doubts, and in some cases my acute unhappiness, about the direction the present administration is moving in its domestic programs. In this article for the Saturday Evening Post I hope to set down in orderly form some of my thoughts on these matters, to elaborate on them a bit and to explore a few points on which I have not spoken previously.

In the first place, may I say that this article is in no sense intended as a campaign speech—for anybody. Rather, it is an argument for what I believe to be good governmental policies. I believe deeply, of course, in the Republican doctrine, but I certainly do not insist that my party has a monopoly on sound ideas. There are some men in the Democratic Party who have a solid, healthy, commonsense political philosophy and frequently act accordingly. Consequently, what I have to say here is directed to everyone who is concerned about the future of our country, regardless of party affiliation. It is an appeal to Americans to think long and hard about the road ahead.

One of the present trends which disturb me greatly is the apparent thirst of more and more power centered in the Federal Government—and particularly in the executive branch. At times it seems we are losing sight of a fundamental principle that the founders of this Nation built into our political institutions—a simple principle, basic to democracy. It is this: The leader of a democracy is not the source of power; he merely directs it. Power derives from, and must remain in, the people. Historically, when the power that belonged to the people was concentrated in the hands of one family, we had the absolute monarch; today, when political power is seized in any Nation by Communists, we have the totalitarian state such as Soviet Russia or Red China.

I would not for a moment suggest that we in America are approaching totalitarianism—the monolithic state; the extremists who shout that we are already teetering on that brink not only are being rather ridiculous but are also making it more difficult for sensible men to preach good Government. Yet one cannot help wondering how far down the present road we can go—constantly investing Washington with greater and more detailed power over the lives of people—without arriving at something quite different from the free society which for almost 200 years has been the bedrock of the American system.

Let us consider briefly, for example, the case of the crackdown on big steel this past spring. Millions of words have been written about that sorry episode, and I do not flatter myself that I can add anything that might increase public enlightenment on the subject. But this one thought occurs to me: In the end this arbitrary display of power by the executive branch might turn out to be a good thing. It might be the danger signal that this country needs. I suspect that it was an eye-opener for millions of citizens who had grown rather indifferent, if not complacent, about the mounting powers of Federal Government. And it could be that even some of the key people in the administration who had a hand in the punitive moves against the steel industry are now having long second thoughts about the propriety of the methods employed.

GOVERNMENT BY INTIMIDATION

Having no detailed knowledge about the economics of steel manufacturing, I am unable to say whether or not the companies were entitled to the 3.5-percent price increase, which brought down on their heads the wrath of the administration. It seems obvious that the timing of the announcement by big steel—coming almost immediately after a major labor settlement—was bad public relations. But it is also clear that no industry can forever hold a rigid line on prices when its costs continue to mount year after year.

In any event, when the administration angrily stepped into this matter with threats and penalties, thus forcing a cancellation of the price increase, it used intimidation—a method that I cannot believe is compatible with our free enterprise system, except in grave emergency. The result was a noticeable deterioration in the spirit of cooperation which for some years has been growing up between Government and industry.

It has been argued endlessly whether or not the Government's action brought on the precipitate stock market collapse of a few weeks later. However, I believe that by this time most economists—except those in the administration, who I suppose must have exercised a profound influence in the matter—are agreed that while there were other important elements in the general market situation presaging a decline in stock prices, the action against big steel did help trigger the near panic of selling, which was such a shock to our economy. Otherwise, the gradual readjustment of prices which had been in progress since January 1 might have continued in an orderly fashion, and the savings of many modest investors would not have been so severely damaged.

"PROFITS" NOT A DIRTY WORD

Once it became obvious that great damage had been done, the White House issued statements friendly to business and proposed measures to give the economy a shot in the arm—including an across-the-board tax cut next year. In any event, we can hope that the theorists, who seem to be so influential in the administration, have learned a harsh lesson about the dangers of excessive tinkering with our free economy.

While we are on the subject of business, I want to say a word about the American profit system—and about businessmen. Somehow during the past generation profits has become almost a dirty word. This has come about partly through demogoguery and partly through the planned economy doctrine, earnestly espoused by some of the theoreticians. As nearly as I can make out, the latter would have business operate in a vacuum of no strikes, no profits and no risks—forgetting that then there likewise would be no production.

Our system can function, and remain healthy, only through reasonable profits. The livelihood of most of us depends on them. The proprietor of the cleaning and pressing establishment, the corner delicatessen, the filling station, and millions of other small business operators—and their employees—depend just as much on a fair return on the money they have invested as do America's giants of industry. The little business which cannot make a profit is inevitably forced to the wall, and its employees are thrown out of work. The farmer cannot exist—cannot buy the modern machinery he must have and the fertilizers he needs to keep vigor in the soil—without profits.

In the area of big business the day is long since past when ownership was in the hands of a few large investors. Monopolies of financial power no longer exist in this country; wisely, the American people are just as unwilling to submit to financial monopoly as they are to political monopoly. Today our large corporations are owned by approximately 17 million individuals stockholders, and these people, too, expect and are entitled to profits on their investment. Furthermore, even those among us who own no stocks usually have an indirect, but nevertheless vital, stake in the prosperity of our corporations—through participation in company pension funds, savings accounts and life insurance policies.

And finally, when I hear some of the claptrap that theorists voice these days against our American profit system, I can't help indulging in a bit of sardonic amusement over their inconsistencies. For they are usually the same people who want larger and larger Government budgets to do more of everything for everybody. They seem to forget that profits are also a principal source of Federal Government income—that when profits diminish and unemployment increases, so does tax revenue diminish. At this moment, for example, the administration is worried because the gross national product this year may add up to only $555 billion instead of the $570 billion which it predicted earlier. That seems like a fairly minor lag in business—but even that much of a drop from forecasts can have a serious effect on projected tax revenues. And if the drop should become the forerunner of a more definite downturn, governmental revenues would decline drastically.

ENLIGHTENED BREED OF BUSINESSMEN

If our American profit system is not perfect—and it isn't—it is still the best system yet devised for progress and the well-being of people who value personal liberty. During the past 15 years I have come to know a great many of our business and industrial leaders rather well—some of the self-righteous pundits have said I know too many of them. In any event, I can testify that the men who run our vast business complex these days are for the most part an enlightened breed. To illustrate: Suppose we consider just one facet of the modern business world, the area of company-employee relations, in which, in the relatively short time since the end of World War II, the change for the better has been remarkable. Solid company pension plans, strongly funded; company insurance plans, both life and accident; medical-care plans, frequently paid for all or in part by the firm; expertly staffed company medical departments to supplement and aid the family doctor—all these and many other benefits have been instituted in profusion. Much of this advance has come voluntarily, with management taking the lead—and all of it comes out of profits.

One evening this past spring I visited the Union League of Philadelphia. Now there was a time, I am told, when the Union League, which is composed largely of the business and professional leaders of that area, was habitually labeled a fortress of reaction. If that accusation was ever justified, it is not today. I had a delightful evening with the gentlemen of that league. I heard no dreary complaints about such things as social security, unemployment insurance or the principle of the graduated income tax. What I heard mostly was in the form of exploratory discussion, the principal object being the good of the country. My own Republicanism felt at home with people who were clearly concerned, principally, with national progress and individual responsibility.

To be sure, there will always be some people in the business community who, for reasons of greed, take advantage of our system. When a Billie Sol Estes appears on the scene, he must be dealt with. When a group of manufacturing firms makes the error of stifling competition by fixing prices illegally, as happened recently, they should be brought up short—as they were. And when some labor leaders are found false to their trust, as happened some time ago, action should be taken against them—as it was. Vigilance is one of the duties of Government.

But it is also the function of our Government to create a favorable climate in which free enterprise can work at its best. Obviously that cannot be done merely by friendly words, by appeals for the cooperation of business. It cannot be done by giving the theorists free rein always to dream up bigger and more glittering Federal programs. And, most assuredly, it cannot be done by constantly seeking more governmental power over our economic life. On the other hand, it can be done by leadership—a leadership that deals not only in words but in action and example as well.

LESS, NOT MORE, FARM CONTROL

There are other directions in which the administration seems intent on reaching out for greater powers. One of the most objectionable of these is reflected in the farm bill developed by the Department of Agriculture. The bill passed the Senate after having been modified somewhat in committee. Shortly afterward, it was defeated by an almost unanimous vote of the Republicans in the House, assisted by 48 courageous and discerning Democrats. Possibly a substitute will soon be scheduled. But because the bill, as originally presented, reflects the purposes and aims of the administration, it deserves our attention.

For as long as most of us can remember, our Government has been engaged in trying to assure the farmers an income comparable to that of other occupational groups. At best, success has been spotty—and the cost to the taxpayers has been astronomical. During my administration, Secretary Benson tried hard to get the farmer started back on the road to fewer controls, to a freer agricultural economy, to a program that in the end would be far less costly and more profitable to the farmer because of expanded markets. His efforts reflected my own thinking, and I consistently stood behind him when various interests were after his scalp. He was not able to make much of a start in the right direction because too many Congressmen and some farm leaders were against him—the latter mostly from one of the more radical of the farmer organizations.

"I WOULD GO TO JAIL IF NECESSARY"

The administration bill that was defeated was one of the most repressive measures ever laid before our Congress. It had in it what has been colorfully called—and with some justice, I think—the "blackjack" provision. It said in effect that if the farmers involved did not accept the new controls by a two-thirds vote, the Government could punish them by dumping much of its huge farm surpluses on the market at will. So here again we have the use of naked threat. The dumping of surpluses, an almost inconceivably reckless thing to do, might well drive us into a major agricultural crisis—and worse.

Another provision of the bill, which Secretary Freeman later consented to have dropped, set up penalties involving jail sentences for farmers who failed to comply with certain regulations set forth in the measure. When I learned of this proposal, I rather explosively exclaimed that if these provisions were enacted into law and applied to a raiser of beef cattle (which I am), I would offer myself as a test case. I said that I would go to jail if necessary and conduct a public monolog on human rights from behind the bars.

Although these remarks were made only in conversations with friends, they were inevitably made public and were noted in the newspapers. Because this position had already been abandoned by the Agriculture Department, everybody had a good laugh, and that was that. However, as I then understood the matter, I meant what I said: I felt just that strongly about the use of threats and compulsion to control the lives of Americans.

Another startling section of the farm bill would have put the Department of Agriculture in the business of helping finance and plan such recreational facilities as bowling alleys, dance halls, motels, swimming pools and golf links. The alleged purpose of this provision was to take more land out of production and convert it into recreational areas with all the trimmings. It would be done through loans to farmers and to local units of government on federally planned and approved projects. The Federal Government would then step out of the picture and leave the operation of these playgrounds in the hands of the farmers or the local interests involved.

Most of us, I am sure, are in favor of recreation, and we do need more recreational areas in this country. But what a way to provide this kind of facility—with another vast bureaucracy in the already gigantic Department of Agriculture and another huge Federal spending program. Already we have taken a good many million acres of substandard farmland out of production through various conservation measures now on the books, and doubtless still more poor land should be retired. But does the Federal Government have to get into the bowling alley and motel business to accomplish this objective? As I travel about the country, I have not noted any apparent dearth of private capital for these types of enterprises.

ADMINISTRATION'S PUSH FOR POWER

There is not space in this article to list all the many proposals and actions which the administration has pushed for a greater concentration of Federal power but, merely as a sample, I mention a few of them:

1. Authority for the President to modify income taxes whenever he should so decide.
2. Authority for the President to finance, wherever and whenever he pleases, large-scale emergency public works by diversion of funds directed to other purposes by Congress.
3. Authority to dilute the independence of the Federal Reserve Board—one of the most vital agencies in Government—by making the term of its Chairman, who is appointed by the President, concurrent with that of the President. Thus the President, upon the assumption of office could appoint immediately a new Chairman whose economic philosophy coincided with his own. Yet, historically, the function of the Federal Reserve Board has been predicated on its independence, not only from financial interests of all kinds, but also from all political pressures and philosophies.
4. Authority for the Federal bureaucracy to take over a whole host of State and local responsibilities, including the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs with a Secretary in the Cabinet. (The latter proposal was defeated, but we can never be sure that it won't come up again.)
5. Authority to federalize the unemployment compensation system of this country.
6. Authority to modify by Presidential edict virtually the entire tariff structure of this country. Now, I agree that we need an overhaul of trade policies and laws to enable us to compete successfully with the European Common Market, but whatever additional powers we give to the executive branch should be, I strongly believe, strictly limited by the Congress in time and scope.

In any event, my years in the White House convinced me that the office of the President, which is already one of the most powerful in the world, needs no bolstering with further prerogatives. Rather the problem is to use the existing power firmly, temperately and wisely.

Next let's take a look at Federal expenditures. A couple of months ago Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the highly respected Virginia Democrat who heads the powerful Senate Finance Committee, came up with a startling figure. After probing deeply into Government finance and applying the same accounting methods that any sound business institution would use in projecting its balance sheet into the future, the Senator stated that the Federal Government, just through the 1963 fiscal year, "will have current authority to obligate funds, outstanding Federal debt and other commitments of at least $1,242 billion." If you should try to carry forward the computation beyond 1963, he said, you would quickly find that Federal commitments for the future are beyond calculation. Most of us, I suppose, find such vast sums almost meaningless, but just for the record. Senator BYRD's figure, with all its zeroes, looks like this: $1,242,000,000,000.

WE HAVE MORTGAGED THE FUTURE

Our national debt alone—just the money the Government has already borrowed and must pay back—now stands at about $300 billion. Interest on the Federal debt during the coming year will rise to about $9,400 million annualy. It is futile to belabor the point with endless figures, but clearly we have already mortgaged the future of the country far into the coming decades.

As I look around me and see what a serious financial problem our young people are having today, I am forced to think sadly, how intolerable will be the plight of the young as the years roll on—unless we now begin to use enough commonsense to call a sharp halt on public spending for every bright new idea that the planners dream up. The tax burden imposed on young couples—who, of course, usually have modest incomes—is already so great that many of them find it almost impossible to start a home with even the minimum essentials.

Consider for a moment what they must pay before they even begin to live. Start with the minimum Federal income tax of 20 percent; add in social security which, for anyone who earns as much as $4,800, this year rose to $150 and is scheduled to go up to $222 by 1968; then tack on State income taxes, city wage taxes, school taxes, sales taxes in profusion, real estate and personal property taxes, and all the hidden taxes which are never seen.

Already we have reached the point where it is almost routine for parents—those who can manage to do so—to help young couples rather extensively during the early years of their married life. But should we ignore the millions whose parents cannot give financial assistance? Our planners ought to go into the homes of some of these youngsters and take a look; then ponder long and hard what their children a generation hence will face when they try to start their homes. I suggest that it is high time we think a bit about our young people, and the young people to come, instead of concentrating all our compassion on the indigent and the elderly.

OBLIGATIONS OF A MODERN NATION

Of course, society—including government at all levels—must take care of the needy in this country, the unemployed and the others who are down on their luck; we must see to it that the elderly have the essentials of life and comfort, including proper medical care. A modern nation can do no less.

But current spending plans go far, far beyond these proper humanitarian objectives. In his statement on debt, Senator BYRD said that there have been some 200 actions and proposals involving new and increased Federal spending and credit since this administration took over in January of 1961. In January of this year, the White House proposed a budget which called for $9 billion in increased spending, and it is still plugging hard for all its favorite schemes and measures—despite falling tax revenues. It now looks as if the Federal deficit this year will be around $7 billion.

Now, to give the national economy a push, to promote the much greater growth which we heard so much about in the 1960 political campaign—but which hasn't come—the administration is proposing across-the-board tax cuts for individuals and corporations. Of course we need a tax cut. Actually, what we need is a broad reform of our tax laws, which over the years have become a mishmash of inconsistencies. Yet I think it terribly dangerous, not only for the future but for the immediate present, to cut taxes while at the same time we go right ahead with all the increased spending plans that have been proposed. If we pile up further huge Government deficits, it is sure to set in motion again the sinister processes of inflation which robbed all of us of so much real income in the 1940's. The resumption of a sharp inflation could very quickly pick our pockets of all the extra spending money which tax cuts would put there. Here one is moved to ask a simple question: If promises to spend more are to provide the excuse for lowering taxes, why not go the whole way and have the Government spend so much we can eliminate taxes entirely?

And again we hear the old and shopworn shibboleths of the so-called "liberals" that deficits don't matter, that mounting debt can be a good thing, that the very term "balanced budget" is obsolete. Some members of the party in power have even suggested that the Federal debt limit—which has been raised by a few billions at a time over the years, but which nonetheless has served as a brake on spending—now should be abolished altogether. In other words, let the sky be the limit.

LIBERAL CLICHES VERSUS COMMONSENSE

On matters of spending and debt, the President suggested in a speech at Yale that we all should be more sophisticated, that we should put aside the old cliches by which Americans so long lived and so hugely prospered. Well, possibly the shoe is on the other foot. It is the current crop of theoretical, and apparently influential, advisers now busily dragging out and trying to popularize the spurious liberal cliches of the 1930's, who should be putting them aside in favor of daily doses of commonsense.

So if we are to have tax cuts—and heaven knows we need them to give incentive to our economy—then we should not do it the easy way. We should face up to the hard and unpopular job of balancing off any such cuts through the elimination of unnecessary spending. It's more than good news to know that some of the most powerful congressional leaders of both parties have taken a public position for this sound procedure.

Speaking of cliches, I recently heard once again, in connection with a plea for more Federal money for medical research, the ancient one that "the saving of one child's life is far more important than a balanced budget." Such statements are meaningless; balanced budgets mean a continued solvency which in turn will support vast life-saving discoveries over the years; continued deficits could stop all this great work. Moreover, we know that money doesn't solve everything, although there are some people who think it can. Talent is often much harder to come by than is money! The growth of knowledge, including medical knowledge, comes slowly, little by little, like the growth of a tree; it must be nurtured and supported adequately, but astronomical sums of money are not going to change that principle of research any more than excessive amounts of water and fertilizer will suddenly produce a fully grown tree.

It is obvious that what we need in this country is to set up some sensible priorities on spending projects—to put first things first, do what we must do, and then do the other things we would like to do as the situation and our finances permit.

For example, no reasonable person wants to endanger national security by cutting defense spending below safe limits. The Red threat will be with us for a long time, and we must maintain a powerful Military Establishment—although, even here, money alone cannot solve the problem, and to spend more than necessary can damage our overall position as surely as spending too little.

By all means, we must carry on our explorations in space, but I frankly do not see the need for continuing this effort as such a fantastically expensive crash program. We learn that the space director is asking almost $4 billion this coming year for his agency alone—and future amounts are to go up progressively. Now I am just as proud as any other American of John Glenn and Scott Carpenter and our other astronauts. Indeed, I personally approved the project for selecting and training our future space explorers. But why the great hurry to get to the moon and the planets? We have already demonstrated that in everything except the power of our booster rockets we are leading the world in scientific space exploration. From here on, I think we should proceed in an orderly, scientific way, building one accomplishment on another, rather than engaging in a mad effort to win a stunt race.

COMPETING WITH RUSSIA FOR PRESTIGE

If we must compete with Soviet Russia for world prestige, why not channel the struggle more along the lines in which we excel—and which mean so much to the masses of ordinary citizens? Let's put some other items in this prestige race: our unique industrial accomplishments, our cars for almost everybody instead of just the favored few, our remarkable agricultural productivity, our supermarkets loaded with a profusion of appetizing foods. Let's ask the world: "What has Soviet Russia or Red China got to compare with these achievements?" Why let the Communists dictate the terms of all the contests?

As I said earlier, we must solve the problem of adequate medical care for the aged, but I am opposed to doing this under social security, not only because it is compulsory, but because it doesn't really solve the problem. Under that system, in the end we would be handing out benefits to many elder citizens who don't need them, inadequate benefits to many others and, to still many others, none at all. I believe we should give our rapidly growing private medical-insurance plans, supplemented by the Kerr-Mills Act to assist those older people in genuine need, a better chance to prove their worth. I think that the Kerr-Mills law, which was enacted during the closing months of my regime, should include some provision to cope with catastrophic illness among the aged; it is not too late to amend the law.

In the field of education I was, and still am, for Federal aid to needy localities in the construction of buildings and other permanent facilities. I am not for having the Federal Government pay normal operating costs. Once the need for buildings has been met, Federal assistance could be cut off. But once we start paying the administrators and teachers, we will have, imbedded in the budget, a vast new Federal spending program that can never be terminated and which will almost inevitably induce school officials to run to Washington for new favors—thus giving the Central Government, eventually, direct control over education.

The above are merely examples of dozens of spending proposals which we might examine. My real point is to urge that all of us take a hard look at all these programs—including those for which there is genuine need. Even a nation as rich as the United States of America cannot have everything it wants all at once. This I know: If our country does not show the world, through sound fiscal policies, that it can meet its obligations, we will be headed for deep trouble. Worldwide loss of faith in the dollar would be a catrastrophe of global proportions.

In other areas of activity, there are many things, both favorable and unfavorable, that could, with justice, be said about the present administration. I am astonished, of course, that after all the promises that were made during the 1960 campaign, the new regime has done precisely nothing about the vital matter of civil rights. On the other hand, I am delighted that the executive branch has stood behind its proposal to give private enterprise a healthy part in the development of communication by earth satellites—this despite determined opposition from the antibusiness faction among its own party Members in Congress.

THE NECESSITY FOR HARD WORK

I am pleased also that the Secretary of Labor thus far has steadfastly taken the position that we are not ready for the 35-hour week in this country; that if we are to move ahead, if we are to meet growing foreign competition, we must work reasonable hours. I never forget the reason that an old and wise Frenchman gave me for the French defeat in 1940. He said: "We lost because we tried to oppose Hitler's 7-day workweek with a 4-day workweek." The Communists work hard too.

In the field of foreign affairs I have stated repeatedly my conviction that all good citizens should support the administration in its objectives and programs. In the first place, the goals of both parties in our relationships with other nations are pretty much the same: the containment of communism; informing the world—including, when possible, the people under Communist domination—of the blessings of liberty; protection of the rights of freemen everywhere; sound guidance and assistance to the underdeveloped nations. Party differences here are largely differences of method and procedure. And second, I know from my own experience in the White House that only the President and his closest advisers are in possession of all the facts in a given international situation; only they can assess the problem completely. Consequently, even if there are times when I have my doubts. I not only prefer to keep my own counsel, I shall stand definitely behind the President.

RUSK: CALM AND INFORMED COMPETENCE

Some have said, for example, that if we had gone in with our tanks and knocked over the Berlin wall in the very first hour the East Germans began to build it last August, on the grounds that they were closing our legal access routes, we could have ended that episode right there—and without getting into a war. Maybe so, maybe not so. Who really knows? Some of the military critics have said that in World War II we should have invaded the island of Sardinia, instead of invading Sicily, as our stepping-stone to Italy. Perhaps we should, but again, who knows? Even hindsight is not necessarily 20–20.

I do think that in recent months I have noted more firmness on the part of the administration in dealing with the aggressive ambitions of the Communists, and I am highly grateful if this assumption is correct. And I believe that most people are pleased that we have a man such as Dean Rusk as our Secretary of State. I think that in him the country sees a quality of calm and informed competence, needed in that crucial job.

In summary I believe that on the whole the administration is doing what it believes to be best for the country in its foreign relations. But I think it is on the wrong track in many of its domestic policies. As to this, only the people can decide. Quite obviously what we need in this country is a clearer understanding, by the people as a whole, of the principles of sound Government. Since, in a democracy, power by definition resides in the people, that power must be intelligently generated; and, on their behalf, it must be properly directed by our elected officials. More than this none of us can expect; with less than this we can never be fully satisfied.

Let's Talk About Congressional Abdication of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an article written by Columnist Inez Robb entitled "Let's Talk About Congressional Abdication of Power," should merit special attention by the Congress, and since it is self-explanatory and does not need elaboration on my part, I submit it for the Record.

Let's Talk About Congressional Abdication of Power

(By Inez Robb)

Charges and countercharges of "a Presidential grab for power" and the "Supreme Court usurpation of power" often fill the air.

But so far I have heard no discussion of the congressional abdication of power.

The U.S. Government was designed to have three coequal branches: the Presidency, Congress, and the Supreme Court.

It is one woman's opinion that if the Congress were strong, efficient, dedicated, intelligent, and forceful, there would be no power vacuum into which either the Chief Executive or the Supreme Court could move. Not even nature abhors a vacuum so belligerently as does politics.

As the office of the Chief Executive and the functions of the Supreme Court have moved steadily forward in the 20th century to keep attuned to the times in which they function, the Congress has clung to outmoded customs and prerogatives that should have disappeared with World War I and that became not only antiquated but dangerous with the advent of the atomic bomb.

The Congress is functioning today much as it did at the turn of the century. Its machinery is cumbersome and its legislative structure old and creaky. It is probable that our tax structure is as jerry built as the ancient web of custom and habit to which Congress clings.

In the face of a new world that, like it or lump it, moves with the speed of light, Congress, unheeding, plows along at a snail's pace—a pace not only dangerous to the Nation but to its own position in the triumverate of Presidency, Supreme Court, and Congress.

It seems to me that taxpayers get less and less mileage out of Congress with each passing year. I am weary of the time it wastes by refusing to face up to issues, and tireder still of the last-minute August rush to consider and pass or reject important legislation that was introduced the previous February.

It sometimes appears that no legislation would ever be passed by Congress if (1) it didn't feel impelled to get back home to mend its fences and (2) if it weren't fed up with the heat of a Washington summer and eager to get away to the golf courses in a cooler clime.

The selection of Washington, D.C., as the site of the Nation's Capital has often been criticized. But in view of its purgatory-patterned summers and the itch of legislators to be off to less-humid pastures, the site was probably a brilliant choice, since it does manage to get a little legislation passed annually.

The Senate is still the greatest debating society in the world. It refuses, in the face of threatening world crises, to change by jot or tittle its leisurely pace. Or to forgo a luxury the country can no longer afford: a talkathon that bores the voters as much as it is beginning to bore them.

Its committees can bottle up legislation on which the Nation is paying it to act, either pro or con. In its dilatory fashion, it can delay, from year to year, the consideration of bills on which the country has the right to a "yes" or "no" congressional answer.

Through sloth, inertia, and sheer unwillingness to face the present and break with the shackling rules of the past, through a refusal to streamline and modernize its machinery to deal with a new world, Congress is short-changing the Nation and short-selling itself.

It is doubtful if there would be any talk of "a presidential grab for power" or a "Supreme Court usurpation of power" if Congress were on its toes and exercising its powers as the Founding Fathers expected the legislative branch of government to do.

But if the Congress is content to be a chowder and debating society for most of the year, it—and the Nation—can expect a strong President and an energetic Supreme Court to move in to fill the vacuum that Congress deliberately creates by its outdated mores.

A Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the fine job our National Guard did during the recent callup resulting from the international situation. These units are now being returned home, where they are being welcomed in a manner befitting their service to our Nation.

In an editorial dated August 8, the Palm Beach Post outlines the hardships many of these men had to undergo in the transition from civilian to military life and the vital duty they performed.

In tribute to all National Guardsmen, I insert this editorial at this point in the Record:

A Job Well Done

National Guard units from all over the Nation soon will be returning to their home communities following 10 months of active duty. Our own quartermaster company will be released from active duty within the week.

We believe they deserve a hearty and unanimous "well done."

They were called, in the words of President Kennedy, "to prevent a war, not to fight a war." The fact that Premier Khrushchev's "deadline" over Berlin came and went without major incident is testimony not only to our overall military strength but to the effectiveness of these guardsmen as well.

In fact, Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany has said that, in his opinion, the prime factor influencing the Soviet slowdown on Berlin was the swift, decisive buildup of American forces.

It is difficult to recapture the emotions and tension of last fall, when the threat of war was a desperate reality. It seems clear, however, that we were confronted with the gravest crisis since Korea.

It is difficult, also, to put ourselves in the shoes of the 66,000 Army and Air Guardsmen who were suddenly called; all of them experienced some form of personal hardship and for many it was their second or third callup since 1940.

Some had to sell their cars, homes, or businesses. Some had to leave their families behind. Some had to drop out of school. There are no small sacrifices when you are involved in them.

There were some complaints, too. But they came from a small, vocal minority and in no way reflect on the Guard as a whole.

The fact is that the Army National Guard units which were mobilized brought 98.3 percent of their assigned strength on active duty and the Air National Guard 99 percent. In each case, this represented a sharp increase over the Korean mobilization. Thus the vast majority of guardsmen neither asked to be released nor complained after they were called up.

For 10 months these guardsmen provided essential strength in being for both the Army and Air Force. Now, even if the crisis hasn't entirely disappeared, the active forces have had time to build to more realistic levels and the immediate need for the guardsman is past.

And so they are returning home.

They have served America well. We salute them.

Education's Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, August 9, 1962, I inserted in the Record my tribute to a distinguished public servant of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, State Senator Ralph C. Mahar, whose untimely death was a shock to his host of friends and admirers. The attached editorial from the August 7, 1962, edition of the Greenfield, Mass., Recorder-Gazette salutes Ralph C. Mahar as the "father of regional schools" in Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial entitled "Education's Friend," from the August 7, 1962, issue of the Greenfield, Mass., Recorder-Gazette:

Education's Friend

Public schools lost their best friend in the Massachusetts Legislature when Senator Ralph C. Mahar, of Orange, died at his home Saturday.

Not without reason was Senator Mahar called "the father of regional schools." His efforts to improve public schools in the smaller communities are unparalleled in modern legislative history. Regionalization of facilities was one of the methods he most favored and he wrote laws that helped such combinations come into being.

Working to improve the teachers' lot is a popular electioneering device today. It was not when Ralph Mahar went to Beacon Hill 25 years ago. But from the start the man from Orange worked without rest for the betterment of the teaching profession.

When Mahar was a green young member of the house of representatives, the gap between city and rural schools was immense. Few small towns could afford adequately equipped laboratories, commercial and vocational training equipment, cafeterias, film projection paraphernalia, and the like. Faculty pay was so small that teacher turnover was constant with often a new staff each September.

Through State assistance bills written and supported by Mahar, first as a representative and then as a senator, a more equitable system has come into being. Regional schools can rival the cities in curriculum and equipment. Excellent teachers are attracted and are less inclined to move. Country children now can compete with their urban cousins in colleges or in trades.

Today's University of Massachusetts also owes much to Senator Mahar. It was he who introduced the bill that changed Massachusetts State College to a university. It was he also who helped it grow through appropriations and through legislation that helped

University of Massachusetts attract top-level educators.

Never in really good health, the veteran Orange legislator still was tireless in his efforts for better government, for fiscal responsibility and for work with the veterans of the wars that took place during his lifetime. Never was his interest confined to his own town or district. His mind and his physical efforts were always at the disposal of all the people of the Commonwealth.

Franklin-Hampshire District will miss Ralph Mahar. His home town of Orange will be a poorer community for his death. But, most of all, the cause of public school education is the loser. However, his example cannot but inspire others to follow the paths he blazed and to carry on the work he advanced so selflessly.

Will Russia Bury Us at Sea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, seapower is one of the great factors in the waging of warfare. Seapower is a vital factor, whether in a shooting war in an economic struggle to the death.

Mr. Walter E. Oates, editor of Marine Engineering Log, a technical maritime journal, has written an informative article entitled "Will Russia Bury Us at Sea?" This appeared in the June 15, 1962, issue of the journal.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I offer this article for the information of the Congress:

PRELUDE TO ECONOMIC SHOWDOWN OR WAR: WILL RUSSIA BURY US AT SEA?

(By Walter E. Oates)

Is Khrushchev currently buying time to build more strength for the ultimate armed conflict prescribed by Lenin? Or does he figure that the burgeoning industrial might of the U.S.S.R. eventually will cripple us by undercutting us in our world markets? Two things are certain:

1. A showdown is inevitable, Marxist-Leninist doctrine dictates that there be one.
2. Whether it's to be a war of trade or of military might, ships—merchant ships—and their supporting industries will play a major role in determining the ultimate outcome.

The massive maritime buildup currently underway by Russia soon will provide her with the fleet she will need to prosecute either war. Currently, Russia is at the midway point of its 7-year plan, which by 1965 will provide it with a merchant fleet double the size of the one it had in 1960.

This will be succeeded by a 5-year plan which is targeted to provide a fleet in 1970 that is 3 times the 1960 level. Its programed goal for 1980 is a fleet 5 to 6 times that of 1960.

This buildup of its fleet is being duplicated to a major degree in all major segments of its maritime industry. Its shipbuilding and repair industry is being expanded, and existing facilities are being modernized and enlarged. Its inland waterways are undergoing tremendous development to provide hydroelectric power and provide greater navigable depths for its fleet. The fleet itself is being rapidly upgraded with modern vessels including pusher towboats patterned after our river craft.

Seaport development is being accelerated, particularly in the Black Sea where draft limitations have prevented maximum use of today's larger vessels. Automation and mechanization of port cargo-handling equipment is being accomplished rapidly. Icebreaker construction is being pushed to provide a virtual armada that will permit nearly year-round access to its northern ports. Their oceanography projects are enormous.

In 1958, Russia ranked 21st in worldwide trade. In 1960 it ranked sixth. During the last decade its trade with non-Soviet bloc countries increased by 70 percent.

With its seaborne trade expanding—up 30 percent last year from the 1960 level—Russia also has made sure that its own ships carry the lion's share of this commerce. Whereas in 1938 Russian ships carried only 10 percent of its trade, this figure had risen to 58 percent by 1958. By 1965 U.S.S.R.'s fleet is expected to carry 75 percent of its waterborne trade.

These percentages are even more impressive in that total volume of seaborne trade has been rising sharply. (In 1959 Russian ships carried 11.3 percent more cargo tonnage than they did in 1958.) The chairman of the Soviet State Shipbuilding Committee last year stated that by 1965 Russia's fleet will be carrying three times the cargo volume it handled in 1958.

Currently, concerted efforts are being made to boost its trade with the free world. For example, a May 8, 1962, article in the New York Times reported on trade talk conducted in Rio de Janeiro in which Brazil and the U.S.S.R. were striving to double their current level of trade.

It is readily apparent that Russia recognizes the value of maritime power in all its aspects.

And it also should be emphasized that this huge maritime expansion program is being financed entirely by the state. It is in fact being accomplished with a 100-percent subsidy.

As will be noted in a subsequent section, the maritime buildup of the U.S.S.R. is being duplicated in significant degrees by other countries of the Soviet bloc. The combined programs of the Communist countries reach staggering proportions.

Here at home, we seem to have lost sight of the value of our maritime resources. For the most part they have been in a steady decline since the end of World War II. Temporary respites were experienced during the Korean war and Suez Canal closing. But the lessons to be learned from these experiences as to the value of shipping were soon forgotten.

Qualitatively and quantitatively, U.S.-flag shipping today is not even commensurate with our dominant role in world trade. Last year our exports represented 17.4 percent of the world's total exports. In addition we generated another 12 percent with our imports.

Despite this whopping 29.4 percent stake in world trade, our U.S.-flag shipping in 1961 handled less than 11 percent of our export-import cargoes. In 1946, U.S.-flag ships carried 60.3 percent of our trade. The decline has been steady and rapid—39.8 percent in 1951, 21.4 percent in 1956.

Our fleet's deficiencies when viewed against this country's extensive worldwide military commitments are even more apparent, as has been reiterated time and again by top brass in our Military Establishment.

At present our shipping and shipbuilding industry have contracted to an alarming level. Our active seagoing fleet has contracted by 245 ships in the past 7½ years. Nearly 92 percent of our dry-cargo fleet already is 15 to 19 years old. Only 1.9 percent is under 5 years of age and 1.7 percent is 5 to 9 years old.

U.S. yards engage in cutthroat competition for the limited work available. Profits are marginal at best. Some 20 yards have had to close their doors permanently in the past 15 years.

Our foreign tramp fleet currently consists of a handful of surviving vessels of World War II vintage. Their owners walk the perennial tightrope of insolvency, sustained solely by 50–50 Government aid cargoes.

The Russian fleet expansion is not the result of speculation by this writer. Her 1965 tonnage level was programed by the committee which drew up her current 7-year plan covering the years 1959–65. The U.S.S.R. tonnage goals for 1970 (triple the 1960 fleet) and 1980 (5 to 6 times the 1960 fleet) were set at the Communist Party Congress which was held in Moscow early this year.

The U.S.S.R. always has been reticent about the release of specific figures which would give a precise breakdown of its fleet's size and composition. The 7-year plan and the more recently projected goals for 1970 and 1980 used the 1960 fleet tonnage as the basic index of fleet expansion.

In our projections, we used official Maritime Administration data on the composition and tonnage of the U.S.S.R. fleet in 1960. This estimate reflects information compiled by our intelligence agencies in addition to MARAD's own research. From our own research which included review of the world's maritime press, including translations of Soviet-bloc journals, we feel MARAD's estimate of the U.S.S.R.'s 1960 fleet to be on the low, rather than high side.

ONE MILLION DEADWEIGHT TONS PER YEAR

The Russian fleet expansion goals require a net increase of nearly 1 million tons of shipping annually during the 1960–70 period. For the 1970–80 period the net increase of fleet size would be over 1.2 million deadweight tons annually. As projected in the accompanying bar chart, the Russian seagoing fleet would jump from 4.9 million deadweight tons in 1960 to 9.8 million deadweight tons in 1965 to 14.8 million deadweight tons in 1970 and 27.1 million deadweight tons in 1980.

There are many significant factors to be drawn from Russia's current building program. First and foremost is that Russia will be a formidable maritime power by 1965. Second, she will have elevated herself from an insignificant position to major status in the course of only a few years. Third, her fleet will be comprised predominantly of modern, efficient vessels. Fourth, her fleet expansion rate for the 1960–65 period is predicated on an average annual net growth of 20 percent. Great Britain and Norway, which rank first and second in world fleet standings, took delivery of new tonnage last year which would give an apparent fleet expansion rate of 8 and 10 percent, respectively. New tonnage delivered to U.S. owners last year would give an apparent fleet expansion rate of 3 percent. However, since the new tonnage replaced overage tonnage which was retired, the U.S. deliveries had no bearing on the actual net loss of tonnage actually experienced.

Tonnage building or on order for Russia as of January 1, 1962, comprises 226 seagoing ships, totaling 2,086,000 deadweight tons. These figures are from official data compiled by MARAD's Office of Statistics. This Office is quick to point out that because of the lack of sufficient information of construction activity within Russia these totals may be incomplete.

SOVIET-BLOC FLEETS AGGREGATED 7,603,000 DEADWEIGHT TONS ON JANUARY 1, 1962

The U.S.S.R.'s fleet expansion program is being duplicated in relative degrees by others in the Red orbit. Each has its own equivalent 7-year plan. The following is a recap of the existing seagoing fleets as of January 1, 1962, in which only vessels of 1,000 gross tons and larger were tabulated, showing number and deadweight tons:

	Number	Deadweight tons
U.S.S.R.	895	5,294,000
Poland	134	960,000
Red China	150	760,000
East Germany	32	281,000
Czechoslovakia	10	102,000
Bulgaria	20	124,000
Rumania	8	46,000
Hungary	8	12,000
Albania	5	24,000
Grand total	1,262	7,603,000

Poland's 7-year plan calls for a 2-million deadweight-ton fleet by the end of 1965. While we have no specific tonnage goal for Red China, her current 5-year plan is to produce 54 ships averaging between 5,000 and 10,000 tons.

The fleet development programs of several of the satellite countries have been hindered by their commitments to supply ships to Russia.

The powers that be in Washington no longer can afford to discount appraisals that clearly show that our maritime industry is an irreplaceable asset that is essential to our Nation's welfare. Nor can it continue to rationalize this fact when maritime budgets are determined. Time is running out.

This country's greatest maritime disaster is already shaping up.

Alameda County Leads Bay Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in a time when much concern is being expressed about the national economy, it is heartening to know the outstanding strides being made by Alameda County in taking the leadership of the San Francisco Bay area in key indexes of economic growth. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a front page story from the Oakland Tribune of July 31, 1962, which highlights the progress in education, employment, industry, highways, assessed valuation, manufacturing, building, construction, retail sales, wholesale trade, and savings and loan activities in Alameda County. I think, after the facts concerning this development are read, every encouragement should be given to those responsible for these endeavors so that future years will show a continuation of such achievements.

COUNTY LEADS BAY ECONOMY—LEADERSHIP SHOWN ANEW IN 13 OF 21 HANDBOOK INDEXES

Alameda County has decisively reaffirmed its economic domination of the nine-county bay area by showing leadership in 13 of 21 key indexes according to Nils Eklund, Oakland Chamber of Commerce president. As proof, he points to the 1962 edition of the chamber's "Comparative Data Handbook."

The publication lists San Francisco as trailing in second place with six firsts and Santa Clara and Contra Costa Counties tied for third with one each. The 1961 comparison, which dealt with 25 factors instead of 21, showed Alameda County leading with 14 firsts to San Francisco County's nine, he said.

"This continued leadership by Alameda County conclusively confirms the tremendous and greater growth that is taking place on our side of the bay," Eklund said.

The chamber president cited the following comparisons in the 1962 handbook:

Population: Alemeda County, 970,600, continues the county's domination of northern California as well as the bay area. San Francisco County second with 741,200.

Future population: Recent surveys indicate and experts agree that Alameda County will continue to be the largest population center in northern California and by 1980 will reach 1,410,000. Forecasters pick Santa Clara County as second in 1980 with 1,285,000.

Education: Alameda County continues public school enrollment lead, from kindergarten through junior college, with 1961 October count of 195,555 to 180,147 for second place Santa Clara County. Alameda County second in the bay area in parochial school enrollment with 19,989 students as compared with San Francisco's 29,102.

Employment: Alameda County placed first in insured manufacturing employment for calendar year 1960 with an average of 75,000 manufacturing employees.

Industry: Alameda County led in industrial projects during the period 1947 through 1961 with a total of 3,146 to San Francisco County's 1,959. During the 15-year period, Alameda County accounted for 25 percent of all industrial investment in the bay area for a total of $607,837,080. This was second only to Contra Costa County's $875,931,500 during the same period.

Highways: With a need dictated by the heavy traffic of its growing commerce, Alameda County led in the allocation of State highway funds for the fiscal year 1962–63, heading all bay area counties and northern California, with a total appropriation of $23,488,000.

Transportation: Alameda County continued to lead the bay area in freight car movements from 1959 through 1961, a factor that reflects its importance as an industrial and distribution center. Last year's 264,070 carloads of freight compared with 174,569 for Contra Costa County, and 127,173 for third place San Francisco County, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties combined to record 61 percent of all freight car movements in the industrial bay area counties.

Trucking: Alameda County again led the bay area counties in 1961 with 551 for-hire trucking companies listed by the public utilities commission.

Vehicle registration: Alameda County again led the bay area and all northern California in both passenger car registrations and total motor vehicle registration with 386,065 registered passenger cars and 471,708 total vehicles. Second place Santa Clara County had 302,091 passenger cars and 374,127 total vehicles.

Assessed value: Assessed valuations in Alameda County passed San Francisco for the first time in fiscal year 1962—Alameda County, $1,495,295,166 and San Francisco County, $1,482,218,908.

Manufacturing: The final results of the 1958 Census of Manufacturers place Alameda County in first place in amount of value added by manufacturing process with a total value of $809,690,000 compared with second place Santa Clara County's $671,982,000.

Building: Alameda County placed second to Santa Clara County in valuation of all building construction permits with $177,849,542 to Santa Clara County's $288,179,378.

Retail sales: Final results of the 1958 Census of Business placed Alameda County in second place in total number of establishments and total retail sales volume. Alameda County's 8,245 establishments and $1,159,123,000 in sales were second only to San Francisco County's 9,098 establishments and sales of $1,253,977,000. In taxable retail sales Alameda County's volume of $1,499,273,000 was second only to San Francisco's $1,750,207,000. However, Alameda County's 1961 taxable sales showed a $44 million increase over 1960 while San Francisco figures showed a $3 million decrease.

Wholesale trade: 1958 Census of Business data on wholesale trade in Bay area counties placed Alameda County second to San Francisco County in number of establishments and total wholesale sales. Alameda County's volume of $1,724,212,000 compared with San Francisco's $4,876,605,000.

Savings and loan: In distribution of Bay area savings and loan association assets the eight associations headquartered in Alameda County totaled $402,374,704, placing Alameda County in third place to first place San Francisco's 16 associations with assets of $934,255,973 and Santa Clara's nine associations with assets of $647,233,077.

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Unanimously Resolve Favoring Establishment of a National Flag Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a letter to me from the Honorable Warren M. Dorn, supervisor, Fifth District, County of Los Angeles, State of California, together with copy of resolution which was unanimously approved by the full membership of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, consistent with the high purposes of this resolution, I am pleased to tell you that I am promptly filing all appropriate legislation to carry forward the pertinent purposes of this said resolution.

The letter and resolution follow:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 25, 1962.

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Because numerous individuals and organizations of the county of Los Angeles have expressed an interest in the establishment of a National Flag Week during the first week of July each year, I recently introduced a resolution calling for such observance, which was unanimously approved by members of the board. A copy of our resolution is enclosed.

As a result of the enthusiastic acceptance of such a program here recently, I respectfully request that you please introduce and support the necessary legislation to extend the observance of National Flag Week to both State and Federal governmental jurisdictions.

Your cooperation on this important matter will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN M. DORN,
Supervisor, Fifth District.

RESOLUTION BY SUPERVISOR WARREN M. DORN

Whereas the flag, with its red and white stripes and 50 stars on a field of blue, represents a symbol of these United States of America through which men for generations have realized their greatest, noblest, and most sublime dream of personal accomplishment and freedom; and

Whereas the names of great men of the past, such as Patrick Henry, Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, Paul Revere, Lincoln, Andrew Jackson, and others who helped lay the foundations of our cherished liberties are forever associated with our flag; and

Whereas the great events of our Nation's history from Valley Force to Gettysburg, to the Alamo, San Juan Hill, Flanders fields, Pearl Harbor, to Normandie and Korea, are all indelibly written with the same unfading colors of our national emblem; and

Whereas under the billowing folds of this great guardian of freedom the 13 Original Colonies have grown into the world's strongest nation, a giant of industry, commerce, and agriculture, a patron of education and the arts, with never ending opportunities for all, and more particularly into a nation of ideals, of justice, of freedom, offering a beacon light of hope to the oppressed and persecuted of the world; and

Whereas since June 19, 1962, the board of supervisors has been assisting individuals and organizations in the recognition of the first week of July as National Flag Week throughout the county; and

Whereas those same individuals and organizations have demonstrated great interest in the establishment of an entire week for the appropriate recognition of our flag and the rich heritage of history it represents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, That in view of what our Nation's colors mean to us, the residents and citizens of the County of Los Angeles, be especially urged to display the flag each day during the week of July 1–7 in the initial observance of National Flag Day in America; and be it further

Resolved, That the affected officials and department heads of the County of Los Angeles be authorized and requested to initiate cooperative action among city, county, State, and Federal governments and affected organizations in an effort to bring about the ultimate observances of National Flag Week during the first week of July on an annual basis.

Hospital and Medical Care for Service-Connected Peacetime Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, within the past 20 years, Congress has accomplished more for the benefit of those who served in the Armed Forces during a time of war, than all the previous Congresses of our history.

In going all out for war veterans we had the support of public opinion and the satisfaction of knowing that we were doing everything possible to care for our sick and disabled war veterans—helping their comrades to improve their job-skills, or complete their higher education, or to buy a home or a farm.

The far-reaching and constructive program of benefits that we provided for millions of these veterans, assisted them in making a successful adjustment to civilian life, and contributed to the progress and prosperity of the Nation.

It was proof of our everlasting gratitude to those who had defended our free society with their lives.

But in concentrating on legislation to benefit them, we overlooked the smaller group of peacetime veterans who also served the Nation because they were ready to defend it if war should come.

No one maintains that wartime and peacetime veterans should be treated alike because there are unbridgeable differences in the respective risks and sacrifices that they experienced. By the same reasoning, however, we should not carry this distinction to extremes by generously rewarding one group while denying the legitimate rights of the other group.

Every Member of Congress has found himself in the uncomfortable position of trying to explain to a peacetime veteran suffering from a noncompensable disability incurred or aggravated by his service that he was not eligible for hospital and medical care at a facility operated by the Veterans' Administration.

To excuse it as an oversight on the part of Congress was unconvincing because this unintentional discrimination has closed the Veterans' Administration medical doors to these veterans for many years.

War veterans now are entitled to hospital care and outpatient treatment for disabilities which they incurred in service even in those cases where they were not discharged for disability, or were not awarded compensation.

I believe that the same consideration should be extended to peacetime veterans who, at present, are entitled to treatment only if they were discharged for service-connected disability or are receiving compensation for such disabilities. If they fail to meet one of these eligibility conditions, they may not be granted hospitalization or outpatient treatment for a service-connected condition that is rated as less than 10 percent disabling.

Authorization of hospital and medical care for service-connected peacetime veterans is long overdue, and S. 3109, awaiting the President's action, will correct that neglect.

Nonvoting: A Sad Commentary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, an excellent comment on the failure of many of our citizens to exercise the great privilege of voting is contained in a recent column, Observations and Comments, by Hon. L. S. Stegins, editor and manager of the Screven County News, a fine weekly newspaper published in my hometown of Sylvania, Ga.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend this excerpt from Mr. Stegins' column to the reading of the Members of the House:

NONVOTING: A SAD COMMENTARY

The other day I heard about a local man who has never voted in his life—and he is 60 years of age.

One of the reasons he gave was he is a friend of all candidates and doesn't want to make a choice, one against the other.

He may have other reasons, but I doubt if any of them would be any more valid than the one he gave.

Few if any of us have a perfect record when it comes to showing up at the polls in every election. But refusing to vote in all of them for 40 years is a sad commentary on the duties and obligations of American citizenship.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 11, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT: COMMONSENSE AND TAXES

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

A conservative and commonsense creed for many years has been that taxes directly affect the strength of the economy, that high taxes drain incentive capital from the economy and prevent growth by gradually strangling business activity and initiative. Today, at long last, it seems the liberals have recognized this basic economic truth and are advocating tax cuts as a spur to the economy. In logic then we know that liberals must now also give proper recognition to the basic ingredients of our economy—a freely competitive market and the all-important incentive which is the profit motive and profits, steming from a society of free people. Without all of this there would not be an American economy, the marvel of the world. Here the liberal philosophy breaks down. How can a tax cut be a boost to the economy when the Federal Government's big and increasing expenditures both negates any benefit of a tax cut (and waters the value of our money) and progressively limits the economic freedom of individuals and businesses by Federal rules and regulations. The falsity of the contradictory logic of liberals is further exemplified by their adherence to Federal pumppriming, monetizing the debt (prosperity by printing money and floating bonds), the devastating effect of astronomical spending for liberal legislative proposals, involving government in business, including public housing, public food, urban renewal, TVA and other public power projects, farm subsidies, foreign aid, welfare programs, and many, many others. To summarize the President and the liberals' present dilemma, no tax cut can be beneficial without being matched by reductions in Federal spending, and the President and his advisors are not even considering reduced spending, on the contrary.

As to the discusion of taxes and tax cuts, there are two possibilities: (1) The "quickie" tax cut allegedly to prevent a recession; (2) tax reform (in structure and brackets) to correct basic inequities. The quickie approach is not good. It reduces revenue at a time when we are already deficit financing and increases inflationary pressures. This is the plan advocated by the President who wants flexible taxes, that is, he wants to be able to increase and lower taxes at will, a false ecomonic theory because the uncertainties acompanying fluctuating tax rates will further damage profits, risk and business investment.

Tax reform tackles the problem on a responsible basis. It removes inequities of the present improper bracket system which is too progressive, too confiscatory. Reform is proper at any time, regardless of revenue because it deals not directly with the amount but how it's produced. This brings us to the heart of the political argument on taxes: a flat percentage tax on one hand as against our present form, the Communist-Socialist dictum "from each according to his ability." The solution to imposing taxes in a free society, in my firm opinion, is the flat percentage tax.

Granted there must be a transition period and this is provided by the Alger-Baker-Herlong bill. This legislation reduces both individual and corporate tax rates over a 5-year period within a balanced budget; defers taxes for individuals on long-term capital gains as long as the taxpayer reinvests his holdings; reduces the rates of tax on estates and gifts, and establishes more realistic depreciation rules. This legislation strikes at the crux of the tax problem which is the sharp climb in the graduated rates in the middle income brackets. This is the bottleneck that has slowed the flow of investment funds, especially the risk venture variety, since our capital availability is firmly tied to the rate at which savings can be accumulated. This elementary economic truth is not recognized by the administration which holds that private savings are actually a liability and that economic strength is built through pumping Federal funds into the economy. President Kennedy's economic philosophies are buried in the gobbledygook of administration spokesmen such as in the following statement:

"If the economy were at full employment today, we estimate that total income and total output would be about $30 billion higher than at present. But Federal tax receipts would be about $9 billion above present levels, and private savings would be $5 or $6 billion higher than today. Thus, taxes and savings would be drawing $14 or $15 billion from the economy which would have to be offset by additional investment and Government expenditures for full employment to be maintained. This means that, at present levels of Government expenditures, our present tax system bars the way to full employment unless we are able to raise private investment about $14 or $15 billion above present levels."

The administration, if this statement can be unraveled, does not understand the role of savings and Government spending. Profits and savings provide the necessary investment capital. Federal spending takes away from this investment capital (in taxes) in order to replensh it—obviously self-defeating and contradictory. In conclusion: we have in proper tax reform (Alger-Baker-Herlong bill), the dual forces for impressive and lasting public betterment—the urgently needed tax rate reform and a checkrein on Government spending.

Moscow's Peace Slogan a Cold War Tool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Robert H. Estabrook, writing in the Washington Post on August 12, has made a thoughtful, lucid analysis of the Soviet Union's "peace and friendship" public relations campaign.

There can be no question that we must continue to exert every effort to make progress on such vital mutual problems as Berlin, nuclear testing, and disarmament. We must continue despite rebuffs and frustrations for these efforts to a considerable extent will determine the future course and shape of our world.

As we continue our efforts, however, it is important to recall, as Mr. Estabrook has pointed out, that:

> What the Communists mean when they talk of peace and friendship is not what Americans understand or what most of their own people earnestly desire, but a monstrous perversion of the phrase."

Mr. Speaker, I commend this excellent article to our colleagues' attention:

MOSCOW'S PEACE SLOGAN IS A COLD WAR TOOL

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—Peace and friendship slogans dot the Soviet Union with the frequency of Coca-Cola signs in the United States. In virtually every city and along many country roads you see the phrase "mir i druzhba" plastered on posters and billboards. It is even in neon lights atop buildings.

Newspapers are full of it. At every official function with foreigners there are toasts to peace and friendship. Persons you meet on the street allude to it in casual conversation.

So far as the Soviet people in general are concerned, there is not the slightest question but that the sentiment is a sincere expression of a heartfelt wish.

But so far as the Soviet Communist Party and Government are concerned, peace and friendship is a weapon with which to attack the United States and its allies in the cold war.

There scarcely could be a better example of the duality, the two levels, on which the Soviet system operates. Many, perhaps most, of the people simply have no idea of the way in which a noble ideal is cynically twisted by their Government to serve Communist strategy.

Soviet citizens may not be very sophisticated in all the ramifications of nuclear destruction, but they know a great deal about the effects of war. Even to a people already accustomed to Stalin's terror, the Nazi invasion produced horrors still not fully appreciated elsewhere.

At least 20 million Soviet people, possibly many millions more, died in World War II. Some 600,000 died of starvation alone in the siege of Leningrad, a city that had 3 million population.

Stalingrad was virtually wiped off the map. No one who has encountered the chamber of commerce-type pride of the people in what has been built since in the successor city of Volgograd can have the faintest doubt that the popular repugnance for war is genuine.

KHRUSHCHEV'S CAMOUFLAGE

But as Stalin used the exigencies of war to accomplish his strategic purposes in eastern Europe, so the government of Nikita Khrushchev is using "peace and friendship" as camouflage for its ideological campaign against the West and disguise for its own unwillingness to reach workable agreements.

In fact, the campaign has aspects of a religious crusade. Soviet slogans never speak merely of the quest for peace; it is always the "fight" or "struggle" of the people against the wicked warmongers. Popular idealism is thus converted into a tool of Communist policy.

Last month in Moscow there was the Communist-sponsored World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, attended by delegates billed as representing the peace-loving elements in almost every country. The initial atmosphere, however, could hardly be described as peaceful.

The opening day was largely devoted to vehement condemnations of the American high-altitude nuclear test. By remarkable coincidence, the next morning letters denouncing the United States appeared in Pravda from readers in such remote points as Kiev, Tbilisi and Tashkent—although Soviet mail service is agonizingly slow, presumably because letters pile up awaiting spot-censorship.

Then came the speech by Chairman Khrushchev. Described by one Soviet journalist as "mild," it attacked virtually every aspect of American foreign policy.

Not all the delegates, however, were as compliant as the Communists might have wished. Some spoke out forthrightly, and in the end a resolution was approved condemning all nuclear tests. Several British nuclear disarmers staged an impromptu demonstration in Red Square against official wishes. Their banners were quickly taken away by what were described as "simple Soviet citizens."

But little of this dissent found its way into the Communist press. Distortion and public ignorance remain the instruments by which the government furthers its objectives in this area.

A Soviet citizen reading and listening only to what the Government has told him would think, for example, that the United States alone had frustrated all attempts to ban nuclear tests and control nuclear weapons, that the United States and its allies were using Berlin as a spearhead for revenge, that allied bases around the world were for the sole purpose of threatening the Soviet Union.

PATTERN OF DISTORTION

He also would think that the communization of Eastern Europe had represented the wishes of the people, that the United States had unleashed an attack on North Korea, that the Hungarian revolt had been a counterrevolution instigated by the imperialists, that the United States was preventing the "liberation" of Vietnam, and that Western policy was to repress colonial peoples around the world.

The attacks are so incessant that you sometimes wonder whether they do not have a counterproductive effect. But there is little evidence of this in conversations with people on the street.

They appear totally ignorant of the fact that the Soviet Union broke the nuclear test moratorium last fall, despite Khrushchev's categorical promise to the contrary. They were told in a small after-the-fact announcement that the Soviet Union had conducted a test series but were not told the number of explosions.

Similarly, people you meet seem not to have the remotest knowledge that the Soviet Union repudiated its own nuclear treaty proposal or refused to sign its own draft declaration against war propaganda. Instead they ask why the United States is encircling their country.

How much the higher Communist Party members come to believe their own propaganda is always debatable. In private conversations, some of them are considerably more plausible than the official line.

They avoid mention of the Berlin crisis in this connection. They acknowledge, however, that Khrushchev was surprised when he did not obtain a concession from the new President at their meeting in Vienna last year.

You can believe what of this you wish. Seen from a Communist standpoint, certain Western actions undoubtedly have had the effect of increasing the suspicions of an already suspicious Soviet Government. But however much he may want to avoid war, Khrushchev is doing nothing at the moment to reduce tensions.

What opportunity there may be for a nuclear test agreement after the new Soviet series remains unknown. But there are many indications that East and West are heading for a new period of strain over Berlin.

Certainly Khrushchev spurned the chance to talk seriously during his interview with American editors on July 13. Instead of discussing methods of bridging the real differences with the United States, he chose to make more propaganda.

And this again serves to illustrate the fantastic duality of the system. The people want peace. The Russian Government probably want to avoid war, among other reasons because of the enormous number of uncompleted tasks at home. But it will do little or nothing at present to curtail its exercises in brinkmanship.

The reasons probably are two: First, tension is still considered necessary as an instrument of compulsion in Soviet domestic affairs. Second, Soviet officials retain undiminished the determinist belief that communism is the wave of the future. Tension, they believe, helps history along by keeping the capitalist countries off balance and hastening their disintegration.

In this sense, what the Communists mean when they talk of "peace and friendship" is not what Americans understand or what most of their own people earnestly desire, but a monstrous perversion of the phrase.

You Can't Stay Strong in a Straitjacket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have read many advertisements from all areas of business but Warner & Swasey specifically utilize their advertising to call attention to the United States rather than attention to their products.

I am certain they feel by this, that if the United States thrives, their business will thrive. With this thought I wholeheartedly agree.

Under unanimous consent I am inserting herewith one of their latest editorials, "You Can't Stay Strong in a Straitjacket." This certainly coincides with my own political and economic philosophy and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and all citizens of our great country.

The editorial follows:

YOU CAN'T STAY STRONG IN A STRAITJACKET

The United States is the most powerful Nation in the world, but every new tax, regulation, giveaway, bureau is one more cord tightened in the straitjacket that is weakening, destroying our strength—turning us into the welfare state so many seem to want.

The all-powerful welfare state does your thinking and worrying for you; there is no room in it for ambition—the ambition to make a name for yourself, to do better than your father and your neighbor, to build your family's prosperous future. Ambition and laws that encourage it are what drive men ahead; they are what made this country great, created millions of jobs, gave America the world's highest standard of living, built schools and hospitals, created the wealth we have given in billions to the free world.

Restrict rewards, destroy ambition—and you destroy those rich fruits; you destroy America.

Is being pampered and cared for by government worth that awful price?

Observations and Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my lifelong friend, Hon. L. S. Stegins, editor and manager of the Screven County News, Sylvania, Ga., who also has the honor of serving as a member of the city council of my hometown of Sylvania, expressed in an excellent manner his opinion concerning the prayer decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in his column, "Observations and Comments," in a recent issue of his newspaper.

Early in my life, Mr. Stegins and I were associated in the publishing business and, knowing his background of devotion to the Constitution of the United States and his strong belief in the fundamental principles upon which this Nation was founded, I feel that his comments will be of interest to my colleagues in the Congress and to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who share our feeling that the implications of this decision are deplorable.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert the article, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

(By L. S. Stegins)

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings on us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

This little prayer, recommended by the board of regents, the governing body of the New York public school system, led to a Supreme Court decision that is probably more far-reaching in the separation of religion from the state than any other.

By a six to one decision, the Court found this prayer to be unconstitutional.

However, the Court decision appears to continue to acknowledge that religion is a part of the life of this country. The decision appears to be based on the use of the official prayer of the board of regents. As Justice Hugo L. Black said in the decision, "Each separate government in this country should stay out of the business of writing or sanctioning official prayers and leave that purely religious function to the people themselves."

Unfortunately, our hope and feeling about this case and the decision is not universal. Leo Pfeffer, general counsel of the American Jewish Congress, declared that the ruling "makes it quite clear that Bible readings, prayer recitations and religious holiday celebrations may not be constitutionally conducted in the public schools."

We sincerely hope that Mr. Pfeffer has read far too much into the Court decision. We would not like to see the very subject of religion made taboo in our public school system. The constitution of this State acknowledges Almighty God. Our entire culture is based on a solid foundation of religious faith.

We score denominationalism in public schools. We believe that tax funds should be withheld from purely parochial schools. But we do not believe that the name of God should be silent in the schoolroom.

The Revere Journal, of Revere, Mass., Honored as the Best Weekly Newspaper of the 10,000 Circulation Class in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that the Revere Journal, published in Revere, Mass., has been found worthy of mention in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Journal is an independent and courageous weekly that is much closer to the heartbeat of its subscribers than the big city dailies. In an age where the trend toward centralization of power at the top is smothering the voice of the individual, the little Journal, loyally supported by subscribers who are better known as friends and neighbors, maintains the quality that reflects its New England character.

Being a weekly, it does not have to leap for the readers' attention with sensational headlines. The Journal has leisure to report some of the good things in community life, for it understands that true reporting must encompass more than the coverage of crime, corruption, disaster, and scandal.

Much of its modest success is due to the confidence it inspires in its readers. Most of them know the genial publisher, Sidney Curtis. When he stops to talk with them on the street, he asks about the boy who is serving with the Army in Germany, or the daughter's approaching marriage. Sidney's interest in people keeps him in touch with public opinion. He knows whether most of them favor or oppose the controversial motion that is coming up before the school committee at its next meeting. Because of his many personal contacts he knows where folks stand on the larger issues involving the State and the Nation. It is no wonder that the employees of the Journal are so proud of their paper and their publisher.

At the recent annual convention of the Accredited Home Newspapers of

America that was held in Washington, D.C., the Revere Journal won national recognition. Sidney Curtis was presented with the top award for general excellence of weekly newspapers in the under 10,0000 circulation class.

Congratulations to all who share in the accomplishments of the Revere Journal.

Alabama Retail Firm Wins Recognition For Its Community Service Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following very interesting report concerning the work Loveman, Joseph & Loeb Department Store in Birmingham is doing to encourage an interest in theater and drama. The program they have instituted is being highly successful and all of the people in Birmingham familiar with it are most impressed with the fine results.

The Reader's Digest conducted a nationwide contest and selected Loveman, Joseph & Loeb as its winner in the community service field.

The article is as follows:

DEPARTMENT STORE DRAMA

Consultant Dorothy Schwartz, like the legendary Pied Piper of Hamelin Town, plays a tune that children listen to and joyfully follow. An authority on creative dramatics for children, she is the personal gift of Loveman, Joseph & Loeb of Birmingham to the youngsters of Alabama, Mississippi and Georgia. This gift has been well received. Not only parents, but an important thought-leading group, educators, have formed a favorable image of Loveman's.

Bringing Dorothy Schwartz to Loveman's—and her talents to these children—has brought Loveman's beyond its role as a business institution serving the community. In instituting this project, Loveman's has done its part in fulfilling a pledge made to the children of America a few years ago at a White House Conference on Children and Youth. It read in part: "We will respect your right to be yourself * * *. We will help you to develop initiative and imagination * * *. We will open the way to you to enjoy the arts and to use them for deepening your understanding of life."

Once Paul L. Dowd, president of Loveman's, got the approval of the Alabama State Department of Education, he hired Mrs. Schwartz, an experienced drama instructor, to work with teachers through an inservice training program in the State's school system. She joined Loveman's public relations staff in 1957. Loveman's had hired a personal ambassador, dedicated to a lofty goal which she puts in this way: "Provide children with an opportunity to grow in understanding people, give them the experience of thinking on their feet and expressing ideas clearly, show them how to control emotional release, give them an opportunity to grow in social cooperation, to get along with others and build fine attitudes and appreciations."

How Mrs. Schwartz accomplishes this is best shown by what she did with 35 pupils in the sixth grade class at Hueytown, near Birmingham. She wanted to make the youngsters' lessons in social studies, science and arts come alive, and mean more to them. Her technique: first teach simple pantomine and creative rhymes, dramatic play next, then characterization and dialog. The results: "High, Wide and Deep," an original play depicting man's exploration and mastery of the seas, written and produced, complete with colorful sets and costumes, original poems and pictures, by the sixth grade children.

Her method has also brought exceptional improvement in the four vital learning areas of paragraph comprehension, word meaning, spelling and reading ability. A leading educator says one of the reasons for the success of creative dramatics is that it utilizes a basic instinct in the child—"his innate play instinct."

Mrs. Schwartz has not been contained by State boundaries; she has advised both State and parochial school educators in Mississippi and Georgia as well as Alabama. It has been appreciated.

The Alabama Education Association cited Loveman's for "meritorious service in the field of public education." Virginia White James, professsor of elementary education at the University of Alabama wrote: "We at the university are very much indebted to Loveman's. We deeply appreciate the significant contribution to education in Alabama which is made by your institution through the consultant services of this gifted lady," Maryland Wilson, head of the spech department of Huntingdon College, Montgomery, Ala. wrote: "We appreciate the courtesy and thoughtfulness of Loveman's and are most appreciative of the personal interest in the fine arts which normally one does not expect from an organization as impersonal as a store."

The community appreciates the service as expressed in this editorial in the Birmingham News: "Loveman's and Mrs. Schwartz are making a great educational contribution, particularly meaningful at this time when there is danger that individuality, creativity and sensitivity to the whole of life might be sacrificed on the altar of armament science, skimmed and packaged thinking, vicarious entertainment."

The Advantages of the American Free Enterprise System Over Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks. I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the RECORD the prize-winning essay written by Miss Karen Bledsoe of Glendora, Calif.

The essay entitled "The Advantages of the American Free Enterprise System over Communism," was written for a contest sponsored by the American Medical Association. It was the winner at Glendora High School and at the San Gabriel Valley regional. It won the California State competition, and rated honorable mention in the national contest.

Miss Bledsoe, 17 years of age, was graduated this year from Glendora High School and plans to enter college this fall.

She shows a high degree of understanding of the free enterprise system and the fact that free enterprise has been an indispensable ingredient in the growth of our Nation and the freedom of our people.

I believe Miss Bledsoe's essay will be of interest to many Members of Congress:

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM OVER COMMUNISM

(By Karen Bledsoe)

The free enterprise system and communism have been conflicting forces for a number of years. In direct opposition to one another, they are now waging a deadly war of subversion and propaganda which affects us all. The outcome of this conflict will mean either liberty or slavery for our Nation. The free enterprise system has proven itself the best possible means of fulfilling man's material and spiritual needs, and it has given the great masses of people a prosperity that is yet unequaled. It is not, as the Communists would have it, a "greedy race to fleece the public", but rather a "contest in giving the best and most efficient service to the public".[1] With its emphasis on voluntary, individual action, free enterprise creates an atmosphere where men put into their efforts a devotion and enthusiasm no money can buy and no force compel. There is a constant pressure behind the drive for progress, and although it produces goods in surplus, it also creates and distributes purchasing power which absorbs this surplus. America's production and standard of living under the free enterprise system have increased nearly tenfold,[2] as has the standard of living in all capitalistic countries. At the same time, however, Russia's economic progress has been slow and uncertain. An American's output is 8½ times that of a Russian,[3] which explains in part why out standard of living is so much higher. The Communists, who believe that industrial development in a free economy leads to the impoverishment of the people, are straining their economy to try to equal the industrial potential of the United States—a most striking testimony "that the development of capital-using industry is now everywhere recognized by everyone as the chief source of national strength and of improved material well-being for people."[4]

Free enterprise is based on three fundamental principles: (1) Individuals have the right to use their talents, energy, and enterprise to further the circumstances of themselves and their families; (2) individuals are entitled to the "fruits of their labor"; (3) they have a right to possess and accumulate property in the interest of their own material welfare.[5]

Communism, however, is completely opposed to these basic principles, and has developed a totalitarian dictatorship in which the sole purpose is world dominion. In theory they advocate a classless society in which each contributes according to his ability, and is given according to his need. In actual practice, however, their society is far from classless, and the rewards of labor bear no relation to need.[6] Under communism man is reduced to a "mindless automation"; he is pushed toward a "nightmare world where men look upon one another, not as human beings, but as mechanical objects".[7]

Communism allows no private ownership of "the means of production, distribution, and exchange";[8] all property is publicly (or actually state) owned. When the state holds a great deal of power it becomes corrupt. In the free enterprise system no excessive

Footnotes at end of speech.

amount of power is given to the state, thus acting as a check on the government and preventing tyranny. The ownership of private property also adds to a great deal of security, by promoting liberty of thought, writing, and action. Income from rent, interest or profit is also prohibited, and can be derived only from wages and salaries, possibly professional fees, and state payments.

A central planning authority plans all economic activities of the country, whereas in a free enterprise system most of the planning is done by the producers with an aim to satisfy the wishes of the consumers. Communism has replaced consumer's choice by "planned production for consumption,"[9] and instead of the individual deciding what he shall buy, the state decides for him.

Under the free enterprise system a man is allowed the free choice of a job, but this is not so under communism. He is forced to work where the state places him with little hope of change.

Perhaps the most significant, however, of the disadvantages of communism is its failure to understand human nature. Man is neither all good nor all evil. He will exert himself far more for himself and his family than for the state,[10] and the state expects him to do far more for the state than for himself or his family. In most cases man will work only as hard as necessary, and when he is receiving no reward for extra effort, he will usually not extend himself.

"The desire to own property is one of the most deeply rooted instincts in the human race,"[11] and communism is denying this instinct to man. Communism's treatment of property satisfies only the basest of human emotions: envy, hatred, and malice. "It satisfies the desire of those who have no property themselves to drag down everyone to their level."[12]

Since human nature and communism cannot be reconciled, the Communists plan to change human nature, but that is where they have made their largest error, for human nature has not, nor will in the future. change. "Free enterprise has achieved its results because it cooperates with human nature; socialism is bound to lead to a retrogression because it flouts human nature."[13]

Although free enterprise has its problems, conflicts, hardships, and injustices, it also has its freedom, liberty, and the rights of the individual. No other system can even begin to equal the free enterprise system in "supplying an abundance of material needs, respecting individual differences and desire, and affording opportunity for achievement according to talent and merit."[14] The successes and failures of free enterprise are the successes and failures of men.

"Free enterprise is the mainspring of the mechanism that has made the United States the strongest nation industrially, and the most prosperous, in all the world."[15] It is up to us to keep it so.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ault and Eberling, "Principles and Problems of Economics," New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1937.

Bridges, Hon. Styles, "Report of American Bar Association Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives," Friday, Aug. 22, 1958, from the Congressional Record.

Cox, Jacob Dolson, Jr., "Material Human Progress." Ohio, the Cleveland Twist Drill Co., 1954.

Flynn, John T., "The Road Ahead, America's Creeping Revolution," New York, the Devin-Adair Co., 1954.

Foster, William Z., "Toward Soviet America," California, Elgin Publications, 1961.

Greenfield, Rev. Edward W., "Free Enterprise," in the Congressional Record in a speech by Hon. James B. Utt, House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 27, 1961.

Hoover, Edgar J., "Masters of Deceit," New York, Pocket Books, Inc., 1958.

Shelly, Thomas J., "Clipping of Note, No. 36," New York, Foundation for Economic Education Inc., Jan. 20, 1951.

Sparks, John C., "Clipping of Note, No. 63," New York, Foundation for Economic Education Inc.

Stone, Willis E., "The Chains of the Constitution," from the Congressional Record, Thursday, Mar. 16, 1961.

Thomas, Ivor, "The Socialist Tragedy," New York, the Macmillan Co., 1951.

Vollner, W. G., "The Primrose Path, Planned Economy," Texas, Texas & Pacific Railway Co.

———, "Be Friends With Communists—How?" from Everyman's Problem, Illinois.

———, "Will America Ever Learn?" the Indianapolis News, Sept. 1960.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Jacob Dolson Cox, "Material Human Progress," p. 38.

[2] Jacob Cox, op. cit., p. 24.

[3] Jacob Cox, op. cit., p. 20.

[4] Jacob Cox, op. cit., p. 26.

[5] Rev. Edward W. Greenfield, "Free Enterprises," p. 2.

[6] Ivor Thomas, "The Socialist Tragedy," p. 33.

[7] "Will America Ever Learn?", p. 10.

[8] Ivor Thomas, op. cit., p. 21.

[9] Ivor Thomas, op. cit., p. 130.

[10] Ivor Thomas, op. cit., p. 152.

[11] Ivor Thomas, op. cit., p. 156.

[12] Ivor Thomas, op. cit., p. 158.

[13] Ivor Thomas, op. cit., p. 204.

[14] Rev. Edward W. Greenfield, op. cit., p. 4.

[15] Jacob Cox, op. cit., p. 36.

Cuba: The Growing Pains of a Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit two articles written by Mr. Jesse Gordon for the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, which give an objective appraisal of the Cuban situation. Mr. Gordon recently returned from a Cuban tour for North American Newspaper Alliance and, I understand, was for a good part of his 3-month stay in Cuba the only American reporter there.

The articles follow:

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, July 19, 1962]

CUBA: THE GROWING PAINS OF A REVOLUTION

(By Jesse Gordon)

The Cuban Revolution rolls on. But the road is steep, and along the way Fidel Castro also finds it rough and bumpy, including some detours.

Not too long ago a friend asked Castro when, in a lifetime filled with nightmarish escapes, he had been the most frightened. Castro replied that he was most scared when he came down from the Sierra Maestra shortly before Jan. 1, 1959, and had to face the task of running a government.

It was a colossal undertaking for a man with little or no experience in administration, and little talent for it. In the Sierra Maestra he merely had to worry about a rag-tag guerrilla army numbering at most several hundreds, with logistic problems and supply lines involving a few score miles at most.

Now he has to worry about 6,500,000 men, women, and children—and his logistics include the whole world.

Let's look first at the distribution. Essential for orderly distribution is an efficient bureaucracy and an efficient bureaucracy requires experienced personnel.

The lack of trained personnel in Cuba is appalling. Practically all former civil service employees have been replaced—many of the replacements are youths in their early twenties, without either knowledge or experience. The shortage of qualified administrators and workers runs through all the Government bureaus. It makes for a lot of errors and even some disastrous ones.

During the past year, a big shortage in pharmaceuticals was noted. Persons with doctors' prescriptions were going from drugstore to drugstore unable to get them filled for lack of medicines.

LACKS THE DOLLARS

The embargo placed upon Cuba by the U.S. Government didn't include food or drugs, but the Cuban government lacks the dollars with which to buy either. Canada, too, was prepared to sell drugs, but again there was a lack of foreign exchange.

Things were reaching a crisis. Castro wanted to know why some one had not been farsighted enough to order medicines from the socialist countries before the supplies became dangerously low.

Some of Castro's subordinates explained to him that Cuban doctors, trained to American pharmaceutical standards, could not adjust quickly to drugs from other countries with varying potencies. Someone else discovered that lots of drugs had been ordered—and delivered—from Soviet-bloc countries. Moreover, it was pointed out for doctors to become accustomed to different labeling and potencies was not all that difficult.

The search began for the drugs that had been shipped in from East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union. Even Communist China had sent medicines, including penicillin. But where were they?

Finally, they were located in out-of-the way warehouses and stores, stashed away in crates and boxes, unopened, unmarked, neither indexed nor catalogued. They included valuable antibiotics which by now were ruined because they had not been properly storaged.

A hue and cry went up with the discovery. A board of inquiry was appointed; accountants and other experts began the task of cataloging the various medicines. A fat report was prepared after the task force had worked around the clock for weeks sifting out the stuff.

In one of the warehouses, for example, the task force stumbled across more than 1 million glass ampule containers. An order had just been placed for them by someone who had not known they had already arrived.

At last report, the study with recommendations was on the desk of Prime Minister Fidel Castro.

The situation in the drug field is not the only mess uncovered by teams of experts searching out distribution bottlenecks. For a long time ships unloading at the docks piled their wares alongside the wharves and departed. There is a tremendous lack of storage facilities in Cuba.

The reason is simple: before the revolution, Cuba was buying mainly from the United States—frequently by mere phone calls. Deliveries were often made within 24 hours. There was no need for storage space.

NEED FOR WAREHOUSES

But now. with ships hauling freight long distances, there is a great need for warehouses of all kinds. Cargoes, left at piers, have been finding their way to some building, somewhere; but nobody afterward seems to know what went where—or how much. There are still lots of needed food supplies and other materiel stashed away in unknown places, because Castro doesn't have the trained personnel in the fields of warehousing and distribution.

But progress is being made, slowly. One way Castro is trying to overcome the personnel deficiency is by sending students abroad to study and work, especially in countries such as the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia. But this takes time.

You may be sure Castro would give almost anything for someone to come down and straighten out the distribution mess. If it gets any worse, perhaps, he will even wish he were back up in the Sierra Maestra, handling only simple problems.

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, July 26, 1962]

The Cuban Revolution After 3 Years

(By Jesse Gordon)

A new type of cane-cutting machine, adapted from an earlier model but never before used, promises to revolutionize the Cuban sugar industry.

One of Castro's biggest headaches during the zafra, or sugar harvesting, was getting the workers to cut the cane. Lots of the campesinos wouldn't turn out.

Explanations are various. Whether or not Castro accepted any of them as valid, it is to be noted that he never appealed to the campesinos directly, nor cast any slurs on their lack of patriotism.

Instead, office workers, soldiers, professional people, students, even some foreigners, were drafted to do the work the campesinos wouldn't do. One could see the truckloads of "volunteers" driving out to the canefields, early mornings, especially on weekends.

Something had to be done quickly. Cuba's 1962 sugar harvest totaled 4,815,000 tons. Last year's harvest was 6,767,000 tons. Next year's sugar production could be even worse. So Cuban engineers, working together with Soviet and other technicians, developed a cane-cutting machine.

I watched a trial run of two such machines, one of them an early American model found abandoned in a canefield. It had been brought over some 15 years ago, but the sugar workers union then wouldn't allow it to be used. The machine required two operators and the Cuban-Soviet technicians suggested that it couldn't be produced in sufficient quantity for next year's harvest.

The second machine was a British model which had been brought over from South Africa. It required only one man to operate and could easily be manufactured at home. Some improvements and adaptations were made to suit the particular needs of the Cuban canefields, which are bumpy and uneven as compared to the South African fields.

As finally developed, the diesel machine, set on a Czechoslovak tractor, weighed about 3 tons. The original British model was capable of cutting between 7,000 and 14,000 arrobas a day (an arroba is equal to 25 pounds). A canecutter, working by hand, cuts an average of 225 arrobas daily.

Castro recently announced that 1,000 of the canecutting machines would be in the fields during the next zafra. He is betting on it.

CHINA BIG IMPORTER

The Government claims that the machine is necessary not only because of a labor shortage, but because, since the Agrarian Reform Act was passed, more intensive use of land has been made. Also, the Government expects an increased demand for sugar in the world market.

For example, the People's Republic of China used to import 75,000 tons of sugar yearly; in 1960, it purchased half a million tons; in 1961 a million tons. The Cuban Government expects that China's imports of Cuban sugar will reach even greater amounts in the near future.

Some technicians, however, doubt that the mechanized canecutters work efficiently on the typically rough, uneven Cuban canefields. It may be that the fields will have to be leveled out and replanted before the machines will work as anticipated.

If that should be the case, Castro will have a bigger headache in store. It would take many years to replant the canefields.

Meanwhile, one of the unforeseen problems, adding new headaches, was the severity of this year's drought. It has been described as the worst drought in Cuba during the past 40 years. It brought more economic woes.

While it is true that the island is far from suffering a famine, there is, nevertheless, a serious food shortage, especially in meat, lard, rice, and milk. Some Cuban officials claim this shortage is partly due to a greater and more equitable food distribution. More people are eating more, particularly in the rural areas. One Cuban official claimed that per capital food consumption in Cuba today is higher than that in Mexico.

However, the school and housing program is moving along at a slower pace than when I was there in the latter part of 1960. Dr. Armando Hart, the Minister of Education, stated that there are now 38,000 primary schools, 294 secondary schools, 27 preuniversity schools, and 14 technological institutes in Cuba. He told me that all Cuban children today attend classes, while before the revolution only half did. He added that illiteracy has been reduced to 1.5 percent.

Agriculture is going "fairly well," according to Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, head of INRA. He was optimistic about the agricultural cadres soon to return from oversea farm training. "We need another year for the 'new look' in agriculture to develop," Rodriguez told me.

The obvious goal of the Cuban leaders is to get Cuba off its one-crop sugar economy, diversify agriculture, and develop basic industries. It is fairly safe to assert that without the extensive economic aid from the Communist-bloc nations the Cuban economy would have collapsed long ago.

Well-informed sources, including some astute Western diplomats in Cuba, predict privately that if the Castro regime holds out another 12 to 18 months, it will become economically invulnerable. Even today, some observers point out, Cuba has developed sufficiently to withstand the economic blows dealt by the United States embargo.

Castro's conflict with the Catholic Church has subsided, at least on the surface, and things are quiet today. The churches on Sundays are usually packed with worshipers.

There is an underground movement, although it remains an unknown quantity as to its size and strength. It appears to be, however, without leadership. The mention of Dr. Jose Miro Cardona or Manuel A. deVarona—leaders of the Cuban anti-Castro movement in the United States—brings forth derisive remarks from the anti-Castro elements within Cuba.

NO EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION

It is fairly safe to assert that there is no effective opposition to Fidel Castro within Cuba today. However, a small clandestine newspaper, Rescate (Rescue), appears sporadically with a program calling for "civil war as the only way."

Although the Cuban Government has never acknowledged that it practices censorship, the censors are there, scanning newspapers, radio and TV, the cabled dispatches of foreign correspondents, and even extending to the mails. But I have reason to suspect that the U.S. post office at Miami keeps a similar watch over mail going into and coming out of Cuba.

Despite all problems and shortcomings, the zest behind the revolution has not disappeared, even though it has subsided somewhat—as one might expect in any revolution more than 3 years old. And Western diplomats in Cuba do not question the fact that Castro is a truly popular revolutionary leader.

Resolutions Urging Federal Authorities To Require Northeast Airlines To Continue Its Scheduled Flight Services In and Out of the Municipal Airport of the City of Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts Senate:

Resolutions Urging Federal Authorities To Require Northeast Airlines To Continue Its Scheduled Flight Services In and Out of the Municipal Airport of the City of Lawrence

Whereas the Northeast Airlines has submitted a petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board requesting permission to terminate certain scheduled flights in and out of Richard F. Condon Airport in North Andover, the municipal airport of the city of Lawrence, thereby terminating service for the Lawrence area; and

Whereas hundreds of thousands of dollars of city, State, and Federal funds have been expended in recent years in the enlargement and improvement of said airport, and the Federal Aviation Administration has approved recent expenditures for the development of the airport; and

Whereas the record of airline passengers served from 1952 to 1958 justifies a longer trial period of service by the Northeast Airlines, which company has not fairly tried to promote business in the Lawrence area, particularly in promoting air mail and air freight, nor tried to evaluate the potential of air passenger business in the Lawrence area, notwithstanding the fact that over $2 million has been invested in new facilities at the Lawrence airport during the years 1958–61 on the basis of the resumption of services at said airport by the Northeast Airlines; and

Whereas the suspension of service requested by Northeast Airlines was tentatively allowed by order of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which order was later withdrawn, at which time the Civil Aeronautics Board stated that Northeast Airlines should resume its original schedule of service out of and into the Lawrence airport until the entire matter of Northeast Airlines service in the New England area, including Lawrence, be reviewed at a regional airport meeting to be held in August of the current year; and

Whereas it is not in the public interest to allow Northeast Airlines to discontinue flight service at the Lawrence airport, no other substitute service being available: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States and the Civil Aeronautics

Board to take such action as may protect the interests of the people of the Lawrence area, and to require Northeast Airlines to continue its services at the Lawrence airport; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, to each Member of the Congress from the Commonwealth, and to each member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Senate, adopted, July 26, 1962.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

A Visitor From New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to read into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the August 3 edition of the Savannah Morning News. I agree wholeheartedly with the remarks contained herein and I appreciate this paper's pointing out the hypocrisy of criticizing the fine citizens of Albany, Ga., while overlooking the far more serious problem of crime here in our Nation's Capital.

The article follows:

A VISITOR FROM NEW YORK

These are strange times. A Congressman from New York journeys to Albany, Ga., to "study" the situation there and recommend solutions.

In the State from which this Congressman comes, violence stalks the streets of a great metropolis, crime runs rampant, racial troubles boil, and citizens are afraid to walk alone through some sections of the city even in daylight.

Despite this, the Congressman can spare the time to come to Georgia and tell Georgians how to solve their problems. Can it be that he is more interested in Georgia than in the State he represents, is he blind to what goes on in New York, or does he think a trip to Albany is a good way to win votes back home?

It would have been better, we think, for this Congressman to have stayed home and sought some solutions there. New York needs his services far more than Georgia. Perhaps New York would also appreciate them more.

Washington, D.C., is also in the need of help. A woman there was recently attacked and knifed as she prayed in a church. The Congressman for whom she worked angrily demanded that some action be taken to quell the wave of crime in the Nation's seat of government. Perhaps our New York friend could do something about that.

There is already too much outside interference in the affairs of Albany. Most of Albany's trouble is due to outside agitators who do not live there, who have no stake in the city's future, and who will eventually depart, perhaps to stir uprest somewhere else.

We place the Congressman from New York in this same category, except that he represents better than some the strange attitude that telling someone else how to clean their backyard is better than cleaning your own.

It Takes a Jolt To Get New Drug Laws—Article by Miriam Ottenberg in the Washington Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, long before the thalidomide tragedy became an international issue, I began working on the problem of tightening our "new drug" laws to give the Food and Drug Administration far more power to act quickly in removing dangerous or doubtful drugs from the market. The stilbestrol incident involving hormone-treated chickens, which cost the Federal Government about $10 million several years ago—an incident I discussed in an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 6—pointed up the fact that after the Government once approves the use of a new drug for commercial purposes, it must then prove the product dangerous in order to take it off the market. Proof of danger is difficult, and involves legal proof, not just substantial scientific doubt as to safety.

OMNIBUS BILL NEEDED TO CLOSE LOOPHOLES

This and other loopholes in the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act prompted me late in 1960—after we had enacted the Color Additives Act as an emergency piece-meal change in the 1938 act intended primarily to bail out the lipstick manufacturers—these things prompted me, I repeat, to develop an omnibus bill to cover not just one or two but all of the many loopholes in consumer protections under that act. I introduced H.R. 1235 on the first day of this Congress, January 3, 1961. It was, and is, I believe, the only omnibus bill which has been introduced since 1938 to close in one piece of legislation all of the gaps and loopholes in the 1938 act in order to protect the consumer in the purchase and use of nearly $100 billion a year of foods, drugs and cosmetics.

It would cover not only those shortcomings in the drug provisions of the act which have now come to blazing public attention as a result of the thalidomide incident, but would apply to a lot of other important things as well. For instance:

LABELING ABUSES

H.R. 1235 would crack down in the labeling abuses which make it difficult if not impossible for the housewife to figure out the comparative prices of different sizes of the same products.

H.R. 1235 would eliminate the special interest exemptions in the law for butter, ice cream and cheese, which exempt the producers from showing on the label the presence of artificial coloring matter.

PRETESTS COSMETICS, CURB PEP PILLS

H.R. 1235 would, for the first time, give the Food and Drug Administration power to require pretesting for safety of any new cosmetic item prior to public sale.

H.R. 1235 would strengthen our powers in combating the frightening increase in the bootlegging of pep pills and barbiturates—the former, one of the major causes of our worst highway disasters, the latter a very common cause of suicide and death.

SAFETY AND EFFICACY

H.R. 1235 would require for the first time pretesting for safety of all the therapeutic devices prior to sale.

H.R. 1235 would require for the first time proof of the efficacy of new drugs and new therapeutic devices, as well as of their safety.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN DRUGS

H.R. 1235 would make possible wider use by physicians in prescribing by generic rather than trade names of drugs, thus helping to bring down prices.

H.R. 1235 would bolster and make really effective the factory inspection authority of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

SAFE, ECONOMICAL FOODS AND DRUGS, SAFE COSMETICS

H.R. 1235 would help rid the market of fake cancer remedies, which not only victimize the pocketbooks of those who buy them but, more important, deter the patient from seeking medical help while there is still time to curb this disease.

H.R. 1235 would require the batch-by-batch testing of every antibiotic drug sold in this country, rather than just the five known at the time this special certification provision of the law was enacted more than 20 years ago.

H.R. 1235 would mean safer and more economical foods and drugs, and safe cosmetics; in addition, it would give the Government the most important powers it lacks in dealing with a situation such as confronted Dr. Kelsey and FDA on thalidomide. These include the power to study all research data of the manufacturer; the clear-cut authority to take as long as necessary in passing on a new drug application, instead of the maximum period of 180 days now available in a contested case; also the power to move instantly to take a new drug off the market in case later information or experience should prove the drug has unexpected or dangerous side effects which outweigh its advantages.

FDA REGULATIONS COVER EXPERIMENTAL TESTING

All of us who have spent years studying our food, drug, and cosmetic laws know that the changes we now need in the law would not have prevented the use of thalidomide on a test basis. Such testing is covered by FDA regulations and these regulations applying to experimental drugs in the research stage can and must be strengthened. That is now being done. The thalidomide tragedy precipitated these improvements in the regulations. It is too bad that the price was so high—in terms of thousands of malformed babies in other countries. But this experience will henceforth improve the safety of all experimental testing of new drugs prior to public sale. Nevertheless, in addition to the tighter regulations now being drawn, we also need new laws to close the loopholes in those cases where a new drug has passed all tests and seems to be safe and efficacious prior to marketing, but then discloses dangerous side effects after going on commercial sale. The Government must be able to move in fast and remove the drug from sale instantly on the basis of substantial doubt. That is the minimum change needed in the law.

Let us not confuse the various aspects of this complex issue. Dr. Kelsey deserves all of the public acclaim she has received, but we will continue to need this same kind of stubborn insistence on proof of safety on the part of all of our FDA pharmacologists, no matter how much we strengthen the new drug laws, because in the final analysis, the experience and knowledge of the licensing officials are the crucial determinants. We can strengthen the hands of the Dr. Kelseys—and we should do so—but let us not sit back then and think all of the problems have been solved and all future crises averted.

OUTSTANDING ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. Speaker, the outstanding investigations reporter of the Washington Star, Miss Miriam Ottenberg, who has deservedly won many awards and much recognition for her work, yesterday had an excellent article in the Sunday Star giving the background of the adoption of the 1938 Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, a monumental piece of legislation for its time. She describes the crisis which occurred from the sale of an untested "wonder drug," Elixer Sulfanilamide. In my testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee this year, on June 20, on H.R. 1235 and on the two administration bills to amend the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, I also cited this background. My testimony is in the Congressional Record Appendix for June 20. Miss Ottenberg has presented the background much more dramatically. As the headline states, "It Takes a Jolt To Get New Drug Laws: A 1938 Parallel."

Mr. Speaker, we could go back to the fantastic exposure of the journalistic "muckrakers" of the early years of this century for similar stories about the "jolts" behind the original Pure Food Law of 1906, the Wiley Act, and its companion measure, the 1906 meat inspection law.

HOW THE COSMETIC LAW WAS ENACTED IN 1938

In 1938, we had cases of women being blinded by the use of eye beautifiers which had never been tested for safety. Out of this came the enactment as part of the new Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938 the first safe cosmetic law—but it is a law which had loopholes deliberately written into it then, and those loopholes are still in it.

Any enterpriser, regardless of ability or experience or knowledge of facilities, can make or market any cosmetic item he wants to without first proving it safe. Once it is on the market, the FDA can move against it if FDA can prove it is not safe to use. The only ingredient which must be pretested for safety is the coloring matter. That is the only one, for that is the only aspect of cosmetic safety covered in the 1960 law.

How many women must be scalped, denailed, burned, blinded, scarred or otherwise disfigured or injured before we can develop enough public concern, and congressional concern, to do something more about this terrible gap in the cosmetic laws? Apparently, we are going to have a chance this year to take up a new drug bill—but the other features of H.R. 1235 and the nondrug features of H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582, the two administration bills based on H.R. 1235, are apparently not going to be considered this year.

HAVE WE BEEN JOLTED ENOUGH?

H.R. 1235 was introduced, as I said, on January 3, 1961. The two administration bills were sent up in May 1962, covering many of the same provisions. The jolt came late in July, in the thalidomide case, finally putting some urgency behind the drug changes proposed in H.R. 1235, H.R. 11581, and the original Kefauver bill.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include Miss Ottenberg's excellent article in yesterday's Sunday Star, giving the history of the 1938 act, and what it took to get it enacted. How often do we have to go through these crises before enacting the laws our good sense tells us are needed?

The article referred to follows:

It Takes a Jolt To Get New Drug Laws: A 1938 Parallel

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

It takes a catastrophe—or a near miss—to get new drug control laws in this country.

Today, the name of the drug is thalidomide, blamed for thousands of deformed babies overseas. Only a hunch, a chance look at a letter in a British medical journal and one woman scientist's determined delaying action averted major disaster here.

In late 1937, the name of the drug was "Elixir Sulfanilamide." That time, tragedy was not averted. It took 108 deaths to jolt Congress into modernizing a 1906 law.

The drug situation in 1937 closely parallels today's story except for the deaths. Then, as now, the deficiencies in the law—as far as protecting the public was concerned—had been recognized and bills were before Congress.

But they weren't moving any faster then than they did this time before the thalidomide scare. A strong new measure had been drafted in 1933. Four years later, it was still there—cut to shreds by amendments and not yet enacted into law. Similarly, Senator Kefauver's bill with its combined effort to lower drug prices and increase drug safety had been gutted by the Senate Judiciary Committee just before the thalidomide near-miss became public.

THE NARROW ESCAPE

As Food and Drug Administration officials are called to Congress these days to shape new laws making certain that drugs are effective as well as safe and that the methods of controlling drugs keep abreast of new scientific discoveries, they can't help thinking how close they came to another "Elixir Sulfanilamide" episode before Congress woke up.

In the fall of 1937, sulfanilamide had been widely heralded as a new miracle drug, able to cope with a variety of infections and serious ailments which had previously resisted cures. Publicity that sulfanilamide could also cure gonorrhea in a hurry had contributed to the boom in sales of the drug.

In a small southern plant, a salesman suggested that if sufanilamide could be put in liquid form, it would have a ready sale among patients who couldn't swallow tablets and capsules.

The plant's chief chemist found that the drug wouldn't dissolve readily in the usual liquids used in medicines, but he found another answer—diethylene glycol, a product of the petroleum "cracking" process. Sulfanilamide would dissolve in that.

NO TEST FOR SAFETY

The chemist tested his pink liquid for taste and odor. He did not test for safety. Nor, presumably, was he aware of articles in medical journals reporting that diethylene glycol, during experiments, had killed frogs, mice, rabbits, and dogs.

His Elixir Sulfanliamide went on the market during September, 1937. The patients were to take two or three teaspoonsful every 4 hours, reducing the dosage in a day or two and continuing "until recovery."

The plant's 200 salesmen handed out sample bottles to druggists and doctors across the country and the orders poured in from almost every State.

Then, on October 11, 1937, the American Medical Association got two telegrams from physicians in Tulsa, Okla. Six of their patients had died after taking the "elixir" and they wanted more information about the drug. Analysis of the pink liquid as well as the drug manufacturer's answer to the AMA inquiry revealed the terrible truth. The "elixir" was not a life saver but a deadly poison.

TRYING TO CALL IN DRUG

The drug manufacturer by now was sending frantic telegrams to his salesmen frantic telegrams to his salesmen to pick up the drug and asking customers to send it back. But by that time, the Food and Drug Administration had embarked on its own operation elixir. Virtually every FDA chemist and inspector had embarked on a round-the-clock search for the bottles. State and local authorities and medical societies were mobilized to join the hunt and newspapers and radio stations sounded the alert.

With an unknown number of bottles still in public hands, the search for the elixir had turned into a race against certain death.

Despite the massive search, 107 men, women and children had fallen victim to the poisoned medicine. The toll went to 108 when the chemist who had conceived the "elixir" took his own life.

The deaths provided all the evidence Congress needed of at least one gaping hole in the law. In fact, even the bill then on Capitol Hill would not have filled it. The bill was hastily amended to forbid the marketing of any new drug product until the manufacturer persuaded the Food and Drug Administration, which might also make its own tests, that the drug was safe.

In June 1938 the bill sponsored by the late Senator Royal S. Copeland, himself a physician, cleared Congress. It met not only the emergency which had spurred its passage but broadened protection of foods and included cosmetics for the first time.

As the years passed, it became increasingly clear that the 1938 law, too, needed revision. New drugs had come on the market. Scientific discovery—here and abroad—had outdistanced the law.

In December 1959, when Chairman Kefauver of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee opened hearings on ways to reduce the cost of drugs, it soon became apparent that health as well as price was involved. Many of his proposals, when he finally introduced his measure in April 1961, were double-barreled. While aiming for lower prices for vital prescription drugs, he specifically provided that drugs should be proven efficacious for their intended use as well as safe.

In March 1962 drug legislation then pending at the Capitol was given a push by President Kennedy in his first message in behalf of consumers. But the push didn't go very far. There were warnings that something could go drastically wrong if more controls weren't placed over the mass of new drugs—but nobody around the Capitol had heard of thalidomide.

PUSHED BY KENNEDY

On April 10, President Kennedy gave the legislation another push. He wrote Chairman Eastland of the Senate Judiciary Committee pointing out that Senator Kefauver's bill incorporated the major recommendations he had made in his consumer message, suggesting some amendments to strengthen the bill's controls and urging passage.

As Senator Kefauver told the Senate later, he was preparing to offer President Kennedy's proposals in the Judiciary Committee when the boom was lowered. At a secret meeting to which he was not invited, he told the Senate on June 11, an agreement was reached either to eliminate or water down virtually every feature of the bill.

One of the watered-down provisions concerned how much time the Food and Drug Administration would be given to appraise the possible side effects and efficacy of a new drug and no new drug application would automatically become effective. Senator Kefauver's bill imposed no time limit on FDA. The watered-down version would have increased the present 60-day time limit to 90 days.

It was that 60-day time limit that Dr. Frances Kelsey was sidestepping when she kept delaying approval of the application for sale of thalidomide in this country on the grounds that the application was incomplete and new information was required.

By the time Senator Kefauver wrote his minority report on his bill, he had heard about Dr. Kelsey and used the near-miss of the thalidomide story to illustrate one of his arguments for a bill strong enough to meet not only episodes like this but to get the rest of what he wanted—including price reduction.

THE HARRIS BILL

Meanwhile, on the House side, Chairman Harris of the House Commerce Committee on May 1 had introduced the administration's bill to improve the safety, efficacy, and reliability of drugs. The bill also provided for the factory inspections wanted by FDA and more control over barbiturates. Mr. Harris' committee held 4 days of hearings on the bill in June and then suspended hearings until further notice. There was no indication he would get back to the bill this session.

It was in that atmosphere of frustration, delay, and uncertainty that the thalidomide story snowballed. The impact of what could have happened here, combined with more details of what had happened abroad, the desperate efforts of an expectant mother to have an abortion for fear of a deformed child and the speculation on how many women of child-bearing age have taken the drug in this country—all contributed to spur action.

At President Kennedy's request, the Senate Judiciary Committee is now busy rewriting the rewritten Kefauver bill with amendments along the lines of the Harris bill. Chairman Harris' committee has announced it will resume hearings on his bill this month. Dr. Kelsey has gotten the highest civilian award the Government gives to its employees.

And out of it all, the chances are good that the parallel with the "Elixir Sufanilamide" story will become even closer—that, before the session ends, a new drug law will be on the books.

Bernardston, Mass., Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to call the attention of my colleagues to a birthday of considerable significance that is being celebrated this year—the 200th anniversary of the founding of the town of Bernardston, Mass. The celebration of the anniversary of any birthday is a joyous event, but this one is especially noteworthy since Bernardston's history dates back to pre-Revolutionary days.

Bernardston, located in Franklin County, in the western part of Massachusetts, borders on the State of Vermont. This beautiful little community is surrounded by attractive natural features, nestled comfortably in the valley through which Fall River tumbles. The mountainous regions to the east and west present a colorful and picturesque display of charming scenery. West Mountain overlooking Bernardston on the west, rises high above the village. The more towering Bald Mountain in the northwest, and Wildcat Mountain just to the north, give Bernardston a setting of majestic beauty.

It is difficult for many to realize that the western part of Massachusetts shares a background different from that of the eastern portion of our great Commonwealth. The first pioneer towns in western Massachusetts were founded by religious liberals who for reason of consicence had protested against the rigidity of Puritan doctrine. From the very beginning, these doughty pioneers lived in constant peril from marauding tribes of Indians. Many experienced the horror of seeing loved ones slain and homes burned. Yet they persevered in this battle for survival. One of the towns threatened with extinction was Bernardston, whose bicentennial celebration this year is the finest tribute we can pay to the tenacity and fighting spirit of its people which have made Massachusetts and these United States such formidable forces in freedom's fight against totalitarianism.

A review of its early history shows that Bernardston was originally called Falls Fight Township, in commemoration of an encounter between settlers and Indians in 1676. In November of 1734, a petition for a territory in which to establish a town, signed by surviving officers and soldiers that belonged to the company of Captain Turner, "and the representatives of them that are dead," was presented to the General Court, and confirmed by 1736. In October 1741, the town had changed its name to Fallstown, adopting its present name upon incorporation on March 6, 1762, in honor of Sir Francis Bernard, appointed in 1760 as Governor of the Province.

The settlement was seriously threatened during the period of Indian warfare between 1745 and 1750, and many of the settlers moved temporarily to towns with greater security. Those who remained worked feverishly to protect their families against the dreaded Indian attacks. The settlement was not extinguished at the hand of the savages. By 1750 the wanderers had returned, and the business of pushing the settlement forward was briskly resumed.

With the pacification of the frontier, the settlers were able to again turn to the needs of their community. From the very beginning, the citizens of Bernardston were strong adherents of the wisdom of worshiping God and educating their children. The first church was constructed by 1740, a roadhouse by 1760, and the first schoolhouse by 1770. Since then, progress has been steady. Today public buildings and small industries add their outlines to the horizon of this community serenely resting in a river valley surrounded by three mountains: Wildcat, West, and Bald.

The records show but vaguely the action of the town during the stirring years of the American Revolution, but they do show that Bernardston was prompt and patriotic in meeting the challenges of the day, and in devoting its energies to a noble contribution of men and means in behalf of the common cause.

Among the noted men to whom Bernardston has given birth, none holds so firm a place in the grateful remembrance of the town as the Honorable Henry W. Cushman. Mr. Cushman frequently represented Bernardston in the State legislature and was elected as a member of the State senate in 1844. He reached the peak of his political career when he served as Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts from 1851 to 1852. Upon his death, Mr. Cushman bequeathed considerable sums of money for the establishment of a library and other projects for the benefit of the community. Cushman Library, Cushman Park, Cushman Hall, and Cushman Lyceum today are integral parts of this beautiful New England community.

Another of Bernardston's benefactors was Mr. Edward Powers, born in Columbus, Ga., but an adopted son of Bernardston. Mr. Powers bequeathed the sum of $20,000 in 1855 for the establishment of Powers Institute.

In 1862, the citizens of Bernardston were joined by their neighbors in celebrating their first centennial. This year, friends are joining in honoring this symbol of 200 years of unflinching devotion and contribution to our Nation's growth and defense against its enemies—from the Revolutionary, through the Civil War, as well as the two World Wars and the Korean war of our own century. We join together to praise progress and devotion to those ideals and traditions which have made us the greatest Nation on earth: devotion to duty, endurance, sacrifice and the precepts of democracy, guided by principles of law and justice. Americans have shown their ability to meet and conquer adversity by squarely facing reality and having faith in God and the will to win. I am sure we all share in the pride of this fine community as it celebrates 200 years of devotion to the democratic way of life.

Futility of Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent resignation of the Premier of a friendly country which has been receiving foreign aid assistance from us has pointed out once again that we cannot hope to support half the world. An editorial in the Palm Beach Post on July 31 pointed this problem out in clear terms.

Under unanimous consent I insert it at this point in the Record:

Futility of Aid

Many observers have long contended that America's foreign-aid program was raising a crop of chronic dependents rather than helping other nations to help themselves and making lasting friends.

Comments of a resigning Premier of Iran seem to substantiate this view.

Said Premier Ali Amini, attacking the United States as the reason for his government's fall because of slowness in sending aid to Iran: "It is just not possible to run a country without funds. One must either get foreign aid or expenses must be cut. None of these was possible."

But records of the U.S. State Department show that the Amini regime received more U.S. aid than its predecessors. Within 14 months of his administration, the United States provided $67.3 million in economic assistance, in addition to $20 million for a development loan.

We just can't afford to support some of these nations in the manner to which we have accustomed them.

America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of President Herbert Hoover shone out for all our Nation to see the other day in the televised coverage of his address at the dedication of the Hoover Library at West Branch, Iowa. The Washington Daily News reprinted in its editorial columns one of the most beautiful portions of his address, which I insert herewith under leave to extend my remarks:

America

The mightiest assurances of our future are the intangible spiritual and intellectual forces in our people, which we express, not by the words "The United States," but by the word "America."

That word "America" carries meanings which lie deep in the soul of our people. It reaches far beyond the size of cities and factories.

It springs from our religious faith, our ideals of individual freedom, which have come in the centuries since we landed on these shores.

It rises from our pride in great accomplishments of our Nation and from the sacrifices and devotion of those who have passed on.

It lifts us above the ugliness of the day.

It has guided us through even greater crises in our past.

And from these forces, solutions will come again.—Herbert Hoover in his West Branch, Iowa, speech of August 10.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Giveaway Blues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, the Max Lerner column entitled "Giveaway Blues" published in the August 1, 1962, issue of the New York Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Aug. 1, 1962]

GIVEAWAY BLUES

(By Max Lerner)

I never thought I would be writing a column aiding and abetting a filibuster, but here I am doing it. There is a little band of Democratic Senators, including ESTES KEFAUVER, WAYNE MORSE, ALBERT GORE, and Mrs. MAURINE NEUBERGER, who are braving the solid phalanx of administration leaders, Republicans, and A.T. & T. to keep the Government from handing over the future of satellite communications to a single corporation.

Their weapon is talk, their position as former antifilibuster champions is vulnerable, and their chances of success are negligible. But they form a gallant little company, and aside from applauding their courage I have more than a suspicion that 10 years from now most of us will also be praising their vision, and that certain administration leaders who are now fighting them will kick themselves for not having been on their side.

Since the two issues of the substantive goal of the dissenting Senators and their method of the filibuster are getting scrambled, I want to start by separating them. First about the filibuster method. Just as it is a mistake to turn any means into an end, so it is a mistake to turn opposition to some particular means into a cult of opposition.

The segregationists have been using the filibuster against civil rights legislation to deprive human beings of their humanity. Their purpose is not to force more mature consideration of the civil rights issue: we have had years of waiting for that particular Godot. Their real purpose is to keep the people's will from ever being registered on that issue. The Kefauver-Morse-Gore group, on the other hand, is using the filibuster on a spanking new issue hardly out of the hamper that hardly anyone has had a chance to think about. By talking they are buying time for more people to do more thinking.

If a filibuster was ever justified, in this limited sense of an embattled delaying tactic, this one is. I wish that some of the Senators I care about on the other side—HUMPHREY and MANSFIELD especially—could clear their minds on the filibuster problems, and join their brothers, with whom they belong on the issue of substance itself.

The issue of substance is whether America will enter the last third of the 20th century, which can be glorious with the light of a great communications breakthrough, with a narrow commitment to harness that breakthrough to a private enterprise whose decisions, whatever the "partnership" composition of the governing board, have to be made with an eye to private profit. That's a long sentence and the problems for organizing the breakthrough industry are complex. But one thing can be said quite simply. There is no reason today why the Government should give away the space research technology for which the people have sweated and paid.

Beginnings are important. That is one of the things we should have learned from the history of the television industry, where a great cultural asset and potential was narrowed to the earthworm vision of commercial motive. What is opening now, with the communication satellite, is an era of even vaster potential not only for mass culture in any particular nation but for a global culture that will shrink all national boundaries. If we begin that era by handing its bright vistas over to A.T. & T. or any other corporation we will be saddled by that beginning all the years of our lives.

The danger is not just that A.T. & T. will in time get a monopoly advantage in the big new industry—perhaps one of the biggest of the future. The real danger is that we will be entering a future of incalculable possibility in world communication, where the stakes will be the high stakes of who and what will be reaching the minds of billions of men, and we will be putting that future in the hands of men not responsible to the people.

Worst of all, we will be cutting ourselves off from new ways of organizing the communications future, still unglimpsed today by any of us.

Mount Carmel Centennial at Mount Carmel, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Mount Carmel, Pa., celebrated the centennial of the founding of their city on August 12. I was given the honor of delivering the Americanism address on this historic occasion.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the program and the text of my speech for insertion in the Appendix:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE MOUNT CARMEL CENTENNIAL ON AUGUST 12, 1962, AT MOUNT CARMEL, PA.

To be asked to speak at this historic centennial celebration is indeed a high honor. I want you to know I appreciate it. The record shows that Mount Carmel, Pa., was incorporated from Mount Carmel Township on November 3, 1862, and that both are named for the biblical mountain in Palestine.

Yours is a proud heritage. Local history further advises that the Cartright family was one of the first to settle here.

The Cartrights were closely followed by Lawrence Lamerson who made the first substantial improvements on a tract of 406 acres granted to him on September 18, 1792. This tract was called Mount Carmel.

Richard Yarnell was the next and then came Felix Lerch. The latter leased the Mount Carmel Inn, first opened in 1824.

The town sprang up around the King's Highway and grew rapidly. Nature had provided an excellent deposit of coal in this area and with the resources of the land and the industry of the pioneer we can now look back upon a proud history.

Yours was the first town in the world to be lighted exclusively by electricity. Thomas A. Edison completed some of his earliest experiments in Mount Carmel and the third plant of the Edison System was erected here November 17, 1883.

I say in deepest reverence that we should thank God for the heritage which is ours—not only in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—but throughout the entire United States. Thus it is indeed appropriate that today we discuss Americanism.

Americanism is a favorite subject of mine.

I have an abiding faith in the heritage which is ours, but not ours to claim without self-discipline and hard work. It is our responsibility and privilege to keep alive the patriotic spirit that was the creed of our Founding Fathers. We are constantly reminded that the era in which we now live is a period of rapid social change. It is variously described as the power age, the empire of machines, the age of speed, the era of change, and the atomic age.

All these phrases aptly characterize our age, but one carries more significance perhaps than the rest, namely the era of change. Human society is now undergoing the most sweeping transformation in its history. Our entire pattern of living is being transformed at an unbelievably rapid rate. Our modern society is challenged by many serious social, economic, and political problems. This is a fact known to all of us.

However, do we realize that the problems we face today reflect the rapid transition which is all around us?

It is common belief that changes in our way of life come gradually; that life differs but little from one generation to another. This was true in earlier centuries. But today we find the world undergoing such rapid changes that perhaps a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln would be more at home in ancient Rome than in present day Washington, D.C.

A healthy nation requires that its citizens shall recognize the social and economic changes and make the best possible use of new mechanical advantages.

At the same time we are privileged to remember that the basic documents that shaped our Government will survive change. It is, therefore, for us to combine the heritage of the past with the changes of tomorrow to make for a stronger America.

Many forms of republics have been created by the peoples of many lands in the history of the struggle for human rights. From a political point of view a republic has meant government by a majority of the people. The majority rule has been achieved by means of universal suffrage and representative government.

As an ideal it is more than a mere form of government. It not only means the participation of the people in public affairs through their elected representatives, it implies that there will emerge out of popular sovereignty a beneficial type of social organization. Our form of government places a responsibility upon the people to control public policy. It demands that they produce a social organization that will give every member of society an opportunity to develop his personal capabilities to the fullest extent.

Representative governments throughout the world have been facing serious crises. Nearly all European governments have been undermined or menaced by fascism, communism, and war.

America not only faced a serious international situation in the Second World War, it continued after the war to be challenged by complicated problems both abroad and at home. The end of World War II found terrible devastation and chaos in all the countries of Europe and Asia that had been engaged in conflict.

The Communists seized upon this situation and began waving the red banner, promising a better life for all those who followed the Communist pattern. But communism has been a world movement from its earliest days. Marx and Lenin in their thinking and planning divided the world into two irreconcilable camps.

The one camp was the Socialist or Communist group, the other the capitalist. They had forseen great conflicts between the two before communism would win out in the world.

Stalin realized it would require the entire productive capacity of the Soviet Union plus the cooperation of Communists everywhere to achieve world communism. He then united the people of the U.S.S.R. in a program to develop and maintain a war economy. He proclaimed the doctrine of "capitalist encirclement." He believed no Communist state could be safe from the influence of capitalist countries until all non-Communist countries had been destroyed.

He believed that any aggression, war, if need be, was justifiable if it extended communism in the world. The present Red empire represents the biggest "grab" in modern history. We know Russia has a way of life far different and far less desirable than our own.

While the Soviet constitution promises many personal liberties, they do not exist in actual practice. Soviet imperialism stands out today as the greatest menace to world peace.

Since 1939 the Communists have grabbed more than one-fourth of the inhabited land area of the world. The Communists control more than one-third of the world's people. The methods employed by the Soviet Union to sieze control of defenseless countries include propaganda, sabotage, infiltration, and outright war.

America must be capable of dealing with these underhanded tactics. Our Government cannot be too loose, too slow, too inefficient.

But we must move with concentrated effort to face these problems. We must set definite goals, follow long-range plans, and exert united action for a concerted effort to achieve clearly formulated objectives.

America now faces the test of an era in which, as I have previously stated, the pace and scope of change are unprecedented. Devotion to Americanism rests on knowledge of our way of life, that the ultimate source of our strength is the devotion of Americans to our own heritage and the determination to preserve it.

"President Lincoln," according to Carl Sandburg, "enjoyed quoting the Irishman who said 'In this country every man is as good as the next one and for the matter of that a little better.'

"We are men, not angels, that is sure.

"Also we hope we are men and not mice.

"And sometimes we feel like worms of the dust, doing the best we can, moving a little soil of the earth from where it was to where it will be."

These words by Sandburg indicate that personal liberty to an American has a special significance.

We place great emphasis on our individual liberty, on such rights as freedom of speech, on the right to do and act as we please under laws which "we the people" have made.

Most important, we have access to the truth on all questions; we may hear all sides.

I would like to emphasize that we should have faith. We should understand that in a democracy we often move slowly, because legal processes must move slowly. Purges, lies and killings are quick.

The most effective way to fight communism is to be a true American. It has always been the way of Americans to risk the abuse of the privilege of freedom rather than suppress those who so abuse it. Our Bill of Rights, which guarantees our freedom, must be taken seriously.

Our American way of life thrives on the challenge of new ideas. Our enemies watch and weigh our every action, every incident of suppression, bigotry, and discrimination.

Soviet propagandists saturate billions of listeners with what they call the ruthlessness of American capitalists and the big American life.

The American heritage will survive if we bring to bear upon the solution of America's problems, informed intelligence, and convictions based on justice.

It is healthy that we should ask ourselves why our sacred national documents have survived the test of time. For example, the best test of the greatness of the Declaration of Independence, both in matter and in expression, lies in the terrific ordeal to which it has been put.

For more than a century and a half the Declaration has been read at gatherings of perspiring citizens at Independence Day observances amid fireworks and orations. Yet, even under those circumstances, when read intelligently the dignity, the lofty aspirations, and the marvelous style of the Declaration have triumphed.

They have triumphed, too, over the criticism which beginning with that of John Adams in the committee which framed it, has been leveled at its originality, its rhetorical structure, and its political philosophy.

What has saved the Declaration of Independence has been the realization that in a brief space Jefferson wrote the creed of a new political faith.

It is faith in humanity, not as members of a caste or an order, but as citizens of a republic. Representatives of every shade of religious belief were in that assemblage. The men who signed that document were in every sense the sponsors of our American way of life, sponsors of a new type of citizenship.

One of the usual mistakes in the consideration of Americans, especially by those who do not know our way of life, is to think of us as though we are all alike. They presume that our democracy has reduced us to complete uniformity.

As a matter of fact it has produced the most highly individualized race in the world's history. Our personal individuality in meeting the struggle for existence comes partially from the training of the pioneer. He had to meet conditions for which there were no precedents—and he met them through individual initiative.

The epic of our Nation with its liberty under law, its many different faiths and national origins, its schools and churches, its clubs and free associations, its rights and responsibilities, that epic is one which we proudly cherish. Many persons, unfortunately, forget that the blessings they receive have come down to them through the bitterness of several wars.

There has been a tendency on the part of some to shun their responsibilities as citizens and react indifferently to the vital needs of our country.

It is through the cracks of this forgetfulness and indifference that the elements seeking to destroy can infiltrate.

Our Nation, therefore, will measure its success in a distinctive way. In the last analysis it will judge itself by the character of the men and women who make it up and the goals they strive to achieve. In the end it is the individual, his self-awareness, his personal powers, his acceptance of the responsibilities of citizenship, that will nurture our American way of life for the generations who follow us.

AMERICANISM PROGRAM, MOUNT CARMEL, PA., CENTENNIAL, SUNDAY, AUGUST 12, 1962

Master of ceremonies, Mr. Arthur A. Bressi.

Invocation, Rev. Robert G. Detwiler.

Greetings by the mayor, Hon. Lawrence R. Joyce.

Greetings by centennial chairman, Dr. Robert E. Allen.

Americanism address, Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Concert, Miss Marie Powers, world famous opera star, accompanist, Mr. George Cory. Selections: "The Lord's Prayer," Maillot; "My Days Have Been So Wondrous Fair," Hopkinson (this was the first American song ever written on our shores, and was dedicated to our first President, Gen. George Washington); "Peace of Mind," Cross-Cory (composer at the piano); "Song for the Lonely," Willian Grant Still (America's first Negro composer of opera); "The Hero," Menotti; "O Mio Fernando" (from La Favorita), Donizetti; "Air of Dido," Purcell.

Benediction, Most Rev. Lawrence F. Schott, D.D., L.L.D.

"Battle Hymn of the Republic," Marie Powers, soloist; Mount Carmel High School Band and centennial chorus conducted by Edmund Nejaimey.

National anthem.

Organ and piano through the courtesy of Parenzan's, Shamokin.

World Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the United States, blessed with a relatively good food supply, still shortsightedly fails to utilize this resource, in my judgment, as an adequate adjunct to our national policy.

Around the globe, about 2 billion people live on inadequate diets.

According to experts, this "food gap," unless and until solved, will prove to be a serious threat to peace; and, as well, a jeopardy of human life.

For this reason, I believe that, as I recommended in the past, we need to again reexamine our national food policy.

The purpose would be not only to better utilize this valuable resource for humanitarian, and possibly strategic, purposes; and also to find ways to lead more people in the world out of the "valley of the shadow of hunger."

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an article by Alton Blakeslee, entitled "World Food Shortage Called Worse Threat Than H–Bombs." Reflecting upon global challenges in the field of nutrition, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Aug. 12, 1962]

World Food Shortage Called Worse Threat Than H-Bombs—Despite U.S. Surpluses, Earth's Present Output Is Insufficient To Feed All 3 Billion People, Scientist Says; 6 Billion Expected

(By Alton Blakeslee)

East Lansing, Mich.—Inspecting the world's scanty food cupboard, a scientist ominously warns: There's not enough food now to feed the world's 3 billion people—yet this population is expected to double in 40 years.

The United States and some other countries are lucky. But one reason they eat so well is they import food—including fish protein in meal to feed to chickens—from nations where many humans are malnourished and lack protein to keep them productive.

The food gap is a bigger threat to civilization and peace than H-bombs, germ warfare, and intercontinental missiles.

And, says Dr. Georg Borgstrom, of Michigan State University's department of food science, most proposals to solve the food shortage make only a small dent in the total problem.

More money is available to study how to feed future space travelers than on how to feed nearly 2 billion hungry people, he adds.

IF WE DIVIDED ALL FOOD

Dr. Borgstrom declares we ought to seek disarmament, but a greater, more urgent need is "for a gigantic rearmament to wage the basic war for human survival" by providing enough food "to give the human race a future."

From his analysis, he concludes:

"If all the food of the world—including surplus stores—were distributed equally and each human received identical quantities, we would all be malnourished.

"If the entire world were fed on the U.S. level, all available food would be only enough to feed less than half the human race.

"The world as a global household knows of no surpluses—merely enormous deficits.

"Yet every month we are adding to the world the population of a Los Angeles (4½ million) and every 4th year more than an entire United States (180 million)."

Swedish born Dr. Borgstrom has traveled on several continents studying food problems, and in five languages (Swedish, French, English, German, and Spanish) can assail what he calls the great calorie illusion.

This, he says, is the assertion that the world can produce enough calories from land and sea to feed everyone now, and for long in the future.

"But, if calories were all that counted, the U.S. corn acreage alone could supply enough calories for every American. And if the total U.S. tilled acreage were devoted to sugarbeets, there would be enough calories to feed everyone in the world.

FEED MUCH TO ANIMALS

"It is not that simple. People wouldn't get the protein and minerals they need, and millions don't, even now."

Americans individually not only eat more total calories than do, say, the people of India, but they also feed a huge amount of calories and protein to livestock and poultry to produce high quality protein. In this total expense of calories, each American accounts for 11,000 calories per day (about 7,500 or so fed to cattle and poultry) versus 3,000 for each Indian and all the livestock in that country.

Dr. Borgstrom worries about a "hunger curtain" dividing the world. The exclusive food club, he says, consists of Americans, New Zealanders, some 200 million well-fed Europeans, and some 15 million persons in Oceania. On the wrong side of the hunger curtain are 2 billion humans, with 600 millions perched on the fence. And "partly because of hunger, half of the 1 billion children alive right now throughout the world will never reach adulthood."

The United States, he adds, "won the prize of enormous resources, far greater than any nation in human history. We have at our disposal of 2.6 acres to feed each citizen. We can afford to keep cattle, hogs and poultry in quantities that consume an amount of protein sufficient to provide 1.2 billion humans with their food needs."

"The Japanese must manage on one-tenth that acreage. For protein needs, their agriculture feeds only 26 of their 96 million people. Fisheries take care of 44 million. Japan imports the protein needed for the other 27 million."

England imports half her protein needs, he adds. The United States imports about 1 billion pounds of meat a year, and more than half of all the fish and seafood Americans consume.

For health and productivity, "the world desperately needs high quality proteins, and at a cheap price."

Fisheries can be expanded, "but even doubling the ocean's production—which is about the limit—would not do all the job even for the present world population."

The Soviet Union has taken the lead in developing ocean resources for protein to feed her people, and Russia, despite her farm troubles, is on the right side of the hunger curtain, Dr. Borgstrom says. Red China is not—and some of the European satellite peoples are finding it hard to get proper food.

Food is being exported from African countries and South America "at the cost of the health and basic food needs of the working people, and when they become undernourished, the economy is sick."

NEED POPULATION CONTROL

One-fifth of the world's catch of fish, constituting an important protein source, now goes to feed poultry and livestock to give Americans high quality protein in eggs, broilers, and pork chops.

"One-sixth of the protein from the Pacific Ocean goes to feed broilers and livestock in North America and Western Europe," Dr. Borgstrom reports. "If it were consumed in Peru and other countries where the fish are caught, that would raise the animal protein intake of the whole of South America above that of people in the Mediterranean region."

Dr. Borgstrom says he sees no hope of conquering hunger unless world population is controlled, and "even then it will be a close thing."

Well fed countries had best realize how much they are dependent on food imports, and that their food standards can go down if imports are cut off, he warns.

The well fed world can't just count on fanciful foods of the future like soup from algae, grass pudding, or beefsteak processed from sawdust and wooden chips, he says.

"All of us have got to start realizing what things really cost in terms of the world's limited resources, the cost in terms of water, land, calories and proteins and soil depletion. We can't merely talk about how nice it would be if other countries became democratic like us, and became informed, and built up their own food supplies.

AMERICAS MAY BE DIVIDED

"For one thing, malnutrition makes people weak, unproductive, and kills ambition. And the world's total resources are too small for everyone to have our standards.

"Mankind is facing the alternatives of extinction or survival. Human solidarity or a class struggle between nations are the choices," Dr. Borgstrom says. "The Americas are caught right in the middle of this formidable wrestling. The northern and southern sections of this hemisphere threaten to land on different sides of the dividing fence."

Canadian Lumbermen Silent on Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, last month on the 26th, President Kennedy announced a six-point program which he said was designed to assist the lumber industry and to improve its competitive position.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, the President's program has many good points and could be effective if carried out. I believe, however, politics might be involved to the point that parts of this potential program may never be acted upon. Without going into details of the program as a whole, let me mention two things. First, the meat of the program was proposed over a 6-month period by both Republicans and Democrats from the Western States involved. But, when the announcement was presented, only the Democrat Representatives and Senators were invited to the White House. The second point is the fact that Republican Congressmen of Washington State introduced legislation requesting the President to negotiate with Canada on the matter of quotas and to impose quotas until an agreement is reached. Instead, the President asked for voluntary quotas.

What will be the result is unknown, but for sure the Canadian's probably will hedge. An article by Mr. Arnie Myers, which I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record, points out that Mr. Kennedy is asking Canada to take a dose of its own medicine. By this, the article means Canada persuaded Japan to set a voluntary quota on its imports to Canada. So far, I have not seen evidence the Canadian Government is willing to voluntarily limit British Columbia imports of lumber to our Atlantic market. By this, I mean, Canada is not in the mood to voluntarily set quotas for British Columbia even though it does not mind suggesting and accepting voluntary quotas on the part of Japan.

In addition to the article by Mr. Myers which the Vancouver, British Columbia, Sun carried on August 1, 1962, and to which I referred, I include under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Seattle, Wash., Times on August 9, 1962.

Both the article and editorial follow:

[From the Vancouver (B.C.) Sun, Aug. 1, 1962]

GOVERNMENT KEEPS MUM ON LUMBER QUOTA

(By Arnie Myers)

OTTAWA.—The Federal Government is maintaining a slience on the question of possible cutbacks in Canadian lumber exports to the United States.

It was last Thursday that President Kennedy suggested negotiations between Ottawa and Washington aimed at persuading Canada voluntarily to restrict its exports.

Finance Minister Donald Fleming made it clear the next day that the Canadian Government regards the move as extremely disturbing. But so far the Government has taken no official stand on the question.

Federal Forestry Minister Hugh John Flemming had a natural forum to put forward the Government's view Tuesday, when he spoke to the National Wooden Box Council at Murray Bay, Quebec.

Flemming dealt at some length with Canada's lumber trade with the United States, but he never once mentioned the Kennedy proposals.

GREEN SILENT, TOO

Responsibility for replying to the Kennedy suggestion has been left with External Affairs Minister Howard Green. So far Green has said nothing.

It's difficult to believe Kennedy would announce such far-reaching proposals without first having informed the Canadian Government. But Green insists he has not yet received any formal proposal from the White House and that therefore he cannot state the Government's stand.

Perhaps Green is reserving his fire until he sees the whites of their eyes. He may feel that speaking out now would be taken as an admission that would prejudice its case when and if it comes to formal negotiation.

The Canadian Lumbermen's Association has also been preserving a discreet silence on the subject waiting for the Government to give a lead.

It may be that both the Government and the association feel somewhat handicapped by their awareness that Kennedy is merely asking Canada to take a dose of its own medicine.

Last year Japan—undoubtedly under Canadian persuasion—set a "voluntary" limit on her exports of hardwood plywood to Canada.

Even this did not satisfy Canadian lumbermen. Their association complains that the quota—51 million square feet per year—was set at the level of Japan's biggest ever export year and should have been set considerably lower, perhaps at a 10-year average.

And they say the quota did not sufficiently protect them from outside competition. Other nations which had seldom if ever sold plywood to Canada have moved into this market, and Canadian lumberyards now stock plywoods from the United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Israel, Gabon and other new competitors.

SURCHARGE PROTEST

The very day Kennedy's plan was announced, the association took the Federal Government to task for exempting these imported plywoods from the 5- to 15-percent tariff surcharge Diefenbaker slapped on a wide range of imports as part of his post-election austerity program.

In the face of this it is difficult for either the Government or the association to wave the banner of free trade and become convincingly indignant over Kennedy's "protectionist" attitude.

The Kennedy proposal is a significant indication of the vulnerability of Canada's dollar-strengthening austerity program to outside influences.

A mainstay of that program is the drive to reduce imports and increase exports to reduce the balance-of-trade deficit.

But without the cooperation or at least the tolerance of the Americans, the program is vitiated.

UNDER PRESSURE

President Kennedy undoubtedly wants to see Canada's economic situation strengthened. But despite his good will, it is clear that he is subject to economic and political pressures over which he has little control.

The lumber export situation is a case in point.

Kennedy's proposal was clearly a surrender to the lumber interests of the U.S. Pacific Northwest, who have been most hurt by increasing Canadian competition, and their lobbyists in and out of the U.S. Congress.

The lumber trade will be a political issue in the congressional elections in these States this fall, and Kennedy apparently felt strong measures were justified in his drive to strengthen his congressional position.

The interests of Canadian lumbermen—and, more important, Canada's austerity program—were obviously secondary.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Aug. 9, 1962]

CRUCIAL TIME FOR LUMBER AID

British Columbians, in their understandable concern with holding—and increasing—the inroads their lumber industry has made into the U.S. Atlantic Coast market at the expense of the American Pacific Northwest, have not been slow to recognize their principal ally.

That ally in the present circumstances is delay.

The aid-to-American-lumber effort announced 2 weeks ago by President Kennedy, plus new moves afoot in Congress, could do much to set right those U.S. Government policies and practices that have amounted to discrimination against American lumbermen in their own domestic markets.

But observers wise in congressional and executive agency procedures know well the validity of the ancient Greek adage, "There's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip."

The Northwest congressional delegation has worked well in recent weeks to counter the combination of circumstances that has resulted in the closure of scores of mills and the loss of thousands of jobs in lumbering communities.

Only a continuing vigorous followthrough while the subject of lumber still is high on government priority lists, however, is likely to produce lasting results in saving Northwest jobs.

The next few weeks will be crucial in making practical politics work for the benefit of American lumber.

The Vancouver (British Columbia) Sun well recognized this when it stated editorially this week:

"If definite U.S. action against the British Columbia industry can be postponed until after the November elections, it is quite possible negotiations may be much less threatening to our prosperity and trade."

But it is not only the November elections that present a significant deadline in terms of the political realities that make the wheels turn in Washington, D.C.

An even more important deadline, perhaps, is the close or the present congressional session. The Pacific Northwest delegation—and its allies from the southern pine region—are in a position to pull considerable weight for lumber in view of the narrow balance of power that exists in regard to a number of key legislative issues.

It should be emphasized that the battle on behalf of lumber is entirely bipartisan. Lumber State Democrats and Republicans are working in harmony as to both objectives and tactics.

The Sun reported this week that British Columbia forest-product profits are up substantially over last year, and that 535 million board feet of British Columbia lumber was shipped to the U.S. Atlantic Coast in the first half of this year, compared to 432 million feet for the same period last year. Most of this increase is at the expense of Washington-Oregon mills.

The various countermoves outlined at the White House, in some Federal agencies and in Congress are aimed in the right direction. But whether they will hit the target effectively depends upon the maintenance of maximum pressure during the first few weeks.

What Took the Bloom Off?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, with the state of the United States economy currently a matter of high policy discussion, I insert, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the RECORD this informative account of why the economy has not shown greater recuperative powers. The article by economics writer Bernard Nossiter appeared in the Washington Post of August 5, 1962:

WHAT TOOK THE BLOOM OFF?

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

An ambivalence about the economy that marks much public discussion was expressed by President Kennedy at his news conference last week.

The President pointed to the gains in output and income since he took office and said he would welcome a political debate over this record. But at the same time, he acknowledged with considerable frankness that the Nation wasn't doing as well as it should.

What has gone wrong? Why has the recovery that looked so healthy a year ago lost its vigor? What took the bloom off the boom?

The practitioners of economics, the dismal science, have no simple answer. Indeed, as usual, they disagree among themselves.

But for the most part, their disagreements are ones of emphasis. There is a consensus of sorts emerging on the main points, even if each expert would assign different weight to them.

In talks with professional economists, these are the points that are made again and again.

The economy has never fully recovered from the 1957–58 slump. Since the economy turned sour 5 years ago, business has been marked by abortive recoveries from shallow recessions. The gains in output, measured against the growth in population, have been slight.

Fiscal policy, the mix of spending and tax collection, has been too tight. The Federal budget comes into balance at a point well below full employment. This very fact prevents the attainment of both a balance and full employment. That is, as the economy begins to rise, withdrawals from the income stream in the form of taxes rise much more rapidly than new additions to the income stream from Federal spending. The higher the economy gets, the more restrictive this clamp becomes. As a result, demand is held down and investment is discouraged.

Technological change, symbolized by the word "automation," transformed the economy at a much more rapid rate than is generally acknowledged. This undigested burst of technology has been capital-saving (i.e. greater output from the same investment input) as well as laborsaving. It has left industry with excess capacity in relation to consumers' ability to buy.

A great shift in tastes has taken place, reflecting the higher incomes of a large segment of the population. Consumers are spending relatively less on goods such as cars, clothing, washing machines and toasters; they are spending relatively more on services such as vacations, television repairs and doctors. In 1948 consumers spent 64 cents out of every dollar of income on goods; in 1961 they spent only 55 cents on goods. But expenditures for goods have a higher multiplier than those for services; that is, $1,000 spent on a car will have a greater effect in increasing jobs by increasing demand for parts, raw materials and the like than $1,000 spent on doctors' services.

The pricing policies of some concentrated industries, notably autos and steel, has been a curb. By maintaining relatively high prices, these industries break even when large portions of their productive capacity are idle. If they followed lower price, higher output policies, their demand and employment would rise and this would spread throughout the economy.

How alarming is all this? None of the experts can say with confidence that another slump is immediately ahead, that output will actually decline in the coming months. But there is a widespread belief, reinforced by the performance of the past 5 years, that rapid growth is unlikely without some major changes in policy.

The performance of this recovery has been typical. A quick way of illustrating this is to look at industrial production, a measure of the output of mines, mills, utilities and factories. Beginning in March of 1961, when the recovery began, the index of industrial output was spurting ahead 2 percent a month. But since July of 1961, the gains have averaged a quarter of this, with brief lulls followed by brief advances.

Much the same thing happened early in 1960. Indeed, if it had not been for the buildup of steel inventories in anticipation of the 1959 strike, the turndown would probably have come sooner than it did in mid-1960.

Much of the current discussion of possible remedies revolves around the budget. There is a wide area of agreement that taxes should be cut—although whose taxes should be reduced and at what point in time the reduction is needed is a source of dispute within and without the Kennedy administration.

Several authorities, concerned about the repressive effect of taxes, are now beginning to question whether the tax structure—as distinct from the level of taxes—does not bear too heavily on spending and encourage too much saving.

These experts recall that the present tax structure is largely an inheritance of World War II and Korea when the Nation was faced with inflationary pressures from the sudden burst in Government spending. Taxes then were designed appropriately to clamp down on spending and stimulate saving.

On the other side of the fiscal picture, changes in Government outlays also have dampened a business advance. The sudden cutback in military spending in early 1957 helped bring on the slump that summer; similarly, last year, defense outlays were rising about $2 billion every 3 months and this year the gains have been less than $1 billion.

In all of the soul searching about the current sluggishness, the lack of enlarged business spending for new equipment and plants is a recurring theme. The analysts agree that the corporations are liquid, that no shortage of funds is holding them back.

But the corporations are confronted now with unused capacity; their expectations of future demand and sales is clearly not high enough to justify stepping up the pace of their investment. And this weakness of future demand can be traced to the factors discussed above—taxes, Federal outlays, technological change, and the shift in tastes.

This does not exhaust the list of reasons for the economy's weakness. Among the points sometimes cited are the generally restrictive character of monetary policy, the rise of foreign competition for American producers, and the growing inequality of incomes.

The general sluggishness of the economy has stirred talk that has faint echoes of the 1930's, although the situation now is vastly different from that depressed era. More and more economists are using the expression "high level stagnation" to describe the unsatisfactory state of present affairs.

Communist Party Praises UAW Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that in the June 3 issue of the Worker, the Communist Party, U.S.A., expresses approval of a series of resolutions passed by the executive committee of the United Automobile Workers following their annual convention held May 4–10. These resolutions are included in an article which appeared in the July-August 1962 issue of Straight Talk, a publication issued by the Council for Labor's Rank and File. Because I believe many of my colleagues would be interested in reading this article entitled "Communist Party Praises UAW Resolutions," I insert it, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COMMUNIST PARTY PRAISES UAW RESOLUTIONS

The Communist Party U.S.A., in its official publication The Worker (June 3 issue), expresses great elation over a series of resolutions adopted by the United Automobile Workers immediately following the big union's annual convention at Atlantic City May 4–10. Actually the UAW convention delegates were not granted the privilege by UAW President Walter Reuther of discussing and voting upon the resolutions so highly prized by the worldwide Communist apparatus. Reuther decided to withhold these proposed resolutions from the convention floor. His UAW Executive Committee approved them quickly in private session following the convention.

Reuther did not withhold from the delegates, however, the privilege of electing a UAW president and a secretary-treasurer. The candidates for the offices were Reuther and Emil Mazey, respectively. Both won—without opposition. Mazey gained even greater publicity later when, to the delight of the Communists, he led a parade in Detroit protesting resumption of nuclear bomb testing by the United States.

Some of the UAW resolutions which the Communists found so pleasing were:

1. "We urge Congress to reject the administration's wiretapping bill."
2. "We support clemency for Junius Scales who is imprisoned for the crime of membership in the Communist Party USA."
3. "We call for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee."
4. "We oppose deportation of anyone on account of past membership in the Communist Party."
5. "We oppose the governmental Subversive Activities Control Board report and findings that the Mine, Mill & Smelter's Union is 'substantially directed, dominated or controlled' by Communists."
6. "We oppose current efforts of the Government to suppress the mailing of foreign Communist propaganda." (Thousands of tons of this propaganda from Red China and Soviet Russia flow into the United States weekly, designed to brainwash the citizens, especially the youth.)

At the United Packinghouse, Food & Allied Workers (AFL–CIO) convention in Minneapolis on May 25, a number of these same resolutions strangely enough showed up and were adopted. The Communists were pleased by this action too.

United States Supports Lotteries in 50 Countries—Why Not at Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Supports Lotteries in 50 Countries—Why Not at Home?" which appeared in the Victoria Mirror of Texas on August 9, 1962.

As the sponsor of the national lottery bill in Congress, I urge the reading of this interesting article:

UNITED STATES SUPPORTS LOTTERIES IN 50 COUNTRIES—WHY NOT AT HOME?

Almost every week there are facts presented to the Congress of the United States in connection with national lotteries being operated by countries all over the world. Almost all of these lotteries are in countries the U.S. Government has been supplying with money and free gifts for many years.

It is pointed out to the Congress that these lotteries are producing much revenue for these countries, for the benefit of their schools, hospitals, etc. Many of the representations made to Congress upon behalf of these lotteries are presented by Congressman PAUL A. FINO, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and also a representative of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

A typical presentation of Congressman FINO on this highly controversial subject of which many residents of the United States are not too familar is reproduced as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, while we persist in refusing to capitalize on the natural gambling spirit of the American people and while we stubbornly continue to ignore the tremendous revenue producing features of a national lottery in the United States, more and more of our American dollars leave our shore every day in support of foreign operated lotteries and other gambling activities.

"Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 30, will be a very important day in the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans across this country. It will be important because the results of the Irish Hospitals Sweepstakes will be announced. It will also be important to the Irish Government because worldwide sales of tickets for this run brought in the net sum of $15,764,851. I venture to say that at least $13 million came from the pockets of our own citizens.

"Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for most of our American taxpayers to understand the double role played by our Government. While we assume a sanctimonious attitude about gambling, we continue to tax all sweepstake and gambling winnings; we impose taxes on admission to race tracks where parimutuel gambling is allowed; we insist that all professional gamblers purchase $50 tax stamps and pay 10 percent tax on gross receipts. Aren't we really engaged in a game of hypocrisy?

"Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come to be sensible and realistic about our gambling problem. The time has come for us to remove the blinders and recognize the obvious—the fact that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in most human beings. The time has come for us to control and regulate this universal human trait for our own benefit.

"Mr. Speaker, a national lottery in the United States, under proper Government supervision and control, would not only stop the flow of money to foreign lotteries but would pump into our own Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional new revenue. Can we think of a more sensible and profitable solution to our problem of gambling and the Government's need for additional income? Let's rub the luck of the Irish on our American taxpayers."

Since this subject of national lotteries is receiving so much attention in our national Congress, some firsthand information on this matter should be informative and interesting.

In the first place, it is pointed out in the Congress that all of the foreign countries where lotteries are operated are legal and proper and under government supervision and regulation and controlled with no adverse effect on the economic, social, or moral standards. It has been stated that such legalized lotteries have improved their lot. In fact, it is claimed that gambling in these foreign countries is treated as an instinctive and universal human trait and not as an evil. They say that a realistic and sensible approach toward the human urge to gamble has been most profitable to these countries, and it has provided pleasure to the public and enhanced financial benefits to their respective government treasuries.

Further, it is suggested that if such a national lottery were conducted in the United States, millions of dollars would remain in this country and could be used to a good purpose rather than to have these dollars leaving the country to be used in lotteries of foreign nations where nothing is gained by the United States whatsoever and the foreign countries are the benefactors.

Information has been presented to the Congress that 50 countries in the world "spin the wheel of fortune" and that the gross receipts for the year 1959 amounted to many billions of dollars. The legislator who continues to bring facts and figures before the American Congress further points out that a national lottery in this country would not only regulate, check and control the gambling desire of American people but the country could with the additional revenue bring tax relief to the overburdened wage earners and help to reduce the mounting national debt.

A list of the countries showing the population in column 2, the annual gross receipts from lotteries in column 3, and the amount of U.S. Government foreign aid money in column 4 follows:

Country	Population	Annual lottery gross receipts	Foreign aid from U.S. Government	Country	Population	Annual lottery gross receipts	Foreign aid from U.S. Government
Argentina	20,613,900	$25,000,000	$460,500,000	Israel	2,089,000	$14,000,000	$709,100,000
Australia	10,166,000	78,000,000	----------	Italy	50,600,000	72,000,000	5,517,000,000
Austria	6,933,905	14,300,000	1,170,100,000	Japan	93,050,000	12,462,000	3,462,500,000
Belgium	9,144,000	16,800,000	1,935,200,000	Luxembourg	----------	500,000	----------
Bolivia	3,416,000	1,000,000	191,700,000	Mexico	33,304,000	55,120,000	600,000,000
Brazil	65,000,000	17,465,000	1,376,500,000	Netherlands	11,400,000	10,000,000	2,416,000,000
Chile	7,550,000	23,000,000	364,600,000	New Zealand	2,343,000	2,000,000	----------
Columbia	14,000,000	3,506,283	249,500,000	Norway	3,572,000	14,000,000	1,024,500,000
Costa Rica	1,099,962	10,000,000	68,700,000	Panama	1,000,000	28,000,000	58,600,000
Cuba	6,300,000	35,420,000	52,000,000	Paraguay	1,728,000	1,363,934	39,500,000
Cyprus	----------	2,016,000	----------	Peru	10,000,000	2,460,800	334,300,000
Czechoslovakia	13,500,000	12,000,000	----------	Philippines	23,266,900	17,827,335	1,555,700,000
Denmark	4,500,000	6,042,000	822,200,000	Poland	29,500,000	53,364,417	509,400,000
Dominican Republic	2,900,000	32,000,000	8,800,000	Portugal	8,980,682	24,000,000	370,600,000
Ecuador	4,254,000	3,152,300	84,300,000	Puerto Rico	2,300,000	52,500,000	----------
Finland	4,435,000	4,300,000	----------	Spain	30,000,000	92,000,000	1,470,300,000
France	45,400,000	133,800,000	9,423,600,000	Sweden	7,475,000	51,200,000	108,900,000
Germany	54,798,000	240,000,000	4,993,900,000	Switzerland	4,714,929	5,916,353	----------
West Germany and West Berlin	----------	250,000,000	----------	Thailand	----------	34,500,000	571,800,000
Greece	8,618,000	15,000,000	3,073,500,000	Turkey	26,000,000	8,400,000	3,094,900,000
Ghana	----------	1,200,000	4,000,000	Uruguay	3,600,000	23,400,000	72,300,000
Guatemala	3,618,000	3,000,000	117,400,000	Venezuela	6,500,000	67,300,000	73,300,000
Haiti	3,500,000	3,000,000	80,400,000	Yugoslavia	18,530,000	20,000,000	2,132,400,000
Honduras	1,887,389	15,000,000	34,900,000	United Kingdom	----------	----------	8,668,300,000
India	----------	35,000,000	2,383,900,000	England	----------	2,000,000,000	----------
Ireland	2,894,822	48,976,859	146,200,000				

NOTE.—U.S. taxpayers in reading col. 4 figures, billions of tax dollars given to these countries, should bear in mind that Congress has increased the giveaway and more of your tax dollars will be sent to these and other foreign countries.

The Land-Grant Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this year we are observing an important anniversary, the significance of which has been widely recognized.

One hundred years ago President Abraham Lincoln, in spite of his crushing load of military decisions, found the time to give thought to quite another kind of document among those heaping his desk. The document he signed into law was the Morrill bill, creating the land-grant colleges. It may have been because of other pressing decisions that seemed so important at the time, but the President's action on that day passed almost without notice. The Morrill Act, however, has become the most important single piece of Federal legislation in the history of American education. It has led to the establishment of 68 unique land-grant colleges and universities including Washington State University, and such other honored and distinguished institutions as the Universities of California, Illinois, and Maryland, Rutgers, Purdue, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

My purpose in observing the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Morrill Land-Grant Act is not merely to make passing reference to an anniversary, but to show that actions taken by the Federal Government today will oftentimes reach far into the future in shaping the lives of Americans yet unborn.

In 1862 only 1 young American in 1,500 went to college. Today one in three attend. The land-grant system has become the Nation's largest single source of trained and educated manpower. Today's land-grant colleges enroll 20 percent of all U.S. college students. They confer 40 percent of all the doctor's degrees awarded in this country. Through their ROTC programs, these institutions provide almost half of all the Regular and Reserve officers in the Armed Forces. Twenty-five of the forty-two living American Nobel Prize winners have earned degrees from land-grant institutions.

Research at these colleges and universities brought the development of the first cyclotron, television tube, transistor, the production of pure uranium, and the discovery of such wonder drugs as streptomycin, stilbestrol, and dicumarol. The ceramics, soybean, and woodpulp industries all have their start in land-grant colleges.

But perhaps the greatest impact these institutions have had is in the field of agriculture. In 1862 the farmer produced enough for himself and only four others. Today he provides enough for 26 others. Land-grant college research provided the key that unlocked the technological advances that made American agriculture the envy of the world.

Certainly, in our State we have benefited from the fine work that has been done by our land-grant college, the Washington State University. On this 100-year anniversary I pay tribute to all land-grant colleges in general and to our own Washington State University in particular with these words of Jonathan Swift:

> That whoever could make two ears of corn, or two blades of grass, to grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before, would deserve better of mankind, and do more essential service to his country, than the whole race of politicians put together.

Homecoming Welcome for Combat Support Company, 2d Battle Group, 128th Infantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in our history, the 32d Division, Wisconsin National Guard, was called to service during peacetime and returned to their homes in peacetime. These men were welcomed home through Wisconsin, and reservists and other guard divisions throughout the Nation by a proud and grateful people. In Wisconsin, the city of Platteville was chosen for the welcome home ceremony, a symbol representative of the feelings expressed in other communities.

Platteville has long been proud of old Company M of the 128th Infantry. These men of Combat Support Company, 2d Battle Group, 128th Infantry, have ranked as one of the top strength units of the Wisconsin National Guard and the 32d Division. It was a winner of the Eisenhower Trophy given for the overall excellence of the unit.

This significant ceremony was recognized by the presence of State leaders, Maj. Gen. Donald W. McGowan, chief of the National Guard Bureau in Washington; Maj. Gen. Clifton F. Von Kann, assistant chief of staff for operations in the U.S. Strike Command; Lt. Gen. J. K. Waters, Fifth Army Commandant; Maj. Gen. Ralph J. Olson, adjutant general, Wisconsin National Guard; and county and community leaders from the entire area.

The program, under the able direction of Mr. T. R. Given of the Community Action Council of Platteville, moved flawlessly under a brilliant sun to the cheering of tens of thousands of area residents.

This was an historic occasion for the National Guard, for the Platteville unit, and for America.

The welcome home program held in the Platteville downtown city park follows:

WELCOME HOME PROGRAM, PLATTEVILLE DOWNTOWN CITY PARK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 4, 1962, 11 A.M., ROBERT J. BODDEN, WSWW GENERAL MANAGER, MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Ladies and gentlemen, this is Platteville's great day. To your left on the street in front of the municipal building stands our honor company, Combat Support Company, 2d Battle Group, 128th Infantry. And now, after all the individual welcomes of the past week, we all shall say welcome to Platteville's pride as they march in with the band playing the "32d Division March."

[Band plays "32d Division March." Unit moves in in single file to seats before platform.]

The invocation to open our program today will be offered by the Reverend R. R. Doering, senior clergyman of Platteville, and pastor of the English Lutheran Church. Reverend Doering.

[Reverend Doering gives invocation.]

Our host today is our mayor, the Honorable Lawrence C. Kindschi. Mr. Kindschi, engineer, businessman, manufacturer, and public servant, has been mayor of the city since last spring. For this significant occasion, for Platteville, our neighbors, and all America, Mr. Kindschi will speak for all of us in this, our welcome home. Mr. Kindschi.

[Mayor gives short welcome message.]

Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Platteville's great day to honor its National Guard company has brought us a distinguished group of guests. You will meet many of them during this program, but I wish to introduce members of this delegation now.

Gov. Gaylord Nelson is commander in chief of the Wisconsin National Guard. In another week, his command will be enlarged as the 32d Division resumes its National Guard status.

Governor Nelson, we are glad you could be with us today for this historic occasion in beautiful Platteville, Wis., in the United States. Governor Nelson.

[Band plays quick "On Wisconsin" as Governor approaches speaker's stand. Governor speaks.]

Thank you, Governor Nelson.

Joining our program is "Mr. Grant County" himself, Fred Parker of Fennimore, chairman of the Grant County Board. Mr. Parker.

[Mr. Parker stands.]

Maj. Gen. Ralph J. Olson, the Adjutant General of Wisconsin, heads the Wisconsin National Guard forces of the State as the chief of staff to the Governor. I introduce to you Major General Olson.

[General Olson stands.]

Men of the military in Platteville include a familiar name. Brig. Gen. Scott Cairy, now retired, who in 1942 organized the Wisconsin State Guard, a force of 5,000 men who served the State during World War II. General Cairy.

[General Cairy stands.]

The military organization in Wisconsin includes Regular Army advisers, and we want you to meet the senior Army adviser, Col. George Stump, Madison. Colonel Stump.

[Colonel Stump stands.]

Our next guest is a veteran of the 32d Division and now U.S. Property and Fiscal Officer. Col. Malvin P. Wang of Camp Douglas. Colonel Wang.

[Colonel Wang stands.]

Now a man who is familiar to Platteville, for he served nearly all of his military career with the 128th Infantry. The former commander of the Battle Group, now deputy brigade commander of the 32d Division, Col. Joseph Stehling.

[Colonel Stehling stands.]

The information officer of the 5th U.S. Army at Chicago, but still a Wisconsin resident, Colonel Hamele.

[Colonel Hamele stands.]

Another 32d Division leader joining us is Lt. Col. Arthur J. Kessenich, Milwaukee, who is another veteran of the 128th and now the division assistant chief of staff for operations, Colonel Kessenich.

[Colonel Kessenich stands.]

A veteran officer of Grant County, from Lancaster, Lt. Col. Newman Enloe, retired.

[Lieutenant Colonel Enloe stands.]

The American Legion Wisconsin department commander, Gil Stordock, Waupaca, joins us for this memorable occasion. Commander Stordock.

[Commander Stordock stands.]

You noticed in the parade that southern Wisconsin was amply represented, and this is a wonderful characteristic of the Platteville Guard unit, for it represents men from 18 communities in this area.

Now I want you to meet these mayors, village presidents, and civic representatives who join in welcoming "their boys" home, as we welcome the company.

I introduce to you Mayor J. Miles Thompson, Lancaster; Mayor Ervin Wiederholt, Dickeyville; Mayor George Branger, Mineral Point; Mayor Martin Kaster, Cuba City; Village President M. F. Olafson, Livingston; Village President C. O. Weittenhiller, Rewey; Village President C. M. Hughes, Bloomington; Village President Ray "Penny" Eckstein, Cassville; Village President Duane Donnil, Cobb; Village President Glen Beaumont, Belmont; Village President F. J. Mickus, Potosi; Village President Jerome Laufenberg, Highland; Village President C. A. Bainbridge, Benton; Village President Elmer Mueller, Montfort; City Council Representative James Azim, Muscoda, and City Attorney James Pope, Dodgeville.

This is another reason Platteville is proud these neighboring communities have meant a great deal for the National Guard unit.

We of Platteville greet them all. [Applause.]

There is a great amount of support that goes into a National Guard unit, support that we like to give. One of those area support considerations is the participation in this program today of the nine marching bands from high schools at Mineral Point, Shullsburg, Muscoda, Dodgeville, Hazel Green, Belmont, Cuba City, the Iowa-Grant area, and our own Plattsville High School. [Applause.]

But, the real planners for this day came from the businessmen of Platteville, who are in our various civic organizations such as the Platteville Businessmen's Association, the Kiwanis Club, and the Rotary Club.

A special word of thanks is due to the Community Action Council, the newly organized civic group that composes representatives of 18 civic and fraternal organizations.

May I ask Chairman Tom Given to stand and take a bow, and then have you meet all members of Given's committee.

[Given stands. Business group stands.]

The callup of the 32d Division for the Berlin crisis made these men of the combat support company veterans of a national emergency.

To recognize these veterans—many of whom are veterans of the U.S. forces, I call on the veterans' organization representatives: George Anton, VFW commander; Jack Eversoll, American Legion post commander, and Russell Carter, commander of the Vet- the commanding officer of the combat sup- erans of World War I. To join them, I call port company, Capt. Frank Doescher.

[Veterans make plaque presentation.]

Congratulations to you, the men of the company, and to you, Captain Doescher. To give the response of the company, Platteville's pride, I call Captain Doescher.

The captain is a native of Platteville. He served with Platteville's old Company "M" of the 128th, in World War II, and was commissioned in 1949. His company has ranked as one of the top-strength units of the Wisconsin National Guard and the 32d Division. It was a winner of the Eisenhower trophy, given for the overall excellence of the unit.

Ladies and gentlemen, the company commander of combat support company, Capt. Frank Doescher.

[Captain Doescher speaks.]

Thank you, Captain Doescher.

The Platteville City Band, a 42-piece organization directed by Bernard Rosemeyer, will now play "March of Christianity" by Donald Moore.

[Band plays "March of Christianity".]

Thank you, Mr. Rosemeyer.

The National Guard of the United States is a far-reaching military organization. The callup of Reserve Force involved 44,371 Army National Guardsmen, of which the Platteville Company and the 32d Division were a part.

The Chief of the National Guard Bureau in Washington, D.C., is Maj. Gen. Donald W. McGowan, our guest here this morning.

General McGowan's military career goes back to 1916. He is a West Point graduate, but took his commission in the National Guard of New Jersey in 1922.

He participated in two campaigns in World War I and was on Omaha Beach on D-Day in World War II. He was promoted to the rank of brigadier general in 1947 and to major general in 1949, when he commanded the 50th Armored Division of the New Jersey National Guard.

He went to the National Guard Bureau in 1955 and was appointed Chief of the Bureau in 1959.

Ladies and gentlemen, Maj. Gen. Donald W. McGowan.

[McGowan speaks and presents certificates.]

Thank you, Maj. Gen. Donald McGowan.

This is our day for commanders in chief, for our next speaker also served as the head of the Wisconsin National Guard during his terms as Governor.

VERNON THOMPSON is a former mayor of Richland Center, his native city, and served as State attorney general in Wisconsin before being elected Governor.

Now in Congress, representing the Third Congressional District, we are pleased to welcome back to Platteville Congressman VERNON THOMSON.

[Congressman THOMSON speaks.]

During its period on active duty, the Red Arrow Division earned an important part in the composition of our military organization. They were a part of the U.S. Strategic Army Corps, known as STRAC.

The STRAC forces were the units that were available to the U.S. Strike Command, one of the newest commands in our Armed Forces.

We are most fortunate today to have with us a top member of that new command, Maj. Gen. Clifton F. Von Kann. General Von Kann is Assistant Chief of Staff for operations in the U.S. Strike Command.

He is a native of Boston, and a graduate, cum laude, of Harvard.

He was commissioned in the artillery and commanded both battalions of the 77th Field Artillery Regiment in the action in North Africa, Sicily, and Italy, in World War II.

He has served as assistant division commander of supporting arms in the 82d Airborne Division, and his record includes 46 parachute jumps.

General Von Kann, it is a pleasure to have you in Platteville today, a home of a STRAC unit.

[Gen. Von Kann steps forward.]

General VON KANN. General, I would like to have General Dunlap join you for the return of the STRAC flag.

[General Dunlap steps forward; return of flag; General Von Kann speaks.]

The return to Wisconsin for the Platteville company and the 32d Division also meant a return to the 5th U.S. Army area.

This large midwest Army command includes Wisconsin, and it is the direct command from the U.S. Continental Army Command.

We are exceedingly happy to welcome to Platteville, the commanding general of the 5th Army, Lt. Gen. J. K. Waters.

General Waters, a veteran combat commander, took the 5th Army command this year. He has visited throughout this area and now, we'd like to extend our welcome program to include you, General Waters.

[General Waters speaks.]

The focus of attention has been on Platteville and the famed 32d.

The division is represented here today by Brig. Gen. John A. Dunlap, the assistant division commander.

It was 31 years ago that our speaker joined the division as a private.

He was a captain when called with the 32d in 1940. During World War II he went with those units of the 32d that were redesignated, and served in the campaigns of North Africa and Italy.

In 1959, General Dunlap was promoted to brigadier general.

He commanded the 32d Division Artillery before moving to division headquarters as assistant division commander.

General, we are as proud of the 32d as we are of Platteville's combat support company. It is a happy occasion to welcome you to Platteville.

[General Dunlap speaks.]

To bring our program to a close, we present to you one of the leading military men of Wisconsin, the Honorable Carlisle P. Runge.

Just last Monday, Mr. Runge completed his work as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower. He has returned from Washington, and is now a special assistant to the new president of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Fred Harrington.

Mr. Runge was born in Seymour, Wis., educated at the University of Wisconsin, which he also served as a professor of law. In World War II he was a major in the 3d U.S. Army, and wears the Bronze Star and four Campaign Medals.

In early 1961 he was appointed by President Kennedy for his Washington post.

He went to Washington as a real 32d man, having served the division and the Wisconsin National Guard since World War II.

Mr. Runge, welcome back to Wisconsin, and welcome to Platteville.

[Mr. Runge speaks.]

Thank you, Mr. Runge.

Ladies and gentlemen, that has been a Platteville welcome, Platteville's pride. Now we would like to make it a real Wisconsin welcome, and what finer way is there than with Alice in Dairyland, and cheese.

Sylvia Ann Lee of Colfax is an excellent representative of the State of Wisconsin. A sophomore at Eau Claire State College, she is 20 years old, a blue-eyed blond, and represents Wisconsin's finest.

Alice, we like cheese, dairyland, and you. [Alice speaks and presents box of cheese to Doescher.]

As your master of ceremonies, may I thank you for the privilege of serving and participating in your program today.

A special word of thanks is due the hundreds of radio, television, and newspaper representatives who have given such excellent coverage to this event.

In closing, may we express a word of deep appreciation to the more than 20,000 residents of the tristate area who came to join us for the colorful parade and this program in downtown city park.

Now may I ask you to rise while Reverend Doering offers the benediction, which will be followed by the Platteville City Band's rendition of the "Stars and Stripes Forever."

Reverend Doering will now offer the benediction. Reverend Doering.

[Benediction.]

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

On the Durability of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of our outstanding former Presidents, Herbert Clark Hoover, recently celebrated his 88th birthday. On that happy occasion, this statesman, who has weathered with sweetness and humility, some of the bitterest attacks ever made on a presidential candidate in any political campaign—and who has come to be acknowledged by all thinking people, as well as most of his former enemies, as one of the finest examples of an able and honorable American citizen—dedicated the Hoover Presidential Library.

We all need a hero of some kind. To many of us Herbert Clark Hoover exemplifies that hero. He is a man who seldom expresses himself publicly. When he does, his words deserve to be recorded in American history. His remarks, on the occasion of the dedication of his library, are a clear and eloquent expression of what America has meant to him, and what it should mean to each of us. The fact that he made these remarks, with humility and sincerity, proves what America can produce in the way of men.

Mr. Hoover will go down in history as one of our outstanding American citizens, well loved by many in foreign lands as well as in his homeland, a former President in whom we can take the utmost pride.

I would like to ask that Mr. Hoover's remarks, during the dedication ceremonies, "On the Durability of Freedom," be included with mine today. I commend them to the attention of each Member, and each American citizen.

Mr. Hoover's remarks follow:

[From the National Observer, Aug. 13, 1962]

MR. HOOVER: ON THE DURABILITY OF FREEDOM

(NOTE.—Former President Herbert Hoover returned last week to West Branch, Iowa, where he was born 88 years ago August 10. The occasion was the dedication of the

Hoover Presidential Library, a ceremony that former President Truman also attended. In his address, Mr. Hoover reaffirmed his faith in the future of America with these words.)

Our people are deeply troubled, not only about the turbulent world around us but also with internal problems which haunt our days and nights. There are many despairing voices. There are many undertones of discouragement. The press headlines imply that corruption, crime, divorce, youthful delinquency, and Hollywood love trysts are our national occupations.

And amid all these voices there is a cry that the American way of life is on its way to decline and fall.

I do not believe it.

Perhaps amid this din of voices and headlines of gloom, I may say something about the inner forces from which come the strengths of America. They assure its future and its continued service to mankind.

The mightest assurances of our future are the intangible spiritual and intellectual forces in our people, which we express, not by the words of the United States, but by the word America. That word America carries meanings which lie deep in the soul of our people. It reaches far beyond the size of cities and factories. It springs from our religious faith, our ideals of individual freedom and equal opportunity, which have come in the centuries since we landed on these shores. It rises from our pride in great accomplishments of our Nation and from the sacrifices and devotion of those who have passed on. It lifts us above the ugliness of the day. It has guided us through even greater crises in our past. And from these forces, solutions will come.

This representative Government, with its 186 years of life, has lasted longer than any other republic in history.

If you look about, you will see the steeples of tens of thousands of places to worship. Each week a hundred million people come to affirm their faith.

If you will look, you will find that the Bill of Rights is an enforced law of the land; that the dignity of man and equality of opportunity more nearly survive in this land than in any other on earth.

If you look, you will also find that from our educational system there comes every year a host of stimulated minds. They bring new scientific discoveries, new inventions, and new ideas. It is true that they revolutionize our daily lives. But we can readily adjust ourselves and our Government to them without the assistance of Karl Marx.

I could go on and on reciting the mighty forces in American life which assure its progress and its durability.

Perhaps on this occasion it would not be immodest or inappropriate for me to cite my own life as proof of what America brings to her children.

As a boy of 10, I was taken from this village to the Far West 78 years ago. My only material assets were two dimes in my pocket, the suit of clothes I wore. I had some extra underpinnings provided by loving aunts.

But I carried from here something more precious.

I had a certificate of the fourth or fifth grade of higher learning.

I had a stern grounding of religious faith.

I carried with me recollections of a joyous childhood, where the winter snows and the growing crops of Iowa were an especial provision for kids.

And I carried with me the family disciplines of hard work. That included picking potato bugs at 10 cents a hundred. Incidentally, that money was used for the serious purpose of buying firecrackers to applaud the Founding Fathers on each Fourth of July.

And in conclusion, may I say to the boys and girls of America that the doors of opportunity are still open to you. Today the durability of freedom is more secure in America than in any place in the world.

May God bring you even more great blessings.

Reservists Discharge Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the privilege of participating in a program in which the city of Philadelphia welcome home the U.S. Army reservists, in a ceremony at Independence Hall Mall. The presiding officer was Arthur C. Kaufmann, civilian aid to the Secretary of the Army. He was chairman of the citizens welcome committee.

Greeting to the reservists were extended by the Honorable Paul D'Ortona, the president of the Philadelphia City Council.

The main speaker of the evening was the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable David L. Lawrence.

His message to the men was so inspiring that I have set it forth in full in my remarks:

REMARKS OF GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE AT APPRECIATION DAY CEREMONIES HONORING THE HOMECOMING OF U.S. ARMY RESERVISTS, INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1962

I can think of no better place to hold this brief ceremony than this great, historic shrine. For in a very real sense, the spirit we honor in each of you is the same spirit that guided the men who met in this hall to set down the principles of freedom and self-government that have changed the world. They were men bound together by a common interest and a common ideal. They believed that mankind was born to be free, that God had given men the right to live their own lives and govern themselves without fear and without prejudice.

Perhaps we have come too far in the march of human progress to realize the greatness of the ideas Thomas Jefferson put down on paper those many years ago. If we are in danger of forgetting, we have you to thank for reminding us.

We can thank you, also, for reminding us, less than 1 year ago, that America has a vast reservoir of skilled and dedicated men in the Army Reserves who stand ready to defend man's freedom whenever and wherever it is threatened. There are not too many occasions, unfortunately, when we are able to express our appreciation for commendable performance of duty. I am delighted and proud that we have such an opportunity now.

To each of you, to your families, and to the dozens of communities from which you have come, whether they are in Pennsylvania or Delaware or New Jersey, the people of this State and the citizens of America express their wholehearted thanks. The job you have done has been an excellent one, and it has been carried out under the most difficult possible circumstances, short of a shooting war.

But the quality of your performance of duty in this time of international tension has been no accident. It has been the result of long hours of hard work in your local Reserve units here in Philadelphia, and it reflects the quality of mind, the dedication of heart and the patriotic spirit you have brought to your service as America's Reserves.

Today, as you prepare to return to your homes and your jobs and your families, it will be difficult for you to realize the magnitude of the assignment you are now completing.

The world, after all, looks only a little different, on the surface, than it did 10 months ago, when you responded to President Kennedy's courageous and immediate call to action in the face of Communist threats against Berlin. But the world has changed. It has changed significantly, and for the moment at least, it is changing for the better. In October 1961 the threat to free Berlin was ominous.

The thin line that separates the cold war from a potential hot war could have been obliterated by hesitation or indecision. It was imperative, at that point, that the United States of America answer this newest political and military threat with a strong demonstration of its position. It was imperative then, as it is now, that this country should show the world its determination to protect the frontiers of liberty.

In the face of this challenge, President Kennedy spoke for all Americans in a clear, firm voice that all men, no matter where they live, could understand.

There can be no doubt in anyone's mind, no matter how imprisoned that mind may be by tyranny or dictatorship, that the American people are united in their love for freedom and in their will to protect and preserve it. How can anyone, in these circumstances, find the words to tell you how much your service this past year has meant to America and to mankind?

I have given deep and serious thought to this question, and I confess that I have not found the right words or the proper phrases. I doubt that any man could do so.

For your response to this call to duty has been in the true tradition of American military greatness. It has been the same kind of unselfish devotion the Minutemen brought to their defense of a newborn America. It has been the same sacrifice freedom has demanded of those who enjoy its benefits throughout man's history from the dawn of civilization to the Battle of Shiloh, from the woods of the Argonne to the landing at Leyte, from the fight for freedom in South Korea to the day-by-day struggle to preserve liberty in Vietnam.

You have given up nearly a year of your lives at a time when no actual battleground existed, when few shots were fired and there were not many barbedwire entanglements to dramatize the need for your extraordinary service. It has not been an easy task, and if time and events conspire to make such service necessary once again, it shall be no easier.

But the truth is that the battleground of freedom is more broad and far-reaching today than it has ever been in man's history. Across the length and breadth of the world, greater learning has brought to countless millions for the first time the true concept of fredom and, having tasted its promise, they are determined they shall be free.

The essence of that dream had its roots in America, the America of Patrick Henry and Jefferson and Washington and Nathan Hale. It is still this country, today, that holds out the light of hope to the millions of human beings who see in it the greatest example of free, democratic government the world has ever known.

It is this America, the modern giant of technology and science, the America of John Kennedy and John Glenn, of yourselves and thousands of young men like you, for which you speak and act today.

I believe that you have spoken and acted affirmatively, and I know that the people of the world have listened and watched and understood.

If, in the remaining years of this century, our Nation, and the world can live in peace, it will be because thousands of men like yourselves were willing to respond to duty without selfish consideration.

Pennsylvania—and the people of America—applaud you for your service, for your love of country and your dedication to the ideals of liberty.

The duty you have performed was a national duty, for this Nation can only survive through the strength and the alertness of its citizens in this State and in all the others that are part of the Union.

Whatever part you have played—no matter how small it may have seemed to you, the fortress of freedom is stronger and mightier and more glorious tonight because you were there.

How To Cut Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of Saturday, August 11, carried a timely and constructive editorial on the subject of "How To Cut Taxes." The editorial emphasizes the increased spending "for civilian affairs" which amounted to $1.9 billion last year. Excerpts from the editorial are included herewith:

> Tax reduction without Government economies is a delusion. It would be accomplished only at the cost of inflation. Dollars saved on the tax cut, and more, would be handed right back through higher prices at the grocery.
>
> And economy hardly is the word for what is going on in Washington. The Government spent $87.7 billion in the fiscal year which ended June 30. That was $6.2 billion more than the year before. Estimated spending for the current fiscal year is $94 billion, up another $6.3 billion.
>
> At this rate of growth we will pass $100 billion by 1964—more by billions than we spent at the peak of the Second World War with 12 million in uniform and our industrial plants engaged in war production.
>
> Some of this spending is by design. Part of it has just grown. For instance President Kennedy, 10 months ago, urged Cabinet members and department heads to hold the number of Government employees "to the minimum consistent with getting the job done." But the Government payroll at the end of the fiscal year was nearly 2.5 million—up 77,000 in a year. The payroll cost is $14 billion. When it comes to saving a dollar, no one is tending the store.
>
> Increased spending customarily is attributed to defense. That accounted for $3.7 billion of the extra spending last year. Even though there are frequent evidences of waste, this is no place to economize. But no effort is made to balance these extraordinary costs by economies elsewhere. In fact, spending for civilian affairs actually increased $1.9 billion during the year. This increase would have been far larger, had Congress not bucked at some administration spending proposals.
>
> Severe shock treatment will be necessary to bring Washington back from this Never Never Land where money grows on trees and there always is more where that came from.

Cultural Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a valedictorian speech made by Miss Doris Ross at the graduation exercises of the Sparks High School this year.

I was very much impressed with this young lady's speech, and I feel it is a credit to her as well as to the public schools of Nevada. I am certain that Miss Ross will continue to be outstanding in her future undertakings:

> CULTURAL EXCELLENCE
>
> Of the many charges hurled at the United States one of the more frequent is the charge that we are cultural boors, that we lack cultural excellence. Is there any justification for this charge? Do we lack cultural excellence?
>
> Before any answer can be arrived at, we should decide what culture means. Each person attaches a different meaning to culture. One says that culture is one of the products of man's attempt at self-perfection. Another says that culture may be described simply as that which makes life worth living, and there are many other definitions. Perhaps these definitions can be summed up by T. S. Eliot's statement that culture is the improvement of the human mind and spirit.
>
> What does cultural excellence mean? Any definite statement would be, of course, somewhat arbitrary. But even with this limitation, some type of answer can be given that will be satisfactory. First of all, excellence must take into account at once all three senses of culture: that of the individual, that of the group or class, and that of a whole society. Each of these senses of culture depends on the other two. The excellence of one depends on the excellence of the other two. With a second thought also in mind, that there are as many levels of culture as there are levels of aptitudes for culture, we may say that cultural excellence means that every individual takes his place at the highest cultural level for which his natural aptitudes qualify him.
>
> Let us examine further these three senses of culture which are so interdependent. An individual's culture should contain learning and close acquaintance with the accumulated wisdom of the past, refinement of manners, and an interest in and some ability to manipulate abstract ideas or the arts. As T. S. Eliot wrote, "Good manners, without education, intellect or sensibility to the arts, tends toward mere automatism; learning without good manners or sensibility is pendantry; intellectual ability wihout the more human attributes is admirable only the same way as the brilliance of a child chess-prodigy, and the arts without intellectual context are vanity." No perfection in any one of these fields to the exclusion of the others can confer culture on anybody. Does each individual in our society have an individual philosophy? Is he interested in art as well as science, and in science as well as religion and philosophy? Does he use his mind instead of vegetating and letting the world walk over him, or does he lack the strength to declare his own individual perceptions and feel that he must conform in his thinking to what is considered fashionable? Is his the ability of examining evidence and can he delay decisions? Have we achieved an individual excellence in culture?
>
> By groups I mean the different groups which are concerned with each activity of culture. Does our society have cultural excellence in the group sense? Have we produced a great composer or conducter or a Picasso? Have we achieved in the literary field? Do we have great philosophers and scientific thinkers and religious leaders? Is there the overlapping and sharing of interests so essential to the cohesion of culture or are religious thought and practice, philosophy and art and science becoming isolated areas cultivated by groups in no communication with each other? Once the following was written: Never were the artistic sensibilities improved by divorce from the religious sense, religion by divorce from the artistic; and the same may be said for science. In the field of manners have we come to the place where the vestige of manners is left to a few survivors of a vanishing class, who, their sensibilities untrained by either religion or art and their minds unfurnished with material for witty conversation, have no context in their lives to give value to their behavior, and the rest of us follow little or no code for social behavior? Do we have cultural excellence at the group level?
>
> A principle exists which states that literature and art, music and drama are as essential to the happiness and prosperity of a nation as any merely economic activity. Do the actions of our society follow this principle? We do have the Metropolitan Opera, the Fulbright Act, an Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, some theatrical companies and other cultural institutions, but is their existence really enough without the full support of our society? Don't we think that our businesses and labor unions and stock market are more important? Isn't the balance of material activities and cultural activities lopsided? There should be a balance between science and art, for art, in its broader sense, is a process coequally important with science for the life and progress of mankind, but don't we, instead of striving for this balance, make science much more important than art, and think that to know is more important than to create? A society should provide a means of training minds both to receive culture and to criticize and improve upon it. Formerly, education was this means to help transmit culture. However, is there any doubt that now, in our headlong rush to educate everybody, we are lowering our standards, and more and more abandoning the study of those subjects by which the essentials of our culture are transmitted? Schools can transmit only a part of culture, and they can transmit this part effectively only if the outside influences, not only of family and environment, but of work and play, of newspapers and TV, and entertainment and sports, are in harmony with them. Are these things in harmony with our schools?
>
> Finally, have we been able to dissolve our cultural isolationism? Not only can an exchange of cultural products and a knowledge of other cultures enrich our social culture, it can build strong links between our country and other nations and join men in peace. Sir Herbert Read said, "Art has the unique function of uniting men in love of each other and of life itself." Are we, as a society, culturally broadminded?
>
> Have we achieved cultural excellence?

Trohan Looks Into Background of FBI Opponent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has been a concerted effort by some people in this country to discount the danger of the Communist threat and to disparage those who made a serious, responsible effort to alert this country to the menace and to combat it.

In this connection the remarks of Mr. Wilbur H. Ferry before a conference of western Democrats last week is of interest. Here follows the comments of Walter Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau, as broadcast over station WGN, Chicago:

REMARKS OF WALTER TROHAN, CHIEF OF CHICAGO TRIBUNE WASHINGTON BUREAU, OVER STATION WGN, CHICAGO

WASHINGTON, August 11.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation, under its director, J. Edgar Hoover, is regarded as public friend No. 1 by most Americans. But there are those who look at the Nation's first line of defense against Communist espionage and subversion with rose-colored glasses and assail the FBI as public enemy No. 1.

RIPS "SPY SWATTER"

The latest of these attacks came last Monday before a conference of western Democrats in Seattle. Wilbur H. (Ping) Ferry, vice president of the Fund for the Republic, an organization financed by the Ford Foundation, accused Hoover of "sententious poppycock" and building a false legend of communism's strength. He said Hoover was weaving "a mischief-making tapestry of legend and illusion if there ever was one," about Communist intrigue. He called Hoover the "indubitable mandarin of anticommunism in the United States" and "our official spy swatter."

Unfortunately the speech became involved in politics. Republic Chairman William E. Miller demanded that his Democratic counterpart, Chairman John M. Bailey, repudiate Ferry's remarks. Bailey retorted that Miller would do well to concern himself with the lunatic fringe in his own party.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, brother of the President, differed sharply with Ferry, saying communism is a serious threat and anyone who underestimates its danger "is doing the country a disservice." Still, there are rumors that Bobby would like to get Hoover out of the FBI. If these be true and if he should be successful, it would be a sad day for America.

LOOK INTO BACKGROUND

Concern here is not with the political ramifications of the attack on the FBI but with national security. It is fitting and proper to look into the man who leveled the attack on the FBI so as to judge his purpose and motives and consider what makes him tick.

Ferry was born on December 17, 1910, in Detroit. He attended Dartmouth College and was graduated in 1932. For a time he was employed as a teacher, publicity agent, and reporter. No doubt he found the depression years a bit rough and may have been inclined to think on the left. The outbreak of World War II found him not in uniform but in a draft-proof job as an enforcement officer for the Office of Price Stabilization, helping to tell his fellow Americans how much they could eat and what they could buy. He was 30 years old at the time of Pearl Harbor.

After the war he reportedly worked for the Ford Motor Co., allegedly ghost writing speeches for Henry Ford II, who launched the Fund for the Republic. His associates knew him as a shrewd and calculating public relations man. Early in his career he agitated for investigation of the FBI and the American Legion, of which he was not a member or eligible for membership because he did not serve in the Armed Forces during the war, apparently by choice.

SERVES CIO GROUP

Ferry also served as a publicity director for the CIO Political Action Committee. In this capacity he was a member of an advisory committee which met with officials of the joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which has been cited by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization. This does not mean that Ferry was a member of the Red-front group, but that he helped it. On January 2, 1958, the Citizen Register of Ossining, N.Y., published a letter from Ferry criticizing the newspaper for publishing a report favorable to Hoover.

Ferry accused the paper of accepting Hoover's claims of accomplishment without asking him to prove them. He asked why more spies and saboteurs are not brought forth for trial if they constitute a great threat. He said the Communist Party "appears to be falling apart at the seams." He admitted law-enforcement agencies need information, but criticized the paper and Hoover for seeking to raise the status of informing to an accepted American avocation. He stressed the latent danger of a secret police in the FBI. In short, the letter to the paper was the germ of the speech Ferry made to the Democrats.

He has been sounding this record for years. In August 1960, Ferry published a pamphlet entitled "Alternatives to the Arms Race—Drastic but Thinkable." This pamphlet emphasized what he considers the evils of the arms race and wound up recommending total disarmament even though this might mean that the United States would be taken over by Russia. In his pamphlet, Ferry states that domination of America by Russia would be "thinkable" while nuclear war is "unthinkable." In short, Ferry is one who believes that it would be better to be Red than dead. Hoover has publicly stated he would rather be dead than Red.

REMARKS ARE QUOTED

The March 1962 issue of Militant, the official organ of the Trotskyites, carries a quotation by Ferry concerning current economic conditions. This does not mean that Ferry is a Trotskyite or a member of any branch of communism, but it does mean that they are interested in what he says and does.

Hungry Horse News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call the attention of the House to a man from the State of Montana who is a most promising phenomenon in this age of monopoly and bigness in everything. Mr. Mel Ruder, of Columbia Falls, Mont., is this year celebrating the 17th year of publication of the Hungry Horse News, an independent weekly journal of which he is the editor, publisher, chief reporter, and star cameraman. The Hungry Horse News is not simply a comprehensive and pertinent forum of local opinion and happenings, it also features some of the most exciting photography of the Pacific Northwest to be found in any publication. Mel Ruder is famed for his magnificent shorts of natural life and wilderness areas in this impressive part of the country. With camera in hand and groceries on his back, he often takes off into the wilderness in search of the natural beauty which abounds in northwestern Montana, and comes back with breathtaking shots which are enough to convince anyone of the rewards of living in our beautiful State of Montana. For myself, I know that no trip to Columbia Falls or the northwestern corner of our State is complete without a friendly visit with Mel Ruder, and if time permits, a short trip into the woods where Mel is always willing to give a clear and detailed briefing on river development, conservation, and lumbering activities, the evidence for all of which can be seen in the landscape around us. I feel that with his zeal for factual and full reporting and his firm roots in the life of the locale in which he lives and writes, Mel Ruder is one of the most outstanding newspapermen in the country. It is his type of imaginative and dedicated reporting which has established the enviable tradition of the American diversified and responsible press, and which will perpetuate that tradition.

I would urge each and every Member of the Congress to take the opportunity to visit northwestern Montana, and to call on Mel Ruder when there for a friendly and knowledgeable introduction to the beauty and excitment of life in the 20th century Pacific Northwest.

I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD two representative and currently pertinent editorials written by Mel, which appeared August 10, 1962, anniversary edition of the Hungary Horse News:

VOL. 17, NO. 1

This issue marks the start of the 17th year of publishing the Hungry Horse News.

Story of the Hungry Horse News emerging with volume 1, No. 1, August 8, 1946, has been told. We started with a camera, a portable typewriter, $2.50 desk and Navy savings.

There's much personal satisfaction living in the Flathead, and we like the rustic log Hungry Horse News building with its large lawn, and our home with its view of the mountains. There are also six plaques from the National Editorial Association on the office wall. This weekly has been nationally recognized for picture use, and we are a past president of Montana State Press Association.

Another reward is the fine acceptance this weekly newspaper has. Paid circulation is tops among Montana weeklies, and we like our neighbors.

The Hungry Horse News has been favored with a good staff. Mrs. Al Shay, who is raising four youngsters and writes her social news at home, has been with us since August 1, 1946, a week before volume 1, No. 1 appeared. This newspaper is also fortunate in having Ralph Ammondson as the lead printer, and his crew also do a good job.

Columnists have also helped the Hungry Horse News. Newest is George Ostrom, Flathead resident living in Washington. What he writes should be published in more papers than the Hungry Horse News. Then, of course, there's John Tatsey, whose Heart Butte items we publish courtesy of the Glacier Reporter, and the ladies who report local items in the various communities—this is all part of a country newspaper.

It is a good life being editor-reporter-photographer of a picture newspaper in scenic America.

Of necessity our staff must continue small. Columbia Falls as a business community should only have a eight-page paper.

We do not seem to be able to solve the problem of employing an office assistant with some news-writing experience. This would not be mentioned or be a problem in a metropolitan center. It is here.

We like being editor of the Hungry Horse News. We'd like the job better were it 51 instead of 52 full weeks each year.

This is a week that we are pleased in not being a daily newspaper.

The Hungry Horse News doesn't have to devote most of the front page to "Beautiful Marilyn Monroe Died Tragically" or "Question: Was It Suicide?"

Obviously Americans wanted to read of the last moments and past loves of the curvesome blonde actress. We wouldn't expect a city paper to feature a bear story:

Also taking front page space this week are continued pictures and stories of the 8,000 deformed babies born mostly in western Europe as a result of their mothers having taken a particular tranquilizer during pregnancy. The drug developed in West Germany resulted in babies deformed and armless.

The often berated Federal bureaucracy came in for well deserved praise with President Kennedy presenting a gold medal to Dr. Frances O. Kelsey for blocking the marketing of the drug thalidomide in the United States. She is a medical officer in the Food and Drug Administration.

The Hungry Horse News is also fortunate in not having to feature abortion attempts by Mrs. Sherri Finkbine of Phoenix, Ariz. The lady is in Sweden seeking a legal abortion. She had taken the drug.

Meanwhile people of the world are benefiting from experience of the past. For example wonder drugs can be dangerous and destructive, and all cures don't come as pills.

In the years ahead, the world's peoples are not going to handle birth control, abortion, and mercy killing by complete legal bans.

The flood of newspaper and magazine publicity during recent days certainly spotlights the problems.

What Delays Hanford Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest is still angrily reacting to the defeat in the House of the proposal by local public power districts to finance, with non-Federal funds, generating facilities to convert waste steampower into electricity.

As examples of the continuing reaction, I ask unanimous consent to introduce three editorials—one from the August 3 issue of the Oregon Labor Press, a second from the August 6 issue of the daily Portland Reporter and the third from the August 10 edition of the Portland Oregonian. Each effectively reflects the overwhelming reaction of the public spirited citizens of my district, and the States of Oregon and Washington:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Reporter, Aug. 6, 1962]

WHAT DELAYS HANFORD POWER?

No one is working harder to get this region the benefit of 800,000 kilowatts of power from harnessing wasted heat at the Hanford atomic project than Charles F. Luce, the Bonneville Power Administrator. He has more than plenty of kilowatts for today's needs, but is confronted with a serious power shortage of crippling economic impact in a few years simply because our power demands increase 15 percent every year.

If you doubt the power-shortage forecast made by all experts, including those serving private utilities, you can forecast the same result for yourself. The region's power demand is certain to keep on growing, perhaps even faster than 15 percent. For instance Sweden's load went up 24 percent in 1961.

We are in serious kilowatt trouble because forecasts of new power sources are fading into thin air. We will get no Canadian power from Columbia dams above the border for at least 8 years after the treaty is ratified by Canada. There is no definite likelihood of the treaty being approved by Canada in the near future. And there is no money dangling to build these tremendous projects.

We will get no power from Libby Dam because the United States will not be permitted to build this power and storage project until the treaty authorizes the Libby Reservoir to creep back into Canada. We may get no power from the Middle Snake River because of the fisheries opposition to developing the great Nez Perce site as well as the less kilowatt-rich Mountain Sheep site.

Two years ago the Northwest had high hopes that every one of these three big sources of power, plus imports from Canada's Peace River project, would be available by the time the predicted power pinch set in. All these hopes are gone now and here we are 2 years closer to the predicted power shortage—a prediction which the experts have not pushed 2 years back.

This situation looks grave to Mr. Luce, who takes his responsibilities seriously as administrator of a large segment of the region's power. He knows better than any one else what the prospects are for getting the Hanford project producing power for us under the last hope—U.S. Senate amendment of the Atomic Energy Commission's appropriation bill. The Senate came out unanimously for authorizing the Washington Public Power Supply System to hookup the wasted heat and turn over the 800,000 kilowatts to Bonneville for equal distribution between private and public utilities.

This would mean 1½ Bonneville dams in a hurry. Mr. Luce is saying that this 800,000-kilowatt prospect for our future well-being would receive the greatest boost from being recommended by the region's private utilities. There can be no doubt that Mr. Luce is right about this because all the opposition to this greatest atomic power project in America has come from private power. Mr. Luce has focused attention on what will make or break kilowatt abundance in the Northwest for some time to come. He has asked the region's private utilities to let the public know if they favor the public getting 800,000 kilowatts of power to fight off tomorrow's power shortage.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Aug. 3, 1962]

The Hanford power project, killed in the House of Representatives 2 weeks ago, would have provided 900,000 kilowatts of low-cost power—the equivalent of two Bonneville dams. It would have meant rapid industrial development and thousands of urgently needed new jobs for our region.

But the Hanford project is dead, murdered by the private utility companies in an outrageous and brazen betrayal of the public interest.

The back-alley knifing of the Hanford reactor power project by the private utility companies was so raw, so rotten that even the most conservative Republican newspapers could not stomach it.

For example, the ultraconservative, anti-union Tri-City Herald of Kennewick, Wash., which supported private power in the Hells Canyon fight, came out swinging in an editorial headlined "Private Utilities Killed It." Here are its words:

"Private power in the Northwest stands condemned today * * * for the death of the project. For personal reasons and for a private vendetta, they acted against the public interest.

"What is just as galling is the method private power used to forward its public-be-damned attitude.

"Private utility officials didn't have the personal integrity and fortitude to stand up and fight. Their strategy was to have their cake and eat it too—in other words to kill the project while adopting outwardly a pious our-hands-are-off-it attitude.

"But what they did and how they did it was and is no secret.

"These are the people who want the 'right to vote' in this State and also seek to build High Mountain Sheep Dam. Perish the thought."

Those are the words of one of the region's most conservative newspapers, a paper that has been strongly pro-private power in the past. These sentiments have been echoed in the conservative and liberal press throughout the region.

Underdevelopment of our resources, as in the case of Hells Canyon, is one thing. Apparently some people can tolerate that. But resource rape, as in the case of Hanford, is something else again—and even their newspaper friends can't stand the stench of what the private utilities have done.

Because they succeeded in killing the Hanford project, millions of dollars' worth of byproduct steam from the reactor cooling process will go to waste. The Northwest is denied 900,000 kilowatts of firm power at a time when we need it to make certain that there will not be an electric brownout 3 years hence.

The Government cannot recover any of its $25 million investment in the plutonium reactor for convertibility features that make possible the addition of power-generating facilities.

New industries will stay away from the Northwest for lack of power, and those already here will not be able to expand. Thousands of workers who could have had jobs will go unemployed.

Even the private power companies themselves will have to go without 450,000 new kilowatts they could have had from the reactor under the 50–50 compromise that was offered them in the hope of winning their support for the project.

This is the real irony. The private utility companies of the Pacific Northwest want to build High Mountain Sheep Dam, they say, because they need a large block of power as soon as possible. Here they had it from the

Hanford reactor—at a much earlier date than from Mountan Sheep, and at much lower cost. But they chose to be economic wreckers.

In the process they may have wrecked themselves.

The private companies have reopened the old wounds of private versus public power battles that were all but forgotten. The Hanford project may be dead. But its memory will live to haunt these betrayers of the public trust.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Aug. 10, 1962]

FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

The administration's bill to establish a preferential Northwest marketing area for Federal power produced in the Pacific Northwest, with only surplus power to be sold in California or elsewhere, faces uncertain prospects in the House of Representatives after being approved in the Senate 52 to 33.

In the present alinement of the House, with too many Republicans joining Southern Democrats in sullen opposition to administration programs, whether beneficial or not, and with any legislation dealing with "public power" a red flag instantly launching a stampede of bulls, the hope of passage there is not bright. On four occasions the House has defeated bills to allow the use of wasted steam at the new plutonium reactor at Hanford for production of 800,000 kilowatts of power, which by firming up nonfirm power would have added over 900,000 kilowatts to the Northwest Power Pool.

The arguments in the Senate against the Northwest regional preference bill were even more weird than those used against the Hanford project, which would not have cost the Government anything in its latest form providing revenue bond financing.

California utilities, public and private, want to buy power from the Columbia River Federal system. But they do not want to be restricted to buying surplus power, which the Northwest doesn't need. They would rather have that than nothing, for it would save a lot of money in present fuel costs. But if the proposed amendment to the Bonneville Project Act is not adopted, public agencies in California, could lay claim to Northwest firm power as well as nonfirm. And California private utilities could buy and transmit over their own lines as much power as Bonneville would sell them.

The Federal Bonneville Power Administration, marketing agency for the complex of hydroelectric generators in which Congress has invested $1½ billion, wants to sell surplus power, available only in offpeak periods, to California to improve its financial picture. But it recognizes a primary obligation to meet the needs of the Pacific Northwest, which double every 10 years, rather than those of other areas. Bonneville has $30 million worth of surplus energy for sale which is now being wasted. But it is short of firm power because it is wholly dependent upon hydroelectric generation. The Hanford nuclear project would have allowed the firming up of more power to meet an insatiable demand in the Northwest. So would a return of offpeak thermal power from California utilities in the Columbia low-water periods, in exchange for deliveries of surplus Northwest power to meet California's peak demands for summer irrigation and air conditioning.

The coordination of all Northwest utilities in the Northwest Power Pool adds 1,200,000 kilowatts to the generating capacity by integration, more than double the output of Bonneville Dam. We have seen no figures on the net gain which would be achieved both in the Northwest and in California by interconnection, but it would be substantial in both areas—and more substantial in California than in the Northwest. The mutual benefits are clearly apparent.

What has happened, essentially, is that technology has overtaken the Bonneville Power System. When the first transmission lines were built more than a quarter-century ago, the economic transmission distance was about 200 miles. Now it is more than 1,000 miles. If the Northwest is prevented from establishing a primary marketing area consisting of the Northwest, where the power can be used most economically, there will soon come a day when our sole energy resource is being drained into the Southwest and the Missouri Basin. The Northwest is not seeking a "power grab," as the hysterical and misinformed Los Angeles Herald-Examiner asserted. It is fighting for survival.

Are Not Puerto Ricans Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed about the nationlistic attitude among some high officials in the Puerto Rican Government. Indication of this nationalistic and anti-American attitude has been brought to my attention by private citizens and by newspaper articles.

An example of this feeling which is being fostered by officials is a news item that appeared in the San Juan Star on June 26. In essence, the story quotes Secretary of Education Candido Oliveras as saying that the public schools of Puerto Rico should not be utilized as a means toward the Americanization of Puerto Rico. This statement was made during his announcement of a new policy designed to establish Spanish as the language in private schools.

Mr. Speaker, are not Puerto Ricans Americans? I always thought so, but apparently Mr. Oliveras thinks that if his people are, their children should not be exposed to Americanism nor speak English in school.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico receives Federal funds the same as the 50 States, its share being about 12 percent of the total budget for elementary and secondary schools. I wonder what the reaction would be if a high official of Washington State made such a statement as Mr. Oliveras made?

Mr. Speaker, not all Puerto Ricans agree with their secretary of education. The San Juan Star published an editorial which I sincerely hope reflects not only its own thinking, but also the thinking of the majority whose home is in the Commonwealth.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD.

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Secretary of Education Candido Oliveras said yesterday he would implement, as far as possible, the objective of making Spanish the language of instruction in private schools.

Secretary Oliveros said he would recognize conditions that justified exemption from this policy. He listed them as (1) when the parents of children in a private school want them taught in English; (2) in schools primarily intended for continental children; and (3) in schools where Spanish teachers are not available.

We sincerely hope that implementation of this policy will be guided by a careful weighing of the possible consequences to many thousands of youngsters whose futures are involved. We hear every day that thousands of former citizens suffer hardship on the mainland, and are deprived of numerous opportunities for a better life, because they lack a knowledge of English. This would indicate a need for more English teaching, not for less.

We can look around us in Puerto Rico and see on all sides men and women of prominence, whose families enjoy better homes and better lives, and whose children receive better education, because the parents learned English in their youth. Secretary Oliveras is a shining example.

Land-Grant Act Has Had Immense Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I would like to join my colleagues who have paid tribute to an act of Congress which is now more than 100 years old but whose influence is far greater than was dreamed of when the law was passed.

I refer to the Morrill, or Land-Grant Act of 1862. It was finally enacted after a 5-year legislative battle and signed into law by President Lincoln during the midst of the Civil War despite the fact that President Buchanan vetoed an earlier version which he called unconstitutional. While Senator Justin Smith Morrill was responsible for pushing the land-grant legislation through Congress, a Yale-educated teacher in Illinois, Jonathan Baldwin Turner, was the man who first aroused people to the necessity for public higher education and helped to draw up plans for achieving this ideal.

During the 100-year period, 1862 to 1962, the organization and scope of operations in this nationwide system of publicly supported higher education has developed to keep pace with the expanding Nation. Although the present 68 land-grant colleges and universities represent only 3.4 percent of the institutions of higher learning in the United States, they enroll nearly one-fifth of the Nation's college population, award 21 percent of all baccalaureate degrees, grant 25 percent of all master's degrees and confer 40 percent of all doctorate degrees.

In my home State of Washington our land-grant college, Washington State University at Pullman, is doing outstanding work in preparing the young people of the State for useful and productive lives. It is interesting that the first State legislature in Washington, in the year 1890 chartered the Washington State Agricultural College and School of Science, following receipt of 90,000 acres of public land as an endowment for an agricultural college a year earlier.

Alumni bear witness to the quality of a university's education. Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Service, is a graduate of Washington State where he delivered the commencement address last June. Dr. Philip H. Abelson, director of the geophysical laboratory of the Carnegie Institution, is also on Washington State's roster of distinguished alumni. Henry Townley Heald, distinguished president of the Ford Foundation is still another well-known graduate. Washington State University is keeping step with the times in quality of instruction and facilities. Recently dedicated have been the E. C. Johnson Hall for the study of plant sciences; a new engineering building, Royal Sloan Hall; Fulmer Hall addition, dedicated to chemistry laboratories. Biological sciences also have a new home at Frederick D. Heald Hall.

The land-grant influence has spread overseas far beyond the shores of the United States. Washington State University has been working, under an AID contract, with the University of Punjab and others in Pakistan to help raise the quality of programs in agriculture, engineering, education, business administration, and home economics at the university level. To help this program, Pakistani faculty are studying for advanced degrees on the Pullman campus.

I will not attempt to describe the immense influence of the land-grant schools on the social and economic development of life in the United States. My colleagues have presented most of this information. But I am glad to add my voice to those raised in honor of this significant milestone in education and to say that we in Washington are proud of our land-grant university and its contributions to our State.

Goldberg and Shorter Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, an effort is being made by certain segments of the labor movement to shorten the workweek in order to alleviate unemployment. The Washington Daily News of Saturday, August 11, with the title of "Goldberg and Shorter Hours" is recommended reading.

The editorial follows:

How much penetration he's achieving is difficult to say, but Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg keeps trying to get across the point that shorter workweeks aren't a cure for unemployment.

The added costs, he says, would make it all the more difficult to maintain stable prices.

His point is not hard to grasp.

It's one thing, of course, for a union to seek a shorter week as a contract improvement. In that context, it's the same as seeking raises and various fringe benefits. If it's economically feasible for the employer, so be it. But to propose a shorter week for the avowed purpose of reducing unemployment is something else again.

True, this would mean that more people would have to be hired to maintain the existing production pace. So far, OK. But if this isn't matched by greater productivity, up goes the cost of the product. Down goes its competitiveness. Down go sales. And, before long, down goes employment.

Not much of a cure.

During the great depression, there were a lot of shortened workweeks that did reduce unemployment. But that was only because with the shorter week went proportionately lower pay. The 3-day week meant 3 days' pay.

No one is proposing that, and certainly no one who remembers the thirties is eager to see a revival of that routine.

But the memory of it is useful as a lesson in elementary economics overlooked by economic magicians. As the saying goes, they do it with mirrors.

More About Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of August 2, 1962:

MORE ABOUT MEDICARE

"How Europe Deals With Medical Care" in the July 30 issue of U.S. News & World Report is a report of a survey of "government medicine" in eight European countries.

The catastrophic results predicted for the United States by opponents of medicare, if the Kennedy plan should be adopted, have not developed in a single one of these eight countries. On the contrary, most of the people and a good many of the doctors are satisfied.

Public health insurance under a national system has been in operation in Germany for 77 years. The people like it so well it has been expanding ever since being started in 1885.

In Great Britain, which is most often pointed out here as a horrible example of socialized medicine, U.S. News & World Report found:

"Under Britain's 14-year-old National Health Service, no one here worries about medical or hospital bills, and almost everyone—including most doctors—want to keep it that way."

How does the situation in the United States compare with that?

Other countries operating government health services include Sweden, France, Italy, Austria, the Netherlands, and Denmark.

The plans vary from country to country in the services provided but practically all are supported by taxes, either of the social security or direct type or both.

In Germany, for instance, the health insurance tax ranges from 3.44 percent to 4.91 percent of the individual's pay. The services provided include fees of the family physician, cost of surgery if needed, hospitalization in a ward for as long as a year and a half, convalescent care and maternity aid. Charges for prescriptions are limited to 12 cents. Eyeglasses and dental plates are paid for if of average quality. Patients have a free choice of doctors.

Summing up the situation in Germany, U.S. News & World Report said:

"Doctors in recent years have voiced no objection in principle to the system of nationalized medicine. But there have been periods of dissatisfaction with the schedule of fees."

In England, which is so frequently cited by the opponents of medicare, the magazine says:

Anything from a minor cut to cancer is treated without charge by a general practitioner or specialist paid by the National Health Service. Unlimited hospital care also is provided, along with tax-paid accommodations in convalescent and rehabilitation centers."

People in Great Britain are required to pay a 28-cent fee for each drug prescription, approximately $5 for eyeglasses and charges running from 70 cents to $9 for such appliances as elastic hosiery, abdominal supports and wigs. Dental plates cost from $6 to $14.

Employed people pay from 30 to 50 cents per week, covering about 12 perecnt of the total cost, which last year was $2.5 billion. Most of the health-service cost is met out of local and national taxes.

England's general practitioners are paid an annual fee for each patient who signs up with them. Doctors are assured of an average income of about $6,800 per year. A specialist working full time at a state-run hospital may expect to earn from $10,000 to $15,000 annually at the age of about 50.

The French medicare system pays about 80 percent of all medical expenses of the majority of the people. Insurance costs are met by contributions from employees and employers and by the Government which owns a large network of hospitals.

In Italy the employers pay the entire cost of a compulsory health insurance plan.

In Austria all workers are covered by a national health insurance program, and all charges for the sick and injured are paid out of benefits.

In Holland elderly people may join health plans for 15 to 30 cents weekly. Care provided includes the services of family doctors, specialists and 70 days of hospitalization for any one illness. Some of the higher priced drugs are supplied. Patients choose their own doctors.

Most doctors and patients are enthusiastic about Denmark's plan which insures against the high cost of medical care while preserving the advantages of private medical practice.

President Kennedy's proposal for the United States was far short of the most limited of the European plans—and the cost would be far less.

Police Officer Peter T. Lucas, of Stoughton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress a story of courage, determination, and faith as displayed by a brave police officer in the town of Stoughton, Mass. Many times we are prone to forget the fine work done by policemen.

You and I depend on these men for the protection of our loved ones. Their compensation is not great. It is because they are dedicated and devoted men that they render the fine service they do.

I include the news story as written by Mr. Richard A. Powers that appeared in the Boston Globe, Monday, August 13, 1962, relating the experience of a plucky police officer:

LUCKY TO SURVIVE—POLICEMAN RETURNS FROM ALMOST CERTAIN DEATH

(By Richard A. Powers)

STOUGHTON.—Patrolman Peter T. Lucas, nearly killed by a hit-and-run driver 2 years ago, is back on the job.

The simple act of pinning on his badge again was one of the most important in his life.

Without tremendous determination and the help of fellow policemen, doctors, and neighbors, Lucas might have never made it.

When he was brought to Goddard Memorial Hospital the night of September 7, 1960, doctors feared for Lucas' life.

He had been hit by a passing car as he talked to another driver and thrown 48 feet.

He had two broken bones in his right leg, a broken hip, three breaks of the pelvis, two fractures of the right arm, a fractured and cut skull, a puncture of the lower left leg, and multiple cuts and bruises.

For 4 days the 38-year-old patrolman's life hung in the balance as he was shuttled between the emergency room and the X-ray lab.

Lucas recalls that Dr. Edward B. Gray sat by his bedside 38 hours until the crisis passed. Fellow patrolmen joined the doctor on 2-hour shifts to hold the injured Lucas down.

LUCKY TO LIVE

"For some reason I kept swinging my right arm around," Lucas remembers. "It had a cast on it, and the other fellows felt the brunt of it more often than not."

Lucas was unconscious for 3 days and semiconscious for the first week. Hospital officials said he was lucky to be alive.

In his 6 months in the hospital, Lucas underwent three major operations, performed by Drs. Gray and Pierce Leavitt.

Then followed 3 months in bed at home at 97 Charles Avenue. Twice a week his friends on the force took him in the town ambulance to the hospital for treatment.

It was 6 months more before Lucas graduated to crutches.

Last August, Frank Dignan, a Stoughton resident and therapist at the Roxbury Veterans' Hospital, stopped by the Lucas residence and offered his services.

"For 3 months Dignan made me use muscles I thought I would never be able to use again," Lucas said.

Dignan worked over Lucas at no charge, "and I know he has helped others the same way," the patrolman said.

SHOOTS LEFTHANDED

By now the plucky officer was able to use a cane to get down to the Stoughton Fish & Game Club, where he began to learn to fire his service pistol lefthanded.

A fourth operation, at Peter Bent Brigham Hospital last January, enabled Lucas to rotate his right arm again.

Now he walks with a slight limp. He has a plate in his lower right leg and a pin in his right arm. A skin graft covers the hole in his left leg.

The 2 years were "quite a strain," especially on Lucas' wife, Marie, who had to depend on the neighbors to get around, since she does not have a driving license.

The town picked up all the hospital bills and kept the patrolman's earnings coming to the house each week.

His three sons—Paul, 15; David 13; and Wayne, 11; all pitched in to help. Paul even painted the house "and did a pretty good job at it, too," Lucas said.

Today Peter Lucas is back on desk duty at the central station. Soon he will be back on regular duties in the cruiser.

For him, at least, it is true that life begins at 40.

Water Transportation in the National Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, is a dynamic speaker, and it is always worthwhile listening to or reading his speeches because they are pertinent to our times. I am happy to make part of these remarks a speech he recently delivered before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on May 18 of this year, entitled "Water Transportation in the National Space Program":

WATER TRANSPORTATION IN THE NATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM

(Address by Hon. James E. Webb, of North Carolina, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, before the 49th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, May 18, 1962)

Let me apologize first. Thank you very much, Bob, for those kind remarks. I apologize for being late. I didn't come by water. I had to come by air, and that's less certain, I guess.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I know you have a very busy schedule. I have a very large subject, and I'll try to cover it very briefly. I'm not going to follow a text. I'm going to try to give you a picture of what this effort in space really means, the engines that make it possible, the organizational arrangements which make it possible, and some relationship to the importance of the work you have done in providing water transportation to this new program.

First, let me say, you all know that the Wright brothers made their first powered flight in 1903, you know it's been 59 years since that time. Of those 59 years, it took us about 40 to 45 to get to the modern jet airplane, a new form of engine. In the 10 years which have intervened since the jet engine permitted us to get up to about 700 miles an hour, supersonic, we have moved in that very brief period of time up to 4,000 miles an hour with the X–15. This is a very rapid rate of evolution in change. The X–15 breaks that gap between flight in the air and the high reaches of the atmosphere that are almost space. Now, some 36 years ago, Dr. Robert Goddard perfected the liquid-fuel rocket technique, proved that a rocket engine could deliver its power in a vacuum, as well as in the air, and thereby using oxygen in the rocket, carrying his oxidizer with him, developed an engine which had the capability of delivering its power out beyond the earth's atmosphere, not requiring the air to burn, not requiring the air as a working fluid, therefore liberated man from the confines of the immediate vicinity of the earth. This engine under development has proved to be capable of achieving both the power to reach out beyond the pull of gravity, and also to deliver the speeds which would permit orbital flight, speeds that must be as high as 17,500 miles an hour to achieve this.

Now, just as the jet engine has produced new and revolutionary aspects of air transportation, military aviation, so has the rocket produced revolutionary characteristics in the whole area of science and technology. I'd like to mention just a few. First of all, it is necessary in this program to build the kind of vehicle that can move through the air at speeds upward of 5,000 miles an hour before they leave the air and with only some 5 to 10 percent of their structure, of the weight represented in structure, with some 90 percent—we're always striving for 95 percent—in fuel. This means an entirely radically new type of vehicle, radically new type of materials, metals, fabrics, and beyond this, the handling of these very advanced light vehicles, using these very powerful engines, requires many applications of modern electronics for control, for integration of the facilities, for guidance systems, for telemetering the information back, and for receiving the scientific information back from the payloads that fly on these rockets. Now let me say also that in the program to utilize the area beyond the earth's atmosphere as a great resource of this Nation, just as the rivers and harbors of the Nation are a great resource, it has been determined as a matter of national policy that we can do a better job using men to perform work, to make observations, to understand what it means to accomplish the full understanding of the forces of nature as they exist in this new area. I'd like to mention very quickly for many, many years man was confined to observations made through the obscuring veil of the atmosphere in order to reach out for information about the universe in which he lived. This meant many, many observations, synthesis of these, development of a theory, and then the testing of that theory. In this way, we learned vast amounts of valuable information about the solar system, about the universe, about the ionsphere which surrounds the earth, and about the high reaches of the earth's atmosphere, where weather is generated, where the first impact of radiation from the sun and other sources in space begins to affect the earth. But it was only when we achieved the capability with the rocket to go outward from the earth, to look backward at the earth, to take measurements in space, did we escape from this system of observation, hypothesis, synthesis, and then a further testing, always having to do this at a distance. The rocket made it possible to send men and instruments out to the place where you needed to make the measurements to relay the information back. Now what are the tools that have been used here? First of all, we used the sounding rocket. There are some hundred sounding rocket flights a year by the United States. We cooperate with some 300 sounding rocket flights which we participate in with other nations. These are vehicles that go outward to about one earth's radius, about 4,000 miles or less, and take a direct measurement, take a photograph, or get the specific information that is needed by limited duration flight. They drop back into the earth's atmosphere after the flight. Some are recovered.

This generally permits measurements from about a hundred miles from the earth on outward to 4,000. But for longer duration flight, for measurements that take a longer period of time, we use scientific satellites, and then driven to speeds where they attain orbital flights so they continue to orbit the earth, either in circular orbits or in highly elliptical orbits going out to hundreds of thousands of miles and then coming back near the earth, going out again, taking measurements as they pass through the various areas surrounding the earth and out into space.

There is another family of vehicles used for further distances in space. We call this the deep space probe. You know the Pioneer V, which was one of these types of vehicles, moved outward to some 22½ million miles where we lost contact with it something over a year ago. But in the process of being able to get the measurements back from Pioneer V, we learned a great deal about the earth-sun relationship because while Pioneer V was about 20 million miles from the earth there was a major solar eruption, a flare. There happened to also be a scientific satellite circling near the earth, and therefore we were able to measure the emanations from the sun as they passed Pioneer V 20 million miles out, measure them also when they passed the scientific satellite near the earth, measure then again at the surface of the earth. Now this gave us a great deal of information which I cannot take time here to go into, but I think it illustrates the process.

Now beyond this family of scientific unmanned vehicles, we have the manned space program. You know that man has been able to carry a workable environment out on the surface of the sea, under the sea, up into the air, and now he is endeavoring to carry it out beyond the air and into space. In every case before the space program, he was working within some atmospheric capability. He was working in the field of gravity. He was not subject to the high radiation fluxes which exist out in space. So here we have an extremely hostile environment which must be overcome if man is to live and work out in space flight. You know, the vacuum there is so much a vacuum there is so much a vacuum that many ordinary metals which get an oxidized finish within the earth's atmosphere, simply lose the molecules from their surface. They begin to evaporate. Aluminum slowly loses its molecules in the hard vacuum of space. Many of the normal materials which we use, like putty materials for electronic gear, the insulation on wires, the paints that are used, the lubricants that are used, simply will not work out in space because of this hard vacuum. Radiation is a subject of intense interest. It varies with the flares of the sun, with the solar activity, and it does accumulate trapped in the earth's magnetic field in the radiation belts, so we have the problem of overcoming radiation, of protecting against it, and of determining how much man can take and survive.

But now the weightless condition is the greatest unknown of all, because in flights in space the speed is such that the centrifugal forces just balance the gravitational pull and therefore you have no weight. The body functions normally with the one gravitational force. It can function effectively with less than that. We're quite sure of it. Whether it can function with none at all is a great unknown. In the manned space program, we are moving from the three-orbit Mercury mission to a 1-day mission using that same spacecraft. We'll be flying that mission within about a year. We will be moving then to a two-man spacecraft, the Gemini, which will fly on the Titan, which will give us from 1 to 2 weeks experience with weightlessness in orbit around the earth. And then we will be moving on to the Apollo, which will give us from 1 to 2 months experience and which will form the basic unit for flights outward to the moon and around the moon. Indeed, in later years, form a landing on the moon.

Now, let me move backward just a moment to trace quickly how we got this far. If Dr. Robert Goddard's work 36 years ago produced the flight of a man-made satellite in late 1957, think what has happened in this 4 years of space flight. We in this Nation, have launched over 70 satellites. The Russians have launched some 14—a tremendous capability in the area of space has been developed. The first efforts were to use conversions from military rockets. There came a second generation of rockets like the Atlas and the Titan, which gave greatly increased capability. The Thor, the Redstone, all of these became fairly sophisticated, capable, reliable, boosters. But now we find because of the large weights that need to be lifted, we must have a versatile family of rockets, sort of like a family of trucks, some of which can carry very heavy loads, some of which can carry lighter loads, some of which can move at a rapid rate, some can move slower but carry heavier loads. So we have a national launch vehicle program developed by the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. There are 10 vehicles in this approved program, ranging from the small Scout, a 4-stage solid rocket, costing about $1 million to fire, capable of lifting 150 pounds into a low earth orbit, through the Thor which can lift about 350 pounds, on to the Thor Delta, on to the Atlas, on to the Atlas Aegina, which can lift about 5,000 pounds into orbit, on to the Titan, which can lift 6,000 pounds, on to the Saturn, which can lift 10 tons, on to the advanced Saturn, which can lift 100 tons, on to the Nova, which can lift 200 tons into low earth orbit. Now here you see a tremendous development, utilizing in the smaller vehicles the technology that was developed for military purposes, utilizing the basic vehicles like the Thor, the Thor Delta, the Atlas, the Aegina, for the smaller rockets, but constructing a whole new family of very large boosters.

Let me give you again a couple of facts. The advanced Saturn will have 5-million-and-a-half-pound-thrust engines, each of these engines will have the thrust capability of all eight of those engines in the Saturn which you saw fly not too long ago and which carried these 95 tons of water up 65 miles and dumped them into the atmosphere to form the first manmade cloud. Now these new families of vehicles are so heavy, they are so large, they are so intricate, that as the Nation embarked, under President Kennedy's leadership last year, on this forward moving program, it was decided as a matter of policy, that the water transportation system of the Nation should be utilized to move these. Now, it's very important, I think, to recognize that with Cape Canaveral, the place where we expect to launch these large rockets, there's a good reason for this—namely, the fact that the earth turns east, means that you get the benefit of this additional power. It's like landing upwind, instead of landing downwind with an airplane. So with Cape Canaveral in its location and the best place in the world that we could find to launch these rockets, with Huntsville, Ala., being the place they were managed and the first big ones built, we were using water transportation of over 2,000 miles length to carry the Saturns down. If we had to bring one back from Cape Canaveral, it meant backtracking all the way up the Mississippi into Tennessee River to Huntsville. So we took over a vacant Government-owned plant near New Orleans at Michod. This is a large air-conditioned plant with about 4,000 feet of high bay area capable of making these large rockets for assembly. In order to test them before going to Cape Canaveral, because of the large investment in Cape Canaveral, we want to minimize the amount of time there on the pad with these large vehicles, and particularly since we're not moving from the experimental flight stage into operational flight stages, it was necessary to construct a test facility—a static test facility near the mouth of the Mississippi River. This is over in Mississippi about 35 miles from this large assembly plant. So you see now a pattern beginning to develop of compact facilities where once the assembly has been accomplished at Michod, the static test accomplished at the Mississippi test facility, the rockets can be mated with the spacecraft, which will be managed and fabricated around—which will be managed from the manned spacecraft center in Houston, but fabricated wherever needed, and this whole apparatus carried down to Cape Canaveral for the firing.

I'd like to point out that this compact capability accomplishes many purposes. First, it permits us to use water transportation. Second, it permits us to have short hauls for the large vehicles and to assemble three, four, or five of these large rockets for complicated missions where we expect to join two or more sections of this in orbit around the earth. In the case of rendezvous for the moon flight, we are now planning to launch a large engine weighing about 100 tons into low earth orbit, using an advance Saturn, to then launch the manned section of the spacecraft—namely, the Apollo, plus the service module, join the two in orbit around the earth, giving us the 200 tons necessary, and then take off for the moon. This means we've got to have four or five advanced Saturns at Cape Canaveral at the same time ready to fire and with very little capability of delaying flights because once you get the big engine in orbit, you must send the craft that is to rendezvous and join up with it at a very precise time interval. This, again, means a necessity for a compact setup for assembly, test and launching with water transportation carrying these vehicles and bringing them to the place where they'll be used. Now, let me mention also this fact, that if the kind of facilities required for static tests were constructed with Government money and plant of the first contract, who got the first contract, he'd be locked in and other companies would be locked out. This would deny other parts of the Nation the opportunity to participate in this program. The fact that this policy has been followed of having the large Government-owned assembly and static test facility in a central location, means that the desired work, the parts of assembly, the subassemblies, can be made anywhere in the Nation and brought together where they become these large, heavy vehicles at this central point. So it assures competition in each of the future stages of booster development. It insures that other parts of the Nation can contribute their part where they have specialized competence, where they can win the competitive contracts involved.

It does another thing. It permits the Government to do from 90 to 92 percent of this program with contracts to private industry and nongovernmental institutions with a minimum supervisory force to handle all of the supervision and the interphase problems between the stages of the rockets and the spacecraft would be very, very difficult if it had to be done in many locations throughout the country, changing locations if the contractors changed. Here this means that the Government capability will be great, with a very small investment in its own work force.

Let me point out another thing. If it should be necessary to depart from this peace-oriented civilian program and do a major military program using these large rockets in space, here is a compact, integrated tied together with water transportation complex which could be utilized very effectively by the military services. No one wants to overfly that beautiful State of Bob Sykes for these big boosters during peacetime, but if we had to overfly in wartime, we have the basic facilities in the Mississippi test facility to add to the capability of Cape Canaveral if for any reason Cape Canaveral should be, say, disabled or unable to function. So this policy that has been laid down is very important.

Now I was asked in Detroit about a week ago if this location, if these large installations around the Gulf Coast and in Florida was policy, politics or chance. Well, my answer was along the line I have given you. It is policy to do it for the good reason that the earth turns east, for the good reason that water transportation is available, for the good reason that these areas are reachable by water transportation and other means of transportation from all over the Nation, and because competition can be really effective even beyond the form of competitive bidding on contract.

Let me move again very quickly now to another factor that is very important. I'm sure most of you know that the National Aeronautics and Space Agency has asked the Corps of Engineers to undertake the main leadership in the construction of these facilities, again keeping within the military services of this government the engineering specialized corps, the capability to do whatever may be needed in peace or war. This competence for building large launching complexes, for building these large static test facilities, for handling the kind of transportation equipment necessary, is a very important competence which the Government needs to retain. The Corps of Engineers is doing a wonderful job. The Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy is also participating in Seal Harbor, Calif., where we are building a complex for the S–2 stage of the Saturn. But, also important in this regard is the fact that water transportation is going to play an important part of the economic development that will spring from this program. I think it is fair to say that this program, which must do the technology to build and fly large rockets and spacecraft, uses the most advanced and sophisticated forms of energy; civilization and economic growth depend upon efficient use of energy. We have to develop the kind of new material, metals, fabrics, lubricants, required for these very advanced applications. These have many industrial uses. The research to develop them is spread widely throughout the country through our contracting and subcontracting system. This energy, this new process and material type of research and thinking are both important ingredients of ongoing economic growth, but further than this, the marriage of these with the most modern forms of electronics, of systems management, and in this program, with the life sciences, since we are flying men, is a whole new range of relatively unclassified technology. The military research and development program must be classified for national security, the atomic energy programs are largely classified. Congress decided when it set up this agency for this purpose, it would endeavor to keep it in an unclassified area, and require the agency to spend off the benefits into economic growth.

I'm sure one of the most important means through which this science and technology can be applied is through such things as the communications satellite. We are developing four of them. Three of them are active. One is a passive reflector type of satellite. But as the use of these tools which are being developed for research and development programs move forward, a whole new supplement to the undersea cable communication system of the world will come into being. It's been estimated that these microwave relay stations in space can multiply by a factor of 10,000, the present total intercontinental communications system of the world. This is the kind of capability for growth, for knitting the world closer together that comes out of the specific application of a satellite.

In the case of weather, we've already had four successful flights with the Tyro satellite. We've taken over 100,000 pictures of the cloud cover of the earth, made many, many measurements of the heat or energy balance of the earth, how much it absorbs, how much is radiated outward from the earth, learned a great deal about weather, are not preparing an operational weather satellite system to be operated by the U.S. Weather Bureau, by inviting other nations to cooperate with us in putting in this international weather satellite system. Most of you know that we get measurements now under our worldwide weather reporting system from less than 25 percent of the surface of the earth. These satellites by their very nature must continue to orbit the earth. They will work anywhere around the earth. Therefore, we can now get 100 percent coverage.

One of the proposals made by President Kennedy for cooperation with Russia was that they would launch one weather satellite in a particular type of orbit. We would launch a second one in another type of orbit. We would both work with each other's satellites, getting back the weather information, utilizing it. This is possible. It may even be probable if the Russians really mean business about cooperation. But 28 nations have already joined with us in an international workshop to find out how they can learn to use weather. Beyond this, of course, is the possibility of weather modification.

Now I've spoken of the communications satellite and the weather satellite as specific applications where we have ongoing programs moving from the first generation spacecraft, on to second generation, on to third generation. The third generation weather satellite will be a satellite called Eros. It will orbit at 22,300 miles above the earth, which means that at that altitude with the proper speed to orbit, it will remain stationary over a point on the earth because its speed will exactly match the angular sweep of the earth as it rotates and it will stay there as a permanent location, to take continuous pictures of the development of storms and other types of weather phenomena over one-third of the earth's surface.

I want to emphasize, though that beyond these specific applications, which are revolutionary in their implications, is the economic spinoff. I am sure that you have not participated in the development of the water transportation system of this Nation without recognizing the tremendous importance of a developing Nation with a growing population, with an increasing urbanization, with an increasing specialization in division of work. I think it's a remarkable fact that our civilization has developed to the point that we spend one-fifth of our gross national product for moving people and things around—$100 billion a year for transportation. Now in this kind of complex economy with a construction investment for the next 10 years estimated by the Dodge reports of some $700 billion, with a maintenance and repair factor of some $300 to $400 billion in the 10 years, you have a trillion-dollar item for construction, plus maintenance and repair. If you look at the development of the most efficient sources of energy and users of energy, electronics, the vast new opening possibilities with metals, lubricants, and with the possibility of understanding the life sciences in the same sophisticated way we now understand the atom, the physical science side, I think you can see the leverage of a program that will spend $35 billion over the next 10 years while this construction, trillion.

In conclusion, I'd like to state that the image of the United States around the world as a leader in science and technology is very important. Who knows whether the Russians would have acted belligerently as they did in Berlin if they had not flown their sputnik, if they had not the Gagarin flight? I don't know, but I know that the 10-year investment in this program means that we will not be yielding to the Russians the opportunity to hold themselves out as the leader in science and technology. I also know that this is developing the kind of advanced technology, manned space flight particularly, the kind of joining of objects in flight which permits us also to go up and look over other objects that are orbiting the earth, means a military base of technology which may be the difference between the security of the Nation and an insecurity or a threat, and if the threat comes in an area which we do not understand, where we have not developed the technology, we will perhaps not be able to act with assurance.

I can only say that this Nation is cooperating. President Kennedy has said that each of the agencies of the Government should work together in this program, particularly the Atomic Energy Commission, where we are working to build a nuclear rocket, the Defense Department, which is intimately concerned with the whole process, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, because of the communications satellite, the Weather Bureau because we're moving toward the system of operational weather satellites. So I believe you can see here a new type of program. We are utilizing what you have built in the rivers and harbors congress, a water transportation system, because we believe it most appropriate. We are locating these facilities where they can be fed and utilized in a way that will greatly benefit this Nation, and I think economic growth, the applications of the science and technology which we are able to make is going to make a very rapid rate of exchange.

Thank you very much. I'm very happy to be here with you.

Failure To Understand Business Could Cost Us Our Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by David Lawrence in the August 13, 1962 issue of U.S. News & World Report should be must reading for every freedom-loving American citizen. Mr. Lawrence reminds us of what should be crystal clear, that if we continue to make American business and the profit system the whipping boy for every economic problem, we may see the end of private enterprise in America and with it, the end of freedom for all of us.

The editorial follows:

We Need To Understand Business

(By David Lawrence)

We hear people speaking of various individuals as "probusiness" or "antibusiness."

We read of politicians attacking businessmen as hostile to the "public interest."

We read articles, especially in the labor press, by writers who foster the notion that businessmen as a class are undemocratic, shortsighted, illiberal, reactionary, and selfish. They are portrayed as rolling in wealth or as enjoying fancy salaries that presumably are taxed only slightly, and such salaries are theoretically extorted at the expense of the impoverished workingman. Time was when a $5,000 a year salary was considered fancy, too, but today it is virtually a minimum wage for skilled labor.

Businessmen, weighed down by their responsibilities, yearn for an understanding press and an understanding Congress and an understanding President.

Anybody who is at all familiar with the operations of a business knows that price, for example, can make all the difference in the world between profit and loss at the end of the year. If a price is too high, it meets buyer resistance. If it's too low, it cuts or wipes out the profit. When a business sets its price and sends its salesmen out to get orders, the word sometimes comes back:

"I've just been told by the customer that our competitor has cut his price below ours. Shall I meet it?"

If the salesman is instructed to offer the same price, is this businessman unwittingly acting in concert with a competitor to fix a price?

There have been instances where some competitors have deliberately gotten together to monopolize a market as against other competitors, but such conspiracies today are the exception rather than the rule, and the Government rightly moves in on the basis of information furnished by aggrieved competitors.

The problem is complicated by ambiguous laws. Charles R. Sligh, Jr., executive vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, said in a speech on November 20, 1961, before the Sales and Marketing Executives' Club in Washington:

"The most familiar marketing laws on the books today are the antitrust laws. I would be glad to tell you exactly what they mean, except that nobody knows. Lowell Mason, the former Federal Trade Commissioner, quotes a former U.S. Attorney General as say that, there's hardly a business in America that could not be prosecuted successfully under the antitrust laws,' and he cites the case of a businessman who was accused of uniform pricing under one antitrust law and of not pricing uniformly under another, and convicted of both in the same case.

"After having won its price-rigging case against 29 electrical equipment manufacturers, the Justice Department now is seeking assurance from those same companies that they will not lower their price sufficiently to make it hard for the least economical producers to stay in business. Each manufacturer seems to be expected to ignore market factors and set his prices according to what he thinks will satisfy the Justice Department. If this concept prevails, any price, no matter how it is arrived at, will be a potential source of litigation."

But price isn't the only factor that today troubles the mind of the business executive. He is faced every day with responsibility for other decisions that also involve risk. How much material should he buy? What estimate shall he make of probable sales? Can he plan ahead for 3 or 5 years? He is dealing with other people's money. It was made available to him either with a fixed-interest charge or in the confident expectation of a dividend income.

Then, in the midst of his burdens, after he has carefully calculated his costs, surveyed his market for sales and bought his materials, the businessman is suddenly presented with demands from a labor union which, if granted, will eat up most of his profit and make it doubtful whether he will have enough money to pay interest or dividends. If he turns down the demands, he is pilloried in the press as antiunion and as illiberal and selfish. When the strike is called and his plant is shut down, the businessman has to weigh the cost of surrender as against the consequences of a diminished profit. This is sometimes called the "profit squeeze." So, as he resumes operations, he lays off some employees, cuts expenditures needed to get sales, and the chain reaction sets in that starts economic recessions in America.

The solution certainly does not lie in Government control or regulation. In some European countries public-spirited labor leaders are already sitting down with public-spirited businessmen to get the facts and to make agreements in the best interests of both sides.

Labor's demand for high wages is widely understood in America. But can it be said that there is any widespread understanding of the need for a higher profit in business? There is today a lack of understanding of what can make business successful and, by the same token, what really brings economic prosperity.

Overhaul Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the attached editorials. One is from the Rushville Daily Republican, August 6, 1962, and the other from the Muncie Star, August 4, 1962:

[From the Rushville (Ind.) Daily Republican, Aug. 6, 1962]

OVERHAUL OVERDUE

Major reforms, whether in a private business or in a governmental agency, seldom occur unless preceded by some kind of major scandal. It is human nature to coast along, hesitating to upset accepted ways of operating.

This is illustrated in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. For years many insiders have said and many outsiders have guessed that the Department was badly in need of overhaul. It has become a monstrous collection of agencies, offices, committees, bureaus, etc., tacked on as new problems arose.

Now the "major scandal" has occurred, and if the Department cannot be reorganized as a more effective unit in the wake of the Billie Sol Estes case, it never can be.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, pinpointed the place to start when he said "there has been a breakdown of the whole (supervisory) procedure; it has got to be tightened up."

Agriculture Secretary Freeman has shown less than eagerness to move into the situation and bring about the organizational reforms that appear to be necessary. Perhaps it is time for President Kennedy to hunt for that "new broom" that in the usual cliche can "sweep clean."

[From the Muncie (Ind.) Star, Aug. 4, 1962]

SURE AS DEBT AND TAXES

A Gallup poll report says that Americans are substantially more anxious to avoid further increase in the national debt than to enjoy a cut in their income taxes. But for more than 25 years Americans have permitted the Government to forbid their use of the instrument with which they could control the Government's debt policy.

That instrument is gold.

Since the beginning of the first Franklin D. Roosevelt administration monetary gold has been kept away from the American people.

It is in this period—the era of an irredeemable paper currency and the outlawry of personal possession of gold—that the national debt has got out of hand. There had been previous times of heavy debt. Major war always brought such a time. But always before this a warborn period of heavy debt had been followed by a period of persistent and effective debt reduction.

Not so since gold was taken out of the people's hands. During the twenties the debt had been declining, in conformity with the previous pattern, from the World War I peak of about 25 billions. In the thirties it began to rise again, and there has never since been any sustained period of debt reduction. There was never any significant recovery from the massive debt increase of World War II, nor from the smaller but nevertheless important increase of the Korean war.

A third had been trimmed from the World War I debt by 1930. But no more than about 6 percent was ever taken off the World War II peak, and that only briefly. The Korean war peak was scarcely dented before the rising trend was resumed. From the 1919 peak of 25 billions the debt has now been raised to more than 300 billions—more than 10 times from peak to peak in four decades, almost 20 times the low point reached by 1930.

Why blame the gold ban? The answer is in the money principles of classical economies—principles which are spurned by the adherents of a new philosophy that gold is obsolete, a meaningless shibboleth from an unenlightened past. Old-fashioned economists hold that the power of the people to choose for themselves between gold and currency is the power by which the people can hold control over the Government purse, because the Government then is forced to use nothing but sound money in its dealings. Without this restraint in the hands of the people, Government is enabled to make imitation money for its own use by forcing its credit into the currency system. This is just what our Government has been doing, persistently, since it took gold away from the people. That's how the debt got to be almost 20 times what it was when gold was called in.

The tie between debt and taxes is not as inflexible as the Gallup poll seems to suggest. Actually experience shows that a cut in the tax rate may lead to an increase in the Government's revenues, thus making the Government better able to reduce the debt rather than increasing it.

The important tie is between debt and spending. For the spending cannot be disciplined as long as it is possible for the Government to borrow whenever it wishes, whether or not people want to lend to it, by enforcing inflation of the supply of credit. While it can do this, Government continues to borrow for spending no matter how much it gets from taxes.

Maintaining a high level of taxes has not controlled the debt, and will not because it cannot. Unless some other means to check spending can be found, control of the debt rests on return to a currency which is freely redeemable in gold, and to the people's right to own and use gold if they wish.

Compensation for Certain World War II Losses

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 7283) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7283. Passage of this legislation is a big step toward our goal of making just compensation to all Americans who suffered damage at the hands of our enemies during World War II.

I am seriously concerned, however, with our failure to adopt the amendments proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan]. We are still overlooking the very valid claims of other Americans who fought by our side during World War II and who suffered damages or injuries, but who were not then citizens of this country.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I have long been fighting for a bill, H.R. 3178, which would not only provide the added coverage included in the amendments offered by my colleagues, Mr. Ryan and Mr. Cohelan, but which would also extend the provisions of the War Claims Act to any individual who is a citizen or national of the United States on the date of enactment, or to any individual who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence during or after World War II and who is a lawful resident on the date of enactment.

I believe this extension should be made as a matter of justice. I am hopeful that the other body, when considering this legislation, will adopt amendments along these lines so that full justice can be achieved on this subject.

Will Russia Bury Us At Sea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, in the mail the other day, I received a very startling analysis of Russia's growing merchant marine which suggests that this intense activity may be a "prelude to economic showdown or war." This analysis appeared in an article in the June issue of Marine Engineering/Log magazine, and I understand it has been sent to all Members of the Congress.

This carefully documented analysis should be required reading for those in Washington and elsewhere who are unaware of the importance of an adequate merchant marine in the struggle to preserve western civilization as we know it. The subtitles are of themselves most expressive, and as a means of perhaps stimulating my colleagues and others to study this amazing article let me read them:

"U.S.S.R.'s Big Fleet Expansion—Prelude to Economic Showdown or War?"

"Maritime Program Gets Priority in Russia, Lip Service in United States."

"U.S.S.R. Adopts Advance Design Concepts."

"Oil Key Weapon in Russia's Trade."

"United States Relying on Rust-Bucket Fleet."

To these, I need only add that this analysis dramatically projects the future of the U.S. merchant fleet versus that of the Russian merchant fleet—for us the curve is steadily downward, for them the curve is sharply upward. This massive maritime buildup on the part of the U.S.S.R. indeed foreshadows an inevitable economic or military showdown with us—a showdown we could lose by default.

Almost simultatneously with the receipt of this Marine Engineering/Log analysis and forecast, there crossed my desk another article from the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings for August 1962, entitled "The Coming Cold War on the Sea Lanes," which concludes that "there are unmistakable signs that the U.S.S.R. recognizes the international sealanes as an important future cold war battleground." It contains a timely footnote to the question "Will Russia Bury Us At Sea?"

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include this presentation by the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings in the hope that my colleagues may also want to study an ominous warning from another authoritative source.

The article follows:

[From the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, August 1962]

THE COMING COLD WAR ON THE SEALANES

(The Soviet merchant fleet, which at present hauls only 1 percent of the world's tonnage, is not yet ready to challenge the Western bloc for a larger share of world trade. But there are unmistakable signs that the U.S.S.R. recognizes the international sealanes as an important future cold-war battleground.)

(By Desmond Wettern)

The use of a merchant fleet to further political and economic ends is yet another phenomenon of postwar Russia—and a highly important one. Until a very few years ago the Russian Bear was regarded as essentially a land animal, but now, taking a leaf from the West's book, he has discovered that the ability to "swim" can do much to assist the spread of communism throughout the world.

Since 1945 the Soviet merchant fleet has doubled in size and is continuing to expand rapidly. On September 1, 1960, the last date for which figures are available, the Soviet merchant fleet numbered about 925 ships of over 1,000 tons, totaling more than 3½ million tons deadweight. Under the current 7-year plan, due to expire in 1965, new construction programs emphasize fast freighters, tankers, and fishing vessels. By the end of 1965 it is expected that the merchant fleet will be double the size it was in 1958.

In addition to the use of merchant ships to further political and economic aims, the existence of a modern force of freighters and tankers means that the Red Navy has a readily available source of auxiliaries in an emergency.

In all, the combined strength of the Sino-Soviet bloc is 1,175 ships totaling over 4.7 million tons gross. This represents about 3 percent of the total world tonnage and places the Red bloc 10th in size in the world's merchant fleets. Apart from Russia, only Poland and Red China have fleets of any significance. The former's fleet comprises 108 ships of 526,000 tons, while the latter boasts 142 ships of 393,000 tons.

The sixth 5-year plan of 1956–60, subsequently abandoned, called for a 1-million-ton expansion in the size of the Soviet merchant fleet. Two-thirds of this tonnage was to be built in Russian yards and the rest in the satellite countries. The shipbuilding industry was one of the few which in fact attained the target laid down under the 5-year plan.

The change in Soviet naval construction policy, which has resulted in the completion of some cruisers either being abandoned or postponed and the conversion of others for service as guided missile ships, as well as a dropping off in the construction of conventionally powered submarines in favor of a smaller number of nuclear boats, has had little effect on merchant shipbuilding programs. During the past 5 years the Nation's shipbuilding capacity has greatly increased. And in any case, if present resources became overloaded, the Soviets would turn more either to satellite countries' shipyards or to Western yards. Many of the latter would undoubtedly welcome Soviet orders in view of the present worldwide slump in the industry. Relaxation of Western trade controls now impose little restriction on the Soviet's choice of shipbuilding markets. Whether the former controls exercised much effect on the Reds either politically or, more important, economically is doubtful, since only a total ban on Soviet orders being placed in Western shipyards would have been effective. Clearly even Russia requires ships of a type which previous Western controls classed as having little military value and it was precisely such ships which the Soviets ordered from the West—thus leaving their domestic yards free to build ships of military value.

Nuclear power is undoubtedly playing its part in the buildup of Soviet seapower and despite evident delays in the completion of the nuclear-powered icebreaker *Lenin*, an order has now been placed for a 43,000-ton nuclear-powered whale factory ship. Intensive feasibility and economic studies have been carried out on designs and models for nuclear-powered tankers and dry cargo ships and some of these are believed to be on the drawing boards.

Like other sections of the Soviet merchant marine, the fishing fleet has expanded markedly. Today it is the largest and most modern in the world, numbering about 2,400 vessels ranging in size from 250 to 3,200 tons. Thanks to underway refueling and replenishment techniques and the use of modern vessels, Red fishermen are now able to penetrate areas formerly used solely by Western vessels. Soviet activity in the Grand Banks-Flemish Cap area is an example of this, as are the sightings of Red fishing fleets off the Aleutians and west coast of Africa.

Although the increase in the size of the merchant fleet has resulted in growing use of Red-flag ships for commercial operations, nevertheless there has also been an increase in the chartering of Western ships. This clearly reflects the importance the Soviets attach to trade and economic measures in their cold-war policy. Red-flag ships are used for the transportation of military aid cargoes and wherever the use of a ship flying the national flag helps to boost prestige. This growth of worldwide trading operations is also invaluable in that it helps to acquaint the large numbers of naval reserve officers and ratings aboard merchant ships with foreign ports, canals, and so on. These personnel together with some active naval personnel seconded for temporary duty with the merchant fleet can also obtain useful intelligence information.

All this indicates that the Soviets now regard the international sealanes as an important cold war battleground and they are making full use of sea power to boost their prestige in the uncommitted countries and thus further their plans for world domination. Their merchant fleet must therefore become increasingly important.

In the purely commercial field, the chartering of Red-flag tankers to British, Italian, and Western countries for the Persian Gulf petroleum trade continues. Besides earning valuable foreign exchange, it allows the Soviets to enter a trade that is one of the most vital lifelines of Western Europe. Chartering of Soviet tankers first began in October 1956. Soviet tankers have also carried petroleum products to Argentina, Finland, and Iceland under economic agreements signed with these countries. Soviet freighters have maintained a steady level of trading over Eastern Hemisphere routes, while on Western routes their operations have increased. The completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, for example, has allowed them to load grain in inland Canadian ports. It is part of Soviet policy to gain acceptance as a nation of worldwide carriers.

In 1958, they carried out unsuccessful negotiations to obtain Lloyd's Register of Shipping's highest merchant ship classification. The 100A1 classification would undoubtedly have enhanced the reputation of their merchant ships in world markets. But, as sometimes happens in bureaucratic states, the right hand found itself in conflict with the left. To obtain the Lloyd's classification would have meant that capitalistic spies and saboteurs would have had to visit Soviet shipyards and ships—something which would have been too much for the internal security officials to stomach. Thus foreign policy suffered a setback thank to the little commissars at home. This is something which the West might well bear in mind to its advantage when dealing with the Reds.

Also in 1958, however, the Soviets sought and obtained membership of the Baltic and International Maritime Conference and the United Nations Intergovermental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO).

At present the Soviet dry cargo fleet is incapable of carrying more than half of the nation's seaborne foreign trade, while the balance is carried in chartered shipping—usually flying the flags of neutralist nations. Even now the Soviet Government has to charter a large amount of free world tonnage every year, for at least one or more voyages. This is something which can be expected to diminish gradually as their own merchant fleet improves in size and quality.

To what extent is Soviet shipping competing with that of the West? Mention has already been made of the chartering of Soviet tankers to lift Western petroleum cargoes. Nevertheless, the volume of this trade is minute compared with the annual total of world tanker operations. But while the Soviet fleet is not at present in a position to compete economically in an open market with Western shipping, the Reds are certainly well aware of the economic advantages to be gained by obtaining a strong foothold in the world freight market. But the day when they will be in that position is still someway off owing to the relatively small, though increasing, size of their fleet and the heavy demands for shipping on purely domestic routes. The West may be quite certain that wherever the political, economic and military objectives make it worthwhile, they will try to "inject" their shipping into world trade routes. In other words, they will try to skim the cream of the markets without having any of the responsibilities and obligations of most free world shipping companies. At least some comfort can momentarily be taken from the fact that at present Soviet ships carry a mere 1 percent of world trade.

To what extent has the relaxation of the embargo list and other forms of Western export control affected the development of the Soviet merchant fleet? Since the lifting of controls on the building and exporting of ships of various types to the Communist bloc dates only from August 15, 1958, it is still, perhaps, a little premature to try to assess the full impact of these derestrictions. While Soviet shipping has not been assisted very greatly, the shipbuilding industry has certainly been helped by the freeing of various forms of equipment and facilities of which floating docks are an example.

Under the 1958 revision of the Coordinating Committee (Cocom), member nations (which include most of the principal free world shipbuilding powers) are now permitted to build tankers with speeds not exceeding 18 knots for the Sino-Soviet bloc countries. They are also allowed to build dry cargo ships with speeds up to 20 knots; icebreakers up to 10,000 shaft horsepower and fishing vessels with speeds up to 17 knots. Whale factory ships (convertible for use as tankers) have had all restrictions removed and there are now no tonnage limitations imposed by Cocom regulations.

The Reds have no known fishing vessels capable of exceeding 17 knots and a very small number of tankers and dry cargo ships capable of exceeding the Cocom speed limitations. From this it may be deduced that such Cocom restrictions as remain will not restrict the Reds from improving their merchant fleet with ships built in Western yards which meet the kind of requirements needed for the implementation of their various commercial, political, and military policies.

In addition, while the Cocom controls imposed in 1950 encouraged the building of fast tankers suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in Soviet domestic shipyards; it would be foolish to assume that the relaxing of the same controls will slow down the building of merchant ships suitable for naval support duties. Furthermore, ships which for one reason or another are not provided for under current domestic programs will now be built in Western yards leaving domestic yards to concentrate on the types required to extend their economic and subversive activities. Ships likely to feature largely in Soviet orders for Western yards will be fast freighters and refrigerated cargo ships. The latter will be more important for the Soviet import rather than export trade and will help to raise the quality and quantity of perishable consumer goods for the Russian people.

During 1961, an ambitious program has been laid down to increase Soviet prestige in the eyes of the "neutralist" powers by using some of the more impressive units of the merchant fleet in "showboat" cruises. In the spring, the liner *Estonia* took a party of "tourists" from Riga in the Baltic around Europe to Odessa on the Black Sea. Here another party joined the ship for a cruise along the African coast taking in a number of ports including Tangier, Dakar, Abidjan, Casablanca, Tunis and, significantly, Conakry in the Communist African satellite of Guinea. As many of the places visited were in a part of the world once known as the White Man's Grave, the cruise can hardly have been for the health and recreation of the passengers. In March, *Estonia* sailed for India and was then placed in the regular service between Leningrad and the French Channel coast port of Le Havre, making calls at Stockholm, Gdynia, Copenhagen, and London.

The turboelectric ship *Abkhazia* is now making cruises for foreign tourists along the Soviet Black Sea ports while *Amur* and *Dunai* will take tourists on trips up the Danube.

In April, in collaboration with a French travel agency, *Mikhail Kalinin* took a party of tourists to Leningrad from Le Havre for the May Day celebrations.

Baltika, now on the regular service between London and Leningrad, has an additional port of call at Rostock.

A new ship on the Sochi (Black Sea) to Venice cruise route is *Litva*. Sochi has also become a new port of call for *Felix Dzerzhinsky*, which last year was on the Odessa-Beirut (Lebanon) service. This ship and *Litva* cater to "tourists" from the United Arab Republic, Turkey, Lebanon, Italy, Albania, Greece, Bulgaria, and Rumania visiting the Crimea and Caucasus areas. Flights to Moscow and Leningrad are timed to depart and return to coincide with the ships' arrival and sailing from various Black Sea ports.

Of vital importance to both Soviet naval and mercantile operations is the vast network of inland waterways. Using this system, ships can be transferred from one sea to another without foreign observation. It also allows them to carry out the construction of seagoing ships in inland ports. Routes of particular significance are the Baltic-White Sea Waterway which connects the Baltic Sea, via the Belomorsk (Stalin) Canal, with the White Sea and Arctic Ocean; and the Marlinsk Canal system which connects the Baltic-White Sea Waterway system with the Volga River. Reconstruction is now in progress on the Marlinsk Canal system and on the Baltic-White Sea Waterway. Work on the former is to be completed by 1962.

Though not strictly a part of the merchant fleet, some Soviet oceanographic research ships are civilian manned and carry out surveys in connection with deep sea fishing operations. The Soviets are now vigorously conducting oceanographic research in all the oceans and principal sea areas of the world. While all of this research is useful from a scientific standpoint, there is good evidence that much of it is in response to naval requirements. The commitment of a large number of naval ships to scientific work, and the close relations between the Red navy and the non-naval research ships are indications of this.

A large portion of the total Soviet oceanographic research effort is devoted not only to matters of particular significance to naval operations in general but to submarine operations especially. The type of information being collected is also of value for mine and antisubmarine warfare. For example, it throws light on the feasibility of mining certain waters; the behavior and effectiveness of mines, depth charges, and torpedoes; the sensitivity of sonar gear and the development of new underwater communication and detection techniques.

Though Soviet civilian-manned oceanographic research ships are more closely tied to naval operational requirements, it must not be forgotten that the entire Soviet merchant fleet is regarded by the leaders in the Kremlin as another weapon in their fight against the free world. Though commercial and economic considerations play some part in the operational programs of their merchant fleets, such considerations are very much secondary to anything which will help to spread the gospel of communism. This is the essential difference between the Communist and Western merchant fleets—the former are geared to meet political requirements, the latter to meet economic needs with political considerations coming a long way behind—if at all.

At present the West still has unquestioned sea power and the means to exploit the advantages to the full. Little or no attempt has been made to use the power vested in our merchant fleets to match the Reds at their own game. There is, so far, only one plan in existence in the West which seeks to deploy sea power to the full in peacetime and as such it needs every encouragement.

It is a sign of hope, therefore, that men on both sides of the Atlantic are rallying steadily to the support of the White Fleet project. But time does not stand still and there is no shadow of doubt that the Reds are making every effort to compete with and to surpass the West in the use of sea power to further their cause. But the sea, being neutral, can also be used by the West to bring their people, skills, resources, and supplies to those areas now desperately needing them. The West must use its genius for maritime operations born of war to meet the vital problems of peace in the underdeveloped and emerging countries.

Blacklisting: The Faulk Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in the 1950's in this wonderful country of ours with its prized civil liberties there occurred a shameful period of political witchhunting that should provoke liberty loving Americans to shame.

A recounting of one painful episode in that period appeared in the July 14 issue of the Nation. It concerns the destructive activities of a self-appointed vigilante group in the entertainment industry which called itself Aware. I recommend the article both as a means of realizing the political nightmare of that decade and as a means of making us all resolve not to permit such devastating developments to happen again. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

BLACKLISTING: THE FAULK DECISION

(By David Cort)

(David Cort is a frequent contributor. A new collection of his essays and articles, many of which have appeared in The Nation, will be published later in the year by Macmillan under the title "Social Astonishments.")

One day the bill falls due for the wicked—sometimes, it is true, a lifetime or a thousand years late, but all morality and hope disappear when people cease to expect that day.

It came, for thousands of people ruined in the 1950's, in New York Supreme Court, when the libel case of *John Henry Faulk* v. *Vincent W. Hartnett, Laurence E. Johnson, and Aware, Inc.*, went to the jury on the evening of June 28, the 14th wedding anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. Faulk, and a bad 6 years since Faulk was cut down by the word "Communist," and brought suit. Since such maligners leave very faint tracks, the trial had dragged on, under Justice Abraham Geller, for 11 weeks, to pick up that sinister spoor. For Faulk, a man who was anything but a Communist, had been indelibly branded as one—and so ruined. As sensible people, we know that this is impossible; still, it happened.

Louis Nizer, author of the book, "My Life in Court," was counsel for the plaintiff. His case was than an inhuman, un-American and tragic wrong had been done. The defense was that its acts had been very American, and that personal tragedy is irrelevant and immaterial.

Around 1950, the defendants had discovered that close study of the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations and files of the House Un-American Activities Committee gave one a tool against thousands of people, especially in TV and radio, which are supported by conservative and easily scared advertisers. You just had to do the homework. If you made it known in the right quarters that a performer or writer had "a significant Communist-front record" (the standard incantation), he was through. If he defended himself, it would cost him at least $6,000 in the courts, and he was probably still through. Many of the accused therefore took the fifth amendment. In that case, they were through, too. This glorious business flourished most briskly against the members of the American Federation of Television & Radio Artists (AFTRA), to which all performers in TV and radio had to belong.

What sort of American would stoop to this work? Hartnett, whom I watched for some weeks in court, is the type of the eternal, meticulous snooper, and even has the sunken prissy mouth of the beldam gossip of caricature. Paul R. Milton, his associate in Aware, Inc., has a big, wholesale butcher's head from which peeps, now and then, a terrified little girl. Johnson, a Syracuse grocer who sold his chain of supermarkets in 1956, never appeared in court.

Hartnett profited by $25,000 a year for supplying the names of "Communists" to such clients as Borden's, Lever Brothers, American Broadcasting Co., Young & Rubicam, the Cutler Agency. Hartnett wrote a magazine article chiding Borden's for permitting "Communists" on its TV show, got himself hired by Borden's (for $10,000 that year), then added two paragraphs to his article, concluding that Borden's had now taken all appropriate steps to do better in the future. Milton accused a writer on the TV show, "Treasury Men in Action," of being pro-Communist, got him fired, and then took his job. Ah, those were the halcyon days.

Defense counsel described Hartnett as an "expert"—an expert on wicked people, like Bernard Guy or Torquemada, those masters of the question. Hartnett himself testified that he had never blacklisted anybody; he had merely done objective research on "significant Communist-front records." This dazzling new career was childishly, enviably easy: of course, one kept a file of "names," subscribed to the Daily Worker, got on all liberal and leftist mailing lists, saved old programs, eavesdropped on groups of actors with a microphone and hidden recorder, and corresponded with the House Un-American Activities Committee. None of his victims knew him, or remembered ever having seen him, but of course he knew them all, since they were performers, publicly visible or audible. Hartnett was, in effect, the invisible man, and he kept it that way.

The flood of names he garnered he sold to his clients at $5 a head, a price that must make the ruined men rage when they look at their wives and children. To find one's soul worth $5 must be terrible; the devil pays better. But they can be consoled to know that for the same name Hartnett collected $5 from each of a number of clients. Arthur Miller's name was worth $300. One joker got Hartnett to clear the name, Santa Claus, and he did so for $5. It all sounds as petty as a spinster's hobby in Keokuk, but it added up to $25,000 a year for Hartnett, the invisible man whom nobody ever remembered. And corporations worth a hundred billion dollars trembled on his telephone calls and jumped at his command. The thing is too ridiculous to be believed; still, it happened. It was proved in court. It was not even argued by the defense.

The defense emphasized that Hartnett's transcendent virtue was that he did not, repeat did not, add to this income by letting the accused buy their way off his lists. (But in some cases, e.g., the actress, Kim Hunter, he did coerce performers into expressing opinions they hated.) It is an interesting esthetic theory that because he might have been blacker, and was not, he must therefore be white. My observation is that he lacks the guts and tact to blackmail; this must be face to face. Lacking these, he convinces himself that he is filled with principle.

Hartnett's accusation was enough in the fifties, as everyone knows: the corporations immediately panicked and disavowed the individuals. "A sponsor is interested in selling goods; it is not interested in causes. Why buy a headache?" said a witness. But it is hard to prove this legally. Nizer had the utmost difficulty wringing any important admission out of the corporate witnesses, and we all understand why. The defense naturally counted on this.

In these matters, the Communists and the "anti-Communists" are agreed on destroying the only true anti-Communists, the decent people in the middle. Their very decency seems to enrage the two extremes.

The murderous arrogance of these "anti-Communists" was shown when a producer challenged the "nonclearance" of a woman entertainer who, he knew, had extremely conservative policies. He demanded at least an explanation, was refused, demanded it again, and found that the woman had been mistaken for another with a vaguely similar name; still, he was told to fire her anyway, because the public might confuse the two. He refused, and was informed, "Next time don't be so emphatic, or they say they might take an interest in you."

Looking back at Johnson, Hartnett and Aware, Inc. (the name itself is an understated threat), a historical memory comes to mind: the reign of terror of the French Revolution, Robespierre and the Committee of Public Safety: accusations without accusers, cursory trials or no trials, the law of suspects, the "clearing," by the local committees of surveillance. "Not cleared" is an inscrutable tag Robespierre would have liked. And the American people were hardly conscience that this terror was in force. The American press did not report it; it was either sympathetic or too terrified.

And one mean little group of men were able to do this: Johnson combined with the grocery clerks' branch of the Syracuse American Legion, combined with Hartnett and Milton, whom we have seen, and the Aware, Inc., publications.

At the trial, Hartnett confessed that his alliance with Johnson, who could threaten any reluctant advertiser with the hostility of the retail grocers' association (maybe), "enhanced my value." That is, Johnson's operations could put teeth in Hartnett's most careless whims as to who had a "significant Communist-front record." Madison Avenue fell into line. If it did not, Johnson came roaring down from Syracuse, raging up and down Madison Avenue, to see to it.

The closet Government of the United States for some years, while Eisenhower thought he was running the country, was this savage little cabal of very small men without talent, distinction, or courage.

By 1955, however, the thing had grown overripe. The Robespierres had grown fat. And the decent Americans in AFTRA were ready to call a halt and crack down on both Communists and blacklisters. They voted to condemn Aware, Inc., and put up a middle-of-the-road slate of officers, including John Henry Faulk as second vice president.

Hartnett wrote Johnson, "We have already lost Equity. We may lose our control of AFTRA." What? Neither was a member of AFTRA. What control? But of course, AFTRA had been both their victim and their puppet.

This John Henry Faulk had become a radio and TV personality with a great following, on the basis of a rich personality of effortless Texas charm, a liberal humanism and a built-in affection for the whole American heritage. He was wholly unlike, and a better performer than, Godfrey, Linkletter, et al. He liked to talk, and he had a lot to say that America liked to hear. He was on the threshold of a $500,000-a-year career when he consented to try to impose some kind of peace on conflict-riven AFTRA, by running as a candidate. What a fool, I would say, but remember that he was a goodhearted, reasonable man from the country, who thought he was in a decent, reasonable world.

Hartnett, Milton, and Aware, Inc., cooked up a bulletin, exhibit 41 at the trial, purporting to show Faulk's "significant Communist-front record." In view of the sequel, I don't expect you to believe this, but five of the seven items were outright inventions, and the other two were absolutely insignificant. If they were "significant," your mother is an Albanian Communist spy.

For example, the bulletin represented an interview by the New York Herald Tribune with Faulk as an interview with him by the Daily Worker. For example, again, the bulletin stated that one "Communist affair" Faulk attended was a Salute to the United Nations, where the speakers were Secretary of State Stettinius and Trygve Lie (these latter facts, of course, not mentioned in the citation).

The intent to destroy Faulk professionally, and no other intent, was betrayed by the 12 categories of recipients to whom this masterpiece was mailed February 10, 1956; newspapers, radio, and TV companies, two national advertising associations, advertising agencies, association of retail grocers, motion picture studios, sponsoring corporations, law-enforcement agencies, four actors' unions, patriotic organizations, leading magazines, leading columnists. In this list, we can see the combined malevolences of Johnson, Hartnett, Milton, and the others plotting to corner a man.

From that day on, Faulk never appeared again on television, because he had no contract. But somehow the Committee of Public Safety had been unable to dislodge him from his 5 to 6 p.m. radio show. The people still loved him; and the Robespierres raged. What had happened was that Charles Collingwood, a CBS commentator and president of AFTRA, had told the president of CBS Radio that if Faulk were fired, AFTRA would subpena and examine the advertising agency executives whose clients had canceled from the Faulk show. (Twenty-nine did.) Ed Murrow backed up Collingwood. But 16 months later, Collingwood was no longer president of AFTRA, Murrow was no longer with CBS, and Faulk was on a Caribbean vacation; and now CBS fired Faulk, though his program had more listeners than any other CBS show.

However, the Terror had been defied, and was resolved to finish the execution. It followed Faulk to promises of jobs in Minneapolis, New York, and San Francisco—promises which then "mysteriously" fell through. That is, the warm, loving conversation suddenly turned distant and evasive. Faulk told his friends in business he would do anything, even to sweeping over the studio, for after all he had a wife and children. They tried not to tell him that the Terror had conveyed to them that Faulk was not to be hired in any capacity, or the terrible vengeance would fall on one and all. Behind the curtain, as this agony drew itself out, were Johnson, Hartnett, and the members of Aware, Inc., smiling in the various ways they knew how to smile, or even laugh. I saw several of their smiles and they were frightening.

Finally Faulk retreated to his hometown in Austin, Tex., where he and his wife, by both working, were able to bring in under $5,000 a year. In the industry he was a "walking corpse," but not in his own mind, for Louis Nizer had taken his case against the Terror. At the preliminary examinations Nizer, to his amazement, discovered that Faulk had never before laid eyes on Hartnett, who had so vengefully and wickedly chopped him down. Hartnett had indeed been "objective," as objective as Hitler or Stalin in their mass exterminations. Hartnett had not even paid Faulk the compliment of hating him viscerally. He had been far too busy with his little lists. The prim little mouth had bitten down on Faulk and spat him out.

I have in the above roughly synthesized the evidence at the trial with other information and "fair comment," a legal term. Now both sides rest. The defense attorney, Bolan, a partner of Roy Cohn (who else?), argued in summation that Faulk was a liar, Hartnett was a more truthful and honest man than anyone you will ever come across, Faulk did better after the libel than before, Faulk never was any good anyway, Faulk had no future on TV and was just a self-aggrandized disc jockey. So much for Bolan's dramatic criticism. He also advanced the social theory that though the courts cannot object to a man's taking the fifth amendment, his neighbors can and should. A neighborly lynching, he said, is right and proper. Blacklisting is simply splendid and purely patriotic. (This was not an issue in the trial: Faulk never took the fifth amendment on anything, and was never technically blacklisted.) Bolan was in fact arguing some other case that existed in the dream world of Johnson, Hartnett and Aware, Inc., where so many other nightmares had indeed come true; but this was not the case being argued before Justice Geller.

Nizer's summation pulled out of the mass of evidence an easily read trail of conspiracy against Faulk, as given above. A peculiar incident here should have alerted me. I could not get into the courtroom before the first recess, but was at the head of the overflow line when a yahoo type bulled his way through us and into the court attendants, snarling "I will not stand back. Tell the judge I'm here." He identified himself as from the New York Journal-American and was allowed in. He seated himself at the press table, glowering about as if he were banked in Communists. The Journal-American had not reported the case; why this?

Defendant Johnson, hiding out in a Bronx motel, had just died that morning. This for the first time made the trial news to most of the press (though for the Journal-American not good news).

Nizer asked for a minimum $1 million compensatory damages, and $1 million punitive damages from each of the three defendants. The judge, however, told the jury that Johnson was dead and could not be assessed punitive damages.

Before midnight on the Faulk's wedding anniversary, the jury came in with its verdict: $1 million compensatory damages, $1,250,000 punitive against Hartnett, $1,250,000 punitive against Aware. All 12 jurors agreed on the verdict, but one woman thought the amount too high. (In a civil suit, a 10-to-2 vote is enough.)

This story reached page 1, column 1, of the Times which alone had reported the whole trial. The Journal-American headlined its story: "Faulk May Never Get His Millions for Libel—$3,500,000 Phantom Award"—another way of saying "Yah. Yah."

In fact, lawyers agreed that Faulk and Nizer will get the $1 million from Johnson's estate, and part of Hartnett's income for the rest of his life. The liability of the Aware officers is speculative; Milton has a good deal of real estate. Nizer in 6 years had had costs of about $200,000 and will get them back at least. The income tax on Faulk's share of the compensatory damages is subject to various deductions and should properly be spread over the past 5 years. The punitive damages are nontaxable.

It is to be hoped that the defense will appeal so that this largest award in the history of libel cases will be built into the legal structure of the higher judiciary. Already that $3,500,000 award has washed out a lot of mouths. Paupers may continue to gibber, "Significant Communist-front record," but anybody with money had better not join in.

The second hope, which is already more than that, is that John Henry Faulk will now return to his talent for entertaining and instructing the American people.

Sylvester C. Smith: President of the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday in San Francisco a distinguished 45-year career was climaxed for one of my longtime and close personal friends, and one of New Jersey's outstanding lawyers: Sylvester C. Smith. Installation as president of the American Bar Association gave to my good friend a national recognition of personal qualities and professional competence that have been long and well known in our community of New Jersey. And it gives me a deep sense of pleasure to speak today, to point out to my fellow members of the bar who may not have had the privilege of knowing Sylvester just what a fine selection was made in elevating him to the presidency of the American Bar Association.

Sylvester Smith's contributions to civic life through his dedicated and inspiring efforts are, as I say, well appreciated in our native New Jersey. But in order that those who do not personally know him may at least know of him, I would like at this time to insert a news story that appeared in the Newark Evening News on the 10th. I shall add to the story only that in addition to gaining and holding an ever greater respect throughout New Jersey for his work, Sylvester Smith has gained and held the sincere admiration and affection of all who have come to know him.

SYLVESTER C. SMITH HEADS U.S. LAWYERS

SAN FRANCISCO.—Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., of West Orange, N.J., today took office as president of the American Bar Association.

Smith, general counsel of the Prudential Insurance Co. of Newark, N.J., succeeded Whitney North Seymour, of New York, as head of the 100,000 member association.

His installation as head of the Nation's lawyers represented for Smith the climatic event in a 45-year legal career.

BEGAN IN PHILLIPSBURG

His career had it genesis in a country law office in Phillipsburg in 1917, was highlighted by his appointment as one of the youngest prosecutors in the State in 1921, and seemingly reached its apogee in 1948 when he was named general counsel of Prudential one of the most desirable private legal positions in the country.

Being head of the ABA places the 67-year-old Smith in a class with only two other New Jerseyites. The late Arthur T. Vanderbilt, chief justice of New Jersey, and Cortlandt Parker are the only other New Jerseyites to have held the ABA's presidency in its long history.

His election to the post was preceded by years of active service in the association, which he joined in the 1920's. He was chairman of the committee which in 1936 created the ABA's house of delegates as a representative body.

Smith served as president of the house of delegates in 1958–60 and last year was named president elect. He was president of the New Jersey State Bar Association in 1940.

A native of Phillipsburg, Smith attended high school there and Lafayette College before taking his law degree from New York Law School.

After his admittance to the bar, he went into private practice in Phillipsburg with his father, Sylvester C. Sr., a noted Warren County lawyer and prosecutor, as his son was to become. At 21 young Smith was named town attorney of Phillipsburg and at 26 prosecutor of Warren County.

SERVED 17 YEARS

He was prosecutor, either with that title or as an assistant attorney general from 1921 until 1938, when he withdrew from consideration for reappointment after being named to Prudential legal staff.

His first assignment with the mammoth insurance firm was as associate general solicitor. He became general solicitor 3 years later and was named to the company's top legal position in 1948. He directs a staff of more than 160 lawyers.

Since 1955 he has been a member of the New Jersey Highway Authority, which operates the Garden State Parkway, a position to which he was appointed by then Gov. Robert B. Meyner, who had once been his protege in law. He is also president of the Newark Bureau of Municipal Research.

Smith lives at 1 Merrywood Drive in West Orange, with a daughter, Thalia Barbara Smith. Another daughter, Mrs. William S. Bigelow, lives in Maplewood. His wife, the former Thalia E. Graff, whom he married in 1922, died in 1958.

Young Milwaukeeans Report on East Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a moving story of four young people from Milwaukee who relate their feelings of shock and anger on seeing the plight of hungry people in East Berlin. The story, which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of August 12, 1962, is based on a letter written by Joy Schaleben to her father, Arville Schaleben, executive editor of the Milwaukee Journal. The text of the story follows:

YOUNG MILWAUKEEANS, POTATOES, AND EAST BERLIN

The story out of Berlin said, "Communist East Germany more than doubled the price of the basic item (potatoes) in its citizens' diet Friday." New food rationing measures also were announced last week.

Four Milwaukee youngsters, who thrice pierced the wall—the "sickening, revolting" wall, they said—anticipated the news by a few days in a letter describing their observations and experiences in both Berlins. The growing food shortage spurred them to their most adventurous crossing into the East sector.

The letter was written by Joy Schaleben, a University of Wisconsin medical technologist, to her father, Arville Schaleben, executive editor of the Milwaukee Journal. The Schaleben children have been in Europe since June.

Joy is 22, Susan, 21, Mary, 18, and Will, 14. They live at 8254 North Gray Log Lane, Fox Point.

WHERE ARE ALL THE PEOPLE?

About the wall, the potatoes and the Berlins.

After driving through East Germany "we stayed (in Berlin) a total of 5 nights and 4 days," Joy wrote.

"The first day we took a tour of East and West Berlin. Such a difference from our East and West Berlin tour of 3 years ago. (No wall then.) At first it made me so mad that they had turned something like the wall into a tourist attraction. However, I now think differently. It does not have a full impact until you have seen it. It's unbelievable, revolting—as Will says, 'It's sickening.' It's difficult to believe men could do that.

"Sue and I asked our East Berlin guide: 'Where are all the people; why are the streets so empty?' (It was Sunday.) Answer: 'Everyone is at their weekend cottages where, by the way, my family is also.'

"In West Berlin we drove along the wall and saw the East German guards sitting in the trees, on some of the houses * * * the crosses to mark where some had died trying to flee to freedom. By the end of the tour we were all silent in the bus, completely disgusted and so sad.

"The next day we went and got some very interesting information about the situation. ——— (a West Berliner) explained why East Germany was lacking food.

"FARMERS KILLED ANIMALS

"When the farmers lost their property, many killed their animals. If they could not own what had been theirs so long, they'd eat it. Also, they planted less grain, because they lacked desire to work land which did not belong to them. Winter came—not enough food for remaining animals, so they slaughtered them. Anyway, this whole cycle just kept repeating itself until now the situation is serious.

"The next day we decided to take the big plunge and drive back into East Berlin on our own, to see a friend in the ——— district. We were a bit afraid. We did not know what to expect. We took everything out of the Volkswagen and drove to checkpoint Charlie. No trouble at all, crossing the border.

"We had a wonderful time, talking to Hilda (a fictious name; real names of the East Berlin friends are withheld). I asked her what she could not get that she used to get in West Berlin, before the wall, but she said she was not allowed to say. Actually she would not open up at all until Ernst (a boy friend) came over. I'm telling you he's a regular daredevil.

"Mary and Will taught them the twist. They'd seen it on TV but that was all—western music is forbidden.

"Ernst also explained the money situation to us. One East German mark is worth about one-fourth of a West German mark; however, the East German exchange is one for one. We gave him some West German marks * * * for getting things * * * from West Berlin.

"MAIL IS SPOT CHECKED

"Gas is three times as expensive as in West Berlin. We know that because we'd forgotten to fill the tank before we left. Thank goodness Ernst had identification to buy gas. You need ID for everything. These kids never go anywhere without it.

"Also the mail situation. The mail is spot checked, we were told. They never know when a letter has been opened. You can't tell because they steam them open. Once they find something funny in a letter, they open all the mail to that person. Ernst said in his careless manner, 'Write whatever you wish to me.' Hilda, who is more practical in living under this government, said to write something nice about East Berlin.

"Last spring, you remember, they had a typhoid epidemic in East Berlin. Imagine, typhoid in an advanced country like Germany. It was due of all things to bad butter (from Red China). They had absolutely nothing to combat this. East Berlin refused the medicine from West Berlin. The medical students fought this with isolation and washing the rooms with disinfectant. No vaccine for the people.

"And now the food situation: Butter, one-half pound a person for 10 days. Very little meat, and no potatoes. Vegetables and fruit are still available. It's the meat, butter, and potatoes that really get them. Oh, coffee, too. They have coffee but it's terrible.

POTATO SHORTAGE

"The reason they don't have potatoes is this. The farmers planted them 2 feet apart instead of 1, and did not plant the whole field. (Now students are required, I was told, to go out in the fields and measure the distances.) Naturally, the yield has been very little. Much of the German diet consists of potatoes, so this is a real catastrophe for them. They love potatoes—and I know this only too well, having had 4 months of cooking in German schools.

"The food shortage got bad last April. They expect this winter to be the worst.

"We stayed talking to these two delightful kids about 3 hours, and then went to visit Ernst's mother, whom he has not seen, of course, since August 13 (when the wall went up). I can't tell you how excited she was to see us. She has a very nice apartment. She did not go to West Berlin when she could have because she did not want to leave her setup. Boy, does she regret it now. She has a gorgeous piano—locked since August 13. Made me feel so bad that she cannot even bear to play now.

"She also told us about the food. It is even worse in East Germany than in East Berlin, because East Berlin is the showplace for communism and foreigners are permitted there.

"The next morning, when we were preparing to leave West Berlin, Mary discovered Hilda's umbrella in the back seat of the car. She had ridden with us to the mother's.

"We had planned that day to drive to Cologne and take the Rhine River boat the following day. But there was the umbrella, and we knew they were expensive, and the weather was so bad, and, gee whiz, wouldn't it be neat to return the umbrella, and bring them some food, and they really wanted potatoes and-and-and.

PACKED FOOD IN PURSES

"And this is what we did:

"We unpacked the car, packed our luggage and left it with the owner of our pension (boardinghouse). Then, after we paid our bill, we told her what we were going to do and asked her advice on the best kind of coffee to take over. She made a cup of coffee, had us taste it, and said this was the best German coffee.

"We went to the corner store and bought two bags of potatoes, 3 pounds of butter, 2 pounds of coffee, one huge long wurst, five lemons, two cauliflowers, and some chocolate.

"We then emptied our big travel purses completely. Mary put the potatoes in hers. Susan had the butter and wurst and coffee. Will had the lemons and chocolate in his pockets. Sorry to say, my purse was too small to be of any real value in this situation—the cauliflower was simply too big; we had to put it in a bag on the back floor of the car.

EXCITED TO HAVE POTATOES

"So this is how we traipsed through the border—passports and wallets in hands, stuffed purses over the shoulder, and all Will's pockets bulging. Mary and Susan were so funny, trying to pretend that their purses were light. At one point Mary dropped hers—klunk. Needless to say we were a bit nervous. I simply could not think of what I would say if they asked us what in H was in those purses. Boy, when we passed the last checkpoint we certainly were relieved.

"Luck was with us. Both Hilda and Ernst were at her home, studying for exams. It was about 1 p.m. They said they had been up all night, talking about us and hoping against hope we'd come back with the umbrella.

"They were simply thrilled about the food, and especially the potatoes. (I told you—these Germans really go for potatoes * * * ugh.) In fact, they were so excited to have the potatoes they wanted to cook them right away and serve them to us for lunch, with butter. Of course, we refused. Every last one of those lovelies was for them.

"We had planned to stay only a moment but ended staying till about 4 p.m. Oh, I forgot, we also gave them four rolls of American toilet paper we had in the car. We talked and danced the twist those 3 hours. When we finally decided to leave, they decided to accompany us to the border.

"They rode with us to the last street before the first checkpoint. That is as far as the East Berliners are allowed to travel in a car. We all kissed each other goodby and then they walked alongside our car as we drove up to the sidewalk gate which they are allowed to stand behind.

"This walk and drive affair was about one-half block long, and we had all those East German and Russian guards watching the procession. Then our friends stopped at the gate and waved to us as we got out of the car and walked into the checkpoint exist building.

TEARS STREAMING DOWN

"We entered with tears streaming down our faces. I looked at one of the East German checkers and I thought he'd cry, too. Anyway, it was terrible, and all this business of passports and how much money do you have, and counting it, was done in complete silence—that is, except for the sniffling.

"We walked out of the building and continued waving at Hilda and Ernst. Got into the car still waving and blowing kisses. A Russian looked at our passes for the last check at the gate. He said very sarcastically in German, 'Which one is Mary? Oh that one crying in the corner. Ha.'

"Such sick disgust we felt. And those kids kept saying, courageously and derisively for the guards, 'Or, can't you put us in your suitcases?'

"So that was that. We repacked our car in West Berlin and took off for Bamberg."

Protection for Rainbow Bridge National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as passed by the Congress the upper Colorado storage project contained a special provision forbidding the construction of any reservoir in a national monument. In addition, as a part of the specific authority for the construction of Glen Canyon Dam, the Secretary of the Interior was obligated and required to undertake whatever steps were necessary for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

Inasmuch as the preservation of this world-famous national phenomenon is of vital concern to millions of our fellow citizens, I wrote the following letter under date of July 17 to Secretary Udall:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under the Upper Colorado Storage Project Act, construction of any reservoir or national monument is forbidden. Also, as I recall, under the authority to construct Glen Canyon Dam, you, as Secretary of the Interior, are required to provide full protection from any physical damage to the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

I am also advised that the Department of the Interior considers the appropriation for the Rainbow Bridge protective project a closed issue in this Congress.

In view of this fact, I shall appreciate being advised of how the Department of the Interior plans to meet its statutory obligation, if, as you predict, Congress fails to make the protective appropriation this year.

I am sure you have some plans in this connection, such as preventing storage in the Glen Canyon Reservoir until the protective appropriation is provided, and I shall be most interested in hearing what they are.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

So far the Secretary has failed to favor me with the courtesy of a reply.

Meanwhile I have come into possession of a well prepared and fully documented thesis on this whole matter by Dr. William R. Halliday, a national authority on conservation, residing in Seattle, Wash. Dr. Hallidays' thesis, generally speaking, is highly technical. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that the Department of the Interior considers the appropriation for the Rainbow Bridge protective project a closed issue in this Congress, and in view of Mr. Udall's refusal to disclose whatever plans he has, if any, to provide protection for the Rainbow National Monument, as required by law, I think it appropriate to read certain portions of Dr. Halliday's statements into the RECORD at this point:

Like every feature of this planet, and probably of the universe, Rainbow Bridge is only a transient feature. At most, its life expectancy is measured in millions of years, and there is an infinitesimal chance that it might collapse at any time. However, its solid bases and the limitation of present forces of rapid erosion to the inner channel of the canyon, well away from the buttnesses, strongly suggests that it is quite possible that under present conditions, Rainbow Bridge will outlast the human race, just as it undoubtedly predates human civilization. Rainbow Bridge is widely recognized as one of the world's greatest individual features. Any manmade interference with conditions now prevailing at the great span which might possibly shorten its longevity and reduce it to a period of time which can be measured appropriately in human lifetimes would be a matter of grave concern to every citizen.

In this connection, Dr. Halliday who has conducted a personal survey of the monument refers to studies that have been made and has this to say:

As nearly as can be determined, geological studies of Rainbow Bridge and Rainbow Bridge National Monument have been conducted by three bureaus of the Interior Department. Each has been the subject of an "administrative report", an intradepartmental format not normally released for public distribution. In this case, however, the Bureau of Reclamation has distributed copies of two of these "Administrative Reports" rather widely (Bu. of Rec., 1959; Hansen, n.d.). The third report, which expressed radically different conclusions, has not been released, and is known to the public only through a fragmentary quotation of the report of an unnamed National Park Service geologist by an Interior Department official. That quotation stated in part:

"However, by far the most serious effect of floodwaters reaching the bottom of the watercourse beneath the span would be the danger of undermining the buttresses of the bridge itself. Standing (sic) water would dissolve cementing materials in the rock causing the sides of the water (sic) to slough. It is conceivable that the water could be, in a relatively few years, sufficient to caues the weakening of the ledges beneath the ends of the bridge and the collapse of the bridge itself."

As a result, the concern of the National Park Service was sufficient that it formally requested a great reduction in the height of Glen Canyon Dam to preclude any such danger.

Details of this National Park Service study and report have never been made public. Nevertheless, in denying this request by the National Park Service, Congress took specific action to protect Rainbow Bridge and the national monument. Two sections of the Upper Colorado Storage Project Act specifically forbid any invasion of the national monument by the reservoir such as is now proposed (Halliday, 1961).

The administrative restriction of the National Park Service report is in striking contrast to the wide distribution by the Interior Department and especially its Bureau of Reclamation of the two administrative reports quoted so widely as support for the opposite viewpoint. One of these "geologic reports" is a Bureau of Reclamation report; the other, the "Hansen report." The Hansen reconnaissance report refers to a further report on "the geological setting of the Rainbow Bridge area," by a Lloyd Calder, "BuRec Report No. G–126," but no such report has been distributed to the public, and it cannot be stated whether or not this is partially or entirely identical to the "preliminary report" (BuRec, 1959).

That "preliminary report," devoted only 15 lines to the geology and 9½ lines to ground water conditions at Rainbow Bridge. It is a "brief presentation of the engineering analyses of field investigations of facilities for protection of the monument. Other important nonengineering phases of the overall problem are not appraised in this report, and consequently no recommendations are made herein as to the final solution of the problem" (BuRec, 1959, p. 3). It contains no data by which a judgment can be made of the adequacy of the investigation of the geology and ground water conditions in question. As will be pointed out below, certain undocumented assertions in this "preliminary report" are not in accord with those of the "Hansen report." In any event, its 24½ lines of rather cursory text on geology and ground water do not constitute an intensive study of the ground water and geological situation at Rainbow Bridge.

The third governmental study, and the second widely quoted "geological report" was "a brief geological examination of Rainbow Bridge National Monument and vicinity," by Wallace R. Hansen, an engineering geologist of the U.S. Geological Survey. Hansen stated:

"The purpose of this examination was to obtain an independent opinion as to the geologic feasibility of various proposed measures intended to protect the monument, under the provisions of Public Law 485, from impairment by the waters of Glen Canyon Reservoir" (Hansen, n.d., p. 1).

In addition to his stated assignment, Hansen also conducted "examinations of Rainbow Bridge." It appears to be of some importance that although this was to be an "independent opinion," Hansen stated that "the sites of all proposed barrier dams described by the Bureau of Reclamation were visited, but only cursory examinations were made of sites A, C, and an additional site referred to as the "Narrows," inasmuch as these sites are discounted as impractical by both the National Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation." (It is site C which has been chiefly discussed as the most effective protective project (Halliday, 1961)). Hansen also referred repeatedly to Forbidden Canyon as Forbidding Canyon—a curious error.

Hansen spent only 3 days (Hansen, n.d., p. 1) in this reconnaissance of 8 well-separated areas: (1) Rainbow Bridge; (2) the intake portal site upstream from the National Monument; (3) the outlet portal site in upper Aztec Canyon; (4) damsite A; (5) damsite B; (6) damsite C; (7) damsite "Narrows" and (8) "the first major tributary downstream from Rainbow Bridge" (Hansen, n.d., p. 1 and p. 12).

Hansen did not state how much time was devoted to Rainbow Bridge and its immediate surroundings, but on the basis of three 12-hour workdays, it seems doubtful that Hansen spent as many hours in this "intensive" study as I did in my admittedly inadequate study. The present Director of the Geological Survey (Nolan, 1962a and b), and the Secretary of the Interior (Udall, 1962) have refused to make public the length of Hansen's study of this or any of the other seven areas. Since Hansen failed to mention the limestone member of the Navajo sandstone which I found so easily in 1953, it seems doubtful that this study termed "intensive" (Udall, 1962) by those concealing its actual length actually was an even more cursory reconnaissance than mine or that of the Bureau of Reclamation in 1959.

Further on in his report, Dr. Halliday outlines the four major threats to Rainbow Bridge as follows:

Proximity of the fluctuating reservoir to Rainbow Bridge would pose at least four major threats to the stability and continued existence of Rainbow Bridge:

1. Undercutting of one or both buttresses by the altered flow of Bridge Creek atop the deposits within the zone of fluctuation.

2. Development and collapse of solution cavities and other karstic or pseudokarstic phenomena in limestone units of the formations beneath or adjacent to Rainbow Bridge, as a result of alterations in ground water flow as a result of the fluctuating reservoir.

3. Leaching out of the natural cementing materials in the canyon walls by the fluctuating reservoir.

4. Effects of the weight of the reservoir, including earthquakes, differential subsidence and other movement, and collapse of karstic or pseudokarstic cavities in nonlimestone rocks.

Finally, Dr. Halliday comes to the following conclusions:

"Intensive" Interior Department studies supposedly assuring the safety of Rainbow Bridge in the presence of the fluctuating Glen Canyon Reservoir are inadequate and appear to have been distorted for political purposes. An additional Interior Department study with contrary conclusions has been suppressed except for a short quotation mentioned during a 1954 hearing. The present Secretary of the Interior and Director of the U.S. Geological Survey have refused to reveal the current status of Geological Survey knowledge on many vital matters pertaining to this problem. Contrary to widespread statements of political origin, there are at least four major reasons why the fluctuation of Glen Canyon Reservoir in Bridge Canyon would greatly expedite the collapse of Rainbow Bridge which otherwise may well outlast mankind.

Based on the above information, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the importance of preserving this world-famous geological phenomenon, it seems to me that Congress should call on the Secretary to disclose in detail his plans for the preservation of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument prior to the adjournment of this Congress and before undertaking water storage in the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

Dallas Trucker an Outstanding Example of American Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we in Dallas and the great Southwest are proud of the heritage of individual initiative and the hustle and sweat and get-up-and-go which has made our part of the Nation a tribute to what freemen can accomplish in a free society. One of the finest examples of the success story in true American fashion is Henry E. English, founder and head of Red Ball Motor Freight, Inc., one of the outstanding transportation companies in the country. Nationwide tribute was recently paid Mr. English in the following article from the New York Times of August 5, 1962:

PERSONALITY: FARM YOUTH ROSE TO KING OF THE GEAR JAMMERS

(By Griff Singer)

DALLAS, TEX., August 4.—Henry English, a strapping oilfield worker, shuffled his feet impatiently while waiting for a train to take him from Greenville in eastern Texas to his job in southwestern Oklahoma.

His infrequent trips to the nearby family farm home were important. But so was his $7 a day job.

The "iron horse" was 2 hours late already. On a previous trip, the train was so slow he lost work time.

"How much will a cab ride cost to Dallas?" he asked an idle cab driver.

"Twenty-five dollars."

The young English whistled. That was big money in 1919.

But that gave him an idea that paid dividends to a farm-hardened, 18 year old and 40 years later made him the wheeler-dealer in the motor-freight industry, the head of Red Ball Motor Freight, Inc.

He took $150 cached in a money belt and $100 he borrowed and bought a used Cadillac touring car. The Red Ball Bus Line between Dallas and Greenville was established with three regularly scheduled trips a day.

"Why don't you wait until you get a load?" asked griping competitors. "You will ruin our business."

But Mr. English, then as now, would not be intimidated. His business philosophy had been formed: "You want to treat people right and give them good service."

The busline did fine. He repaid the $100 loan within 10 days and in 1927 sold his interest in the line for $65,000.

The next year Mr. English, who is now 62 and has bushy eyebrows that rival those of John L. Lewis, president emeritus of the United Mine Workers, moved to Lufkin in deep eastern Texas and founded Red Ball Motor Freight.

Roads were poor at best and most people did not believe the truck could be as dependable as the railroads. But Mr. English thought he could make the grade.

He put two trucks into service with a permit to haul freight between Lufkin and Houston—119 miles.

Today, Red Ball and its subsidiary company, Red Ball Motor Freight (Southeast), Inc., comprise a system of more than 10,000 miles of certified routes, annual payrolls approaching $10 million, 75 terminals scattered over 9 States, 1,700 pieces of equipment and 1,500 employees.

From general offices in Dallas, Red Ball serves points as distant as Denver, Houston, Shreveport, New Orleans, Mobile, Little Rock and Memphis.

It is regarded as one of the largest transportation systems owned and operated by an individual in the Nation.

ONE OF THREE HOLDERS

Mr. English is president and chairman and one of three stockholders. His son, O. B. English, formerly president of Red Ball and now head of Dixie Highway Express, of Meridian, Miss., and his daughter, Mrs. Fletcher Ward of Dallas, also hold shares in the company.

As the east Texas oilfields began to boom in the 1930's, Mr. English expanded his line. Deliveries were made to any point in the region, but an old reliable team of mules had to be used on occasion when trucks couldn't maneuver rutted trails into an oilfield.

Later in that decade, Mr. English moved the company to Dallas. Prosperity followed. A new terminal in Dallas can accommodate the loading of 100 diesel trucks simultaneously.

In the last 30 years, the big man has taken to working in community projects. He has served as an officer or director in virtually every major civic and charity organization in Dallas. He isn't a joiner; if Mr. English is out of town, one of his aids attends meetings and fills his chief in later.

Mr. English's leadership in the trucking industry has been recognized. In 1950 he became the first Texan to serve as president of the American Trucking Associations.

As his term came to a close, people from throughout the Nation gathered in Dallas to pay tribute to the "King of the Gear Jammers." During the 12 months in office he crossed the country 15 times, dispensing Will Rogers-type philosophy and information about the trucking industry to more than 20,000 persons.

In Dallas, the rugged man looks every bit the part of an eastern executive in custom-fitted suits. But get him out of Texas and he is 100 percent cowboy.

EXPENSIVE WEAR

His wardrobe is fitted with expensive western wear that includes bright, expensive shirts. Western paintings dot his office. He doesn't hide multicarat diamond rings and tie pins that are part of his standard work uniform.

In recent years, Mr. English has been away from his Dallas headquarters much of the time, but the day rarely passes when he isn't in telephone contact several times.

Even when "stealing a little time off" for a Wyoming deer hunt or to take in a rodeo in Calgary, Alberta, or Cheyenne, he knows what is going on in Dallas.

Mr. English hasn't lost touch with the little man, basically because of his recollection of the family farm. He was the seventh of 11 children born to Mr. and Mrs. O. B. English at the place near Brashear in Hopkins County.

During a Dallas polio vaccine campaign Mr. English donated 25 radio-controlled trucks to deliver vaccine to 90 clinics in the county. In 1961, when Hurricane Carla ravished the State, he threw all equipment and personnel into emergency work.

As a young farm boy, he rode a horse constantly, except into the classroom of the Overland County School. He went through the sixth grade, when drought and depression forced him to go to work on the farm.

NO HOBBIES

"We raised everything—corn and corn bread, chickens, black-eye peas, hogs. Ate them all winter," he recalled.

Mr. English and his wife, the former Katheryn Hall of Greenville, live in a large early American home in plush Highland Park, a Dallas island city. They are grandparents six times.

He has no hobbies as such, but he likes baseball and good entertainment, whether opera or a nightclub act, in New York or Los Angeles.

"If I had a hobby, I guess it would be what a farmer would do. I mostly like horses and cattle," explains the gray-haired 6-footer, who could be rated as one of the Nation's top rodeo buffs.

In the style of a Renaissance art patron, he gave royalties from a producing east Texas oil well for 1 year to the world champion cowboy in 1960.

But with all of his love for the farm, Mr. English doesn't own one.

His philosophy of life is that "the man who sits and waits for things to happen usually finds he not only missed his chance in life for success, but also missed a lot of fun.

"Striving for a goal is almost spiritual in nature. Working to obtain a worthwhile objective means self-reliance, self-sacrifice, and self-discipline.

"These are the basic principles my parents taught me and they are guidelines my business and personal life has been based upon," said Mr. English, who is politically conservative.

INCIDENT RECALLED

He recalled one problem customer, a plumbing supply man in east Texas, who continually filed a $48 claim for damage on a single item. The lower echelon workers couldn't figure it out, but Mr. English smelled trouble—his company was being taken by a planted piece of broken merchandise.

The president became a driver's helper and donned work clothes for a delivery to the place. Before, the damaged merchandise had been found in the box—but after it was opened by the customer.

"I grabbed a hammer and started to rip the lid off and the man got mad. He said all sorts of things and wanted to know what I was doing," Mr. English said.

"I told him we wanted to see if the stuff was all right. We either had to open it then or take it back. We took it back.

"Then he called our agent in the town and demanded to know who that smart aleck was. When our man told him it was the president he hung up and we never had another damage claim."

Towering above the company's big Dallas terminal is a big red ball atop a flashing clock and thermometer. The derivation of the truck empire's name?

As a boy, he and his father loaded stock into cattle cars marked with big "red ball" stickers.

"This meant that the cars would go right through," he said thoughtfully. "That stuck with me for years, the idea of speeding right on through on a clear track."

Hail to the Chiefs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the August 11 edition of the Little Falls Times pays eloquent tribute to the enduring and continuing contributions of our three living former Presidents and the system of government which has made this possible. I know the article will inspire a greater appreciation of America and I commend it to the attention of the Congress:

HAIL TO THE CHIEFS

It can happen only in a democracy:

One day he is the most important man in the world. The next, bowing to the dictates of the people or the Constitution, he is an ordinary citizen, suddenly stripped of his immense power and prerogatives.

He is no longer President of the United States.

Three living men have had that unique experience. A fourth has known the first part of it—the overnight elevation from the ranks to the pinnacle of political achievement.

Sadly, throughout our history, the termination of a President's power has too often meant the end of his usefulness to the country. Good enough to lead a nation of millions or tens of millions one day, the next he is relegated to the pages of history before his time.

Or is this no longer true?

By way of observing ex-President Herbert C. Hoover's 88th birthday on August 10, Parade magazine interviewed our living Presidents—Hoover, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy.

The four were asked for their opinions on the uses to which ex-Presidents could be put.

"Having helped to make history," Hoover suggested, "they might try writing it. That is a worthwhile pursuit for past Presidents, and," he adds humorously, "it is quite harmless."

Hoover at 88 is more active than some men half his age. He puts in 12 hours of work a day, mostly in connection with his Library on War, Revolution, and Peace which he founded at Stanford University.

Few ex-Presidents have contributed more to their country on leaving office than Hoover. President Truman made him coordinator of the European food program in 1947. He headed the two commissions on governmental reorganization in the forties and fifties that bore his name. He is on the advisory board of the World Bank.

Truman, now 77, recommends that President Kennedy, who will be only 51 if he serves two terms, try a postgraduate career in the Senate. (John Quincy Adams served nine distinguished terms in the House of Representatives following his presidency.)

Truman once joined Hoover in recommending that ex-Presidents be made honorary members of the Senate, wtihout a vote but with the right to speak. Both Kennedy and Eisenhower reject this idea, feeling that an ex-President's prestige gives him all the forum he needs to make his views heard.

Perhaps more than any other President before him, Kennedy has sought the advice of his predecessors. He briefed all three for instance, before announcing his decision to renew nuclear testing.

For 71-year-old Eisenhower, who urged his friends to call him "Ike" again after he left office, the adjustment to civilian life was difficult in one respect: "You have gotten so accustomed to facing decisions about Formosa or Laos that * * * there is a sort of a feeling of 'What can I do?' * * * Suddenly you realize you can't do anything about them.’

But asked if he would really like to be President again, this still-effective leader of the Republican Party replied, "No, not really."

None of these former Presidents has retired. Each is still much sought out for advice and widely quoted. Each is still active, contributing valuable postscripts to his official career.

Not a one of them has been forgotten.

University People-to-People Program Snowballs to Widespread Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have emphasized the need for all Americans to contribute to the molding and propagation of a true image of America throughout the world. One of the more effective programs in achieving this is the student ambassadors of the people-to-people university program. During the past few days the first group of college students returned to our shores from a 2-month friendship tour of Europe. I know from the remarks of some of my young neighbors from New Jersey that the tour was truly a journey into international understanding.

An excellent summary of the operation appears in the initial issue of the People-to-People News, published by People-to-People, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., and edited by Jim Tice.

For those who may not be altogether familiar with this dedicated effort to promote good will, I would like here to insert that article, so that all our colleagues may know of this real contribution by young Americans to the cause of peace and understanding:

A journey to international understanding by 350 young American student ambassadors, who left June 4 from the base of Kansas City's famed Liberty Memorial—a monument dedicated to friendship among nations, is the high point thus far of the people-to-people university program.

It is directed by Bill Dawson and Rick Barnes, recent students at the University of Kansas, where the program was pioneered, and Rafer Johnson, 1960 olympic decathlon champion and UCLA graduate.

The pioneer campus operation was started at Kansas University by Dawson, Barnes and others. It caught on so quickly that within a year of its founding similar programs were being conducted at each of the Big Eight Conference midwestern universities.

The university program receives guidance and assistance in its initial organization from national headquarters of people to people, but is financed and operated by students. It is unaffiliated with any other student organizations.

CONTACT GOVERNORS

In addition to setting up the student ambassador program which sent 350 students from 14 midwestern colleges and universities to 19 European nations, Dawson, Barnes, and Johnson have been contacting Governors of all States to stimulate their support. The program directors intend to set up on-campus people-to-people movements in every in every State and in foreign countries. So far programs successfully have been arranged at colleges and universities in Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Colorado, Iowa, California, Oregon, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

The Governors contact officials at colleges and universities in their States and meetings are arranged at State capitals. The representatives return to their campuses ready to begin the programs.

STUDENTS SCREENED

On each campus which has a people-to-people movement student ambassador candidates are carefully screened by a Student Abroad Committee. Those who wish to go on people-to-people tours must be interviewed and examined by the committee on their own campus. Those selected have orientation sessions, language study, briefings by natives of countries which are to be visited, and an itinerary of the desired tour must be filed with the committee.

Those selected go to Washington, D.C., for a 2-day briefing by the State Department, Commerce Department, Peace Corps, U.S. Information Agency, U.S. Travel Agency, and Civil Rights Commission.

This year the student ambassadors overseas are encouraging foreign university students to visit the United States next year.

STAFF MEMBERS IN EUROPE

Staff members of the university program have been working in Europe for several months and twice have contacted 48 student groups; set up 125 host families in Bonn, Germany, for a 3-day period; arranged 300 host families in Berlin for a 6-day period; arranged breakfast and dinner with German families for the student ambassadors while they were in Berlin, and arranged for 100 English-speaking German students to take out a week from classes to act as full-time hosts for American students in Berlin.

Berlin activities included a special luncheon at which West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt spoke, special orientation sessions held by German newspaper staffs and the USIA, workshops, industrial tours, a student mixer, bus tours, orientation, and discussion sessions at universities.

The university program staff made hosting arrangements with students in all European countries. A printed handbook of student contacts for 16 countries was prepared and distributed. One hundred European universities now are developing university people-to-people programs and an office has been set up in Brussels' Hotel Plaza.

The American end of the student ambassador program also is set up. An extremely low transatlantic roundtrip air fare has been arranged so that students of all countries, including the United States, may better afford to pay their own expenses, since the program is entirely student-financed and receives no U.S. Government or people-to-people funds.

Medicare Is Not a Dead Issue: It Will Be Very Much Alive Until Congress Passes It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Robert Peterson which appeared in the New York Journal American of August 6, 1962.

The King-Anderson bill is still the good bill that it was before the Senate vote; it will continue to have the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

The article follows:

LIFE BEGINS AT 40: MEDICAL COSTS ERASE ELDERS' DREAMS

(By Robert Peterson)

President Kennedy's proposed medicare bill has been shelved for the time being by the U.S. Senate. But I'm confident a majority of Americans favor better health care provisions than presently exist for our elder citizens.

My thoughts on the subject emerged in clear focus 3 years ago when I interviewed a retired sales clerk of 72 whose wife barely survived a terrible bout with cancer.

In the wake of long hospitalization, three sessions of surgery, private duty nurses and costly drugs and X-rays, the family nest egg of some $6,500 was completely wiped out.

Also wiped out were dreams of motor trips down South, and mountain vacations, and gifts for the grandchildren. Instead this couple faced the grim reality that the rainy day for which they saved had arrived with a vengeance and drowned the pleasures and security they had hoped to enjoy in their retirement years.

My column about that couple elicited a letter from financier Bernard Baruch who wrote me that he believed, "A form of compulsory health insurance can be devised, adequately safeguarded, without involving what has been termed 'socialized medicine.' "

Many righteously contend that existing Kerr-Mills legislation offers adequate protection to elders since it will pay medical expenses of elders who have no money. But what about those who have a little money saved up—a nest egg of perhaps $5,000 or $6,000 such as the couple mentioned. They are not eligible. Only after their nest egg is exhausted and they have taken a pauper's oath are they eligible for assistance from this legislation.

Some physicians and hospitals, of course, attempt to be lenient on hardship cases. They may work out arrangements "within the means" of the individual. But all too often this means they take what you've got. And I claim it's wrong.

It would be fine if private health insurance could be devised to insure elders against the costs of serious illness. But existing private plans suffer from one or more deficiencies; either they exclude some elders, or they offer limited benefits, or they cost more than most elders can afford to pay.

I hate taxes as much as anyone, but the one additional tax I would gladly pay is one earmarked to cover costs which arise when people—particularly older people—are so unfortunate as to be stricken with serious, costly illnesses.

Many are disturbed by the administration's proposal to offer medicare to all social security recipients—regardless of need. "It infuriates me," a woman wrote, "to think of any of my social security taxes going to pay the hospital bills of that rich old codger who lives next door to me."

But there aren't many rich old codgers to worry about. The statistics showing that more than two-thirds of our 17 million past 65 have incomes well under $2,000 a year should scotch any rumors of wealth among a majority of elders.

It would be fine if we could somehow screen out the rich old codgers and make them ineligible for medical benefits under the proposed bill. But the screening-out process would probably cost more than the end savings, and would automatically cast a stigma of charity on those who were eligible.

Footing the Bill for Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many of us who are concerned with the continued growth and cost of our Federal Government structure have appreciated the determined, but aparently losing battle that the distinguished Member of the other body, Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia, is waging in an effort to reduce nonessential Federal expenditures.

I believe that Senator BYRD is providing a great public service in alerting the American public to the tremendous waste of funds involved in this constantly growing bureaucracy.

Apparently, his efforts are meeting with at least some success since a growing number of people have become aware of the situation.

I was pleased to note that the Palos Regional, a weekly publication in my district, saw fit to comment editorially on the suggestions, and used as a basis for their comments the report of Senator BYRD's Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Under permission previously granted, I insert the editorial entitled "Footing the Bill for Bureaucracy," into the RECORD at this point:

FOOTING THE BILL FOR BUREAUCRACY

It is evident from a congressional report released last week that the Federal Government is doing more than its part to combat unemployment.

The ranks of the Federal bureaucracy, the report stated, have swelled to 2,496,455, which is not an impressive figure. Not when it is compared to the more than $14 billion a year which American taxpayers shell out for Federal employees.

There were figures aplenty in the report of Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia, chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and they were so astounding that Senator BYRD did not attempt to give a detailed account of the wasted tax dollars they imply.

Instead he said only "It is my duty to invite the attention of Congress and the public to the fact that numerous records have been broken."

It was, of course, an attempt by the Senator at humor through sarcasm. But there is little humor in a situation which takes money out of the layman's pocket to feather the nest of political appointees.

If you have not become immune to the astronomical figures which are associated with Federal programs, consider a few contained in this report.

The Federal payroll is now $6 billion higher than it was during World War II, when 3,500,000 persons worked for the Governemnt. Civilian employment increased 34,921 in June—a rate of more than 1,000 a day. The Department of Agriculture added 11,975 to its staff in June, bringing its total to more than 110,000.

Of every $100 collected from American taxpayers, $15 is used to pay a Government worker.

Where does it stop? It doesn't, according to the report. The Kennedy administration added 77,351 employees in the fiscal year ending July 1, and President Kennedy himself added 95 workers in June to the White House office staff, which now total 1,680 employees. The President recently announced plans to increase the staff of the Food and Drug Administration by 25 percent.

The first reaction to these figures would be to ask how many of these employees fill a necessary position, and how many of them are reaping the rewards of backing the right candidates.

The huge waste of money is not the most distressing aspects of the growing bureaucracy. The redtape, the obstructionism, that grows with the Federal payroll may prove more harmful in the end.

The bureaucracy is like a cancer. It grows persistently and as it does, the Government grows progressively weaker. At one time, for example, it took the State Department several weeks to formulate a foreign policy and get it to the President's desk. The reason for that was the number of times the policy had to be cleared by different desks before it could reach the White House.

There is the story of a letter written to a bureaucrat, thanking him for a particular courtesy. An order to write the appropriate note of acknowledgment traveled for several weeks from desk to desk until finally it reached the right person. By the time the order had been initialed the required number of times, the bureaucrat who was to write the bread-and-butter note had left for a vacation. Rather than wait several weeks for her boss to return, a secretary wrote the note and signed his name.

In spite of this sort of thing, it would strike the Government as brazen were someone to suggest that instead of expanding the bureaucracy, it be consolidated.

It is the obligation of the administration to eliminate from its payroll the useless bureaucrats who get fat on a diet of taxpayers' money.

The Threat to the New Defense Supply Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by former Budget Director Maurice Stans which appeared in the Washington Post on August 12, 1962. The article is entitled "The Threat to the New Defense Supply Agency."

The article refers to an annual report issued by the House Government Operations Committee under the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman, which shows that military inventories of equipment and supplies and I may add, so far as they know, amount to $122 billion.

Mr. Stans then goes on to indicate steps which have been taken to reduce inventories and develop much needed integration in areas which lend themselves to such treatment. The last and most important of these efforts, by Secretaries McNamara and Morris, under the McCormack-Curtis Act was the establishment of the Defense Supply Agency which became operational only January 1, 1962, and which already shows great promise in achieving economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in a field of the greatest of possibilities—military supply management.

The article gives well-deserved credit to Congressman TOM CURTIS of Missouri for his long-continued work in getting DSA established. I want to add to those deserving of great credit the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, our distinguished Speaker, who with Mr. CURTIS introduced the amendment to the Security Act which has made the creation of the DSA possible.

Mr. Stans correctly states that there are forces which, in the words of Congressman CURTIS, would "emasculate the new Defense Supply Agency before it gets off the ground." I agree that this would be a tragedy. Secretary McNamara needs all the encouragement and support that we can give him. We have recently seen that a section was added to the Military Authorization Construction Act—Public Law 87–554—designed to limit Secretary McNamara's authority. In my view, the Congress should reexamine this provision carefully next year.

Mr. Stans' full article follows:

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY—THE THREAT TO THE NEW DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

(By Maurice Stans)

(Maurice Stans was Budget Director in the Eisenhower administration and is now president of Western Bancorporation.)

According to a recent report of the House Government Operations Committee, the inventories of equipment and supplies of the Armed Forces amount to a staggering $122 billion. Here is a fertile field for economy in the Federal Government.

In 1955, the second Hoover Commission, critical of the procedures for procurement, distribution and management of the growing military stockpiles, recommended the establishment of a single defense agency to supply "common-use" items to all the military services.

For years, many weaknesses and wastes had existed in the Pentagon's supply management, especially these:

There was a lack of uniformity in specifications and in identification of articles between the armed services. What was a "washer" to one was a "collar" to another and a "shim" to a third. A uniform catalog was needed.

Frequently, while one military service was purchasing large quantities of an article, another service was selling the same article as surplus for only a fraction of its cost. Central control was necessary.

Overbuying was a common occurrence, and heavy losses on disposition of surpluses were normal. Integrated supply management was required.

The Eisenhower administration, under Defense Secretaries Wilson, McElroy, and Gates, set out to bring order out of this chaos. The first step was the adoption of the single manager concept for common-supply items (those used by two or more of the military services) under which one service was to be responsible for buying, stocking, and distributing a specific commodity group for all the services.

In 1955 and 1956, four single manager responsibilities were assigned: food (Army), clothing and textiles (Army), medical supplies (Navy), and petroleum (Navy). This was a sharp break with the tradition of independent inventory control by each of the services.

In 1959 and 1960, the concept was extended by the establishment of single managers for four new commodities—industrial (Navy), general supplies (Army), construction (Army), and automotive supplies (Army).

By the end of the Eisenhower term, the single manager program was saving many millions of dollars each year, had materially reduced procurement of common supply items and had cut stocks a half billion dollars. Cataloging, standardization, and central warehousing were reducing requirements, and there were unmeasurable further economies resulting from the elimination of crosshauling and backhauling and cutting out concurrent buying and selling.

Another score for the taxpayers was the reduction of storage space by 6 million square feet and the dropping of 1,000 people from the payrolls. Procurement processing time was sharply cut, and delays in deliveries were dramatically reduced.

To his great credit, Defense Secretary McNamara, aided by able Assistant Secretary Tom Morris, has pursued this program aggressively since taking office. Leapfrogging the single manager concept for common-use commodities he has now established a Defense Supply Agency and merged into it all of the functions performed by the single managers. To it he has also transferred responsibilities in disposing of surplus property and some other functions and has added more categories of goods to be centrally managed.

DSA will procure annually more than $2.5 billion of supplies and materials and will manage a $21 billion inventory of peacetime and military requirements. It will provide a completely integrated control of 1.4 million of the 3.8 million items in military supply.

This can turn out to be a major step in holding down defense costs. Inventory reductions of from $2 to $4 billion are expected, and approximately 3,000 jobs are to be eliminated in the first year.

In this electronic era, even the vast inventories of defense and the military services can and should be kept under close surveillance.

Waste can be eliminated. Overbuying can be stopped. The spectacle of one service selling an overstock at junk prices at the same time another buys the same item at full cost can be ended.

But already the effort is threatened. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, long an advocate of better supply management, recently sounded an alarm about attempts by the services to sabotage the new system.

He said, "I am sure that no one will dispute the fact that the operation of the Department of Defense presents the greatest challenge to scientific management that ever existed. But the problem is more than magnitude—it is also one of encrusted tradition, rampant bureaucracy, entrenched economic pork barrel with all its political overtones and the complicated industrial-military wedding of mutual interest."

Representative CURTIS praised Secretary McNamara for his efforts and continued, "It has been a shock to me, therefore, that a move seems to be under way to emasculate the new Defense Supply Agency before it gets off the ground."

That would be a tragedy. Secretary McNamara needs all the encouragement and support we can give him.

Yonkers Through the Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, history, like charity, should begin at home. Our youngsters, as they pursue their studies in high school and college, are as a matter of course exposed to both world and national history. Far too often, however, the history of their own community remains to them—as to many of their elders—an almost total mystery.

Often the fault for this lack of local knowledge does not lie with the State or the school, but with the scarcity of appropriate study material. Such was, until recently, the case with Yonkers, N.Y., a city which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress. Although the Education Department of the State of New York requires that boys and girls study the history of their local countries in the seventh grade, most of the historical material at hand was beyond the reach of those in that age group. To remedy this situation, a group of teachers in the social studies department in the Yonkers secondary schools wrote an excellent booklet entitled "Yonkers Through the Years." This material was first run as a serial in the Yonkers Herald-Statesman, and the cost of printing it in booklet form was underwritten by the People Savings Bank of Yonkers.

Such cooperation between the schools, the press, and the business community is an excellent example of what local communities can accomplish by and for themselves, unaided by the intervention or assistance of any outside authority. I wish to commend all those whose joint efforts resulted in the publication of "Yonkers Through the Years," and to commend it to all of my colleagues in the Congress. I am sure that schoolchildren for many years to come will greatly benefit from their increased knowledge of the history of their own hometown.

American Finance Conference, Inc., Replies to Letter of General Motors Acceptance Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a reply from the American Finance Conference, Inc., to a letter from the General Motors Acceptance Corp. to me, which I inserted in an earlier RECORD.

The reply from the American Finance Conference, Inc., follows:

AUGUST 1, 1962.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12 a letter from Mr. Charles G. Stradella which refers to my letter of May 3 relative to General Motors Acceptance Corp.'s change of auto financing rates in the States of Texas and Washington.

Mr. Stradella confirms my statement to you that a time buyer whose transaction is acquired by General Motors Acceptance Corp. does not thereby purchase a car at a cheaper rate of finance charge to him.

You will recall that at the hearings some members of the committee expressed concern that the car buyer would suffer a greater charge for financing his purchase if General Motors Acceptance Corp. was divested from General Motors. Mr. Stradella's letter should clear up this point because he carefully explains that "General Motors Acceptance Corp. does not set the dealer's charge to the customer. The dealer determines this himself." He states that the dealer may charge 6 percent or less, which is the general going rate for finance charge to new-car buyers, or he may charge a hiked-up rate of 7 percent, or a shocking rate of 8 percent, it makes no difference to General Motors Acceptance Corp. or General Motors. General Motors Acceptance Corp. will discount the deal at 4 percent and pay the dealer the excess of time finance charge which the customer promises to pay.

Why does Mr. Stradella expect the dealer to somehow pass his savings in discount along to the customer when the General Motors Acceptance Corp. plan announcing it, explained to the dealer that he may charge the customer under it as much as 8-percent discount per annum, thus inviting him not to pass the savings along?

Mr. Stradella takes pride in reporting to you that under this General Motors Acceptance Corp. plan, only 18 percent of the new car buyers get hit with a financing charge of more than 7 percent and only 49 percent pay a financing charge of more than 6 percent.

These statistics are of little comfort to those General Motors time buyers who are paying 8 percent or even more than the going rate of 6 percent.

Mr. Stradella denies that General Motors Acceptance Corp. does not buy the mine run of GM dealers' time sales. Since we are at issue on this point the American Finance Conference stands ready to present at any future hearing on this matter the statistics of General Motors Acceptance Corp. showing the downpayments and the term of months contracted for in contract purchases from dealers by General Motors Acceptance Corp., as shown by its annual reports, with a comparison of such downpayments and terms to contracts purchased from General Motors Acceptance Corp. dealers by independent finance companies. These statistics will convince you that generally General Motors Acceptance Corp. takes the GM dealers top-grade contracts "with recourse" while the independents can buy only the lower grade contracts "without recourse."

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that you insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your convenience with an appropriate reference to your extension of remarks dated July 12, 1962.

Since Mr. Stradella's letter refers to H.R. 71 and was circularized to the other members of the House Judiciary Committee, we are also sending a copy of this letter to these other members of the committee.

Thank you very much for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL B. DEANE,
Washington Counsel.

Poland: A Test Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the contents of a recent press interview with His Excellency H. E. August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland.

The views expressed by Mr. Zaleski, unfortunately, do not reflect much optimism for the early liberation of the brave, long-suffering Polish people. It is the ill-fated agreements at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam which consigned Poland and other nations desiring to be free, to cruel oppression behind the Iron Curtain, that are still working an unconscionable denial of their right to self-determination, self-government, and relief from oppression.

On moral grounds these decisions were entirely unjustifiable and shocking; on political grounds they have served only to perpetuate division and separation of the free world and cause this nation to lose valuable, loyal allies.

Any policy that penalizes friends and strengthens potential enemies is questionable, to say the least, and, of course, it is impossible to find any justification for it, moral, legal, political, economic, or humanitarian.

To the contrary, this policy is permeated with injustice and cries out to

Heaven for rectification, yet little, if anything, is being done by the free world to bring about this desirable result.

Hence, many small, weaker nations, in addition to those already enslaved, live in constant fear of aggression and conspiracy that may strip them of their rights, while powerful, free nations, and the United Nations, stand idly by.

Foreign relations and foreign agreements should be based upon principles of justice, equity and fair dealing between nations and peoples. Territorial aggrandizement by the strong of the territories and rights of the weak violate not only the United Nations Charter and the long-respected fundamentals of international law, but shamefully flout the conscience of mankind itself.

Until the United Nations and the associated free powers make up their minds to stand for the great principles of international and human justice, the plight of the weak, the oppressed and the tyrannized will continue to plague the whole world, divide the forces of freedom and give Marxist communism the power to thwart the hopes and dreams of mankind for peace, security, freedom, and a better life.

The press interview follows:

SPECIAL INTERVIEW WITH H. E. AUGUST ZALESKI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

The June issue of the London Rzeczpospolita Polska (Republic of Poland), published by the Polish Government in exile, includes an exclusive interview with H. E. August Zaleski, legitimate President of the Republic of Poland, on the subject of current international affairs. The interview was granted by him to Mr. Jan Walewski, vice chairman of the Council of the Polish Republic (a parliamentary body in exile), whose recent article on the Katyn Forest massacre was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Washington, D.C., May 14, 1962).

The text of the interview, with Mr. Walewski's introductory remarks, is given below:

"As a thoughtful American journalist describes it, the present free West is in a 'lost world.' And within such a lost world we encounter a ceaseless flow of public enunciations voiced by Western statesmen which unfortunately bring little that is positive. It seemed only right to us that the legitimate President of Poland should express his views on current international affairs in an interview for publication—and this he agreed to do. His statements and political formulations have always been noted for their maturity and precision of judgment backed up by Mr. Zaleski's vast fund of experience amassed during some 50 years of solid and meritorious service for the ideal of a really independent Poland. Moreover, President Zaleski's enunciations reflect two other most currently indispensable features: the courage of his convictions and the moral strength of his character.

"Asked to appraise the present international situation, President Zaleski stated the following:

"'There can be no doubt that the present international situation on the whole provides no grounds for optimism. Lord Strang, that eminent expert on international relations and Permanent Under Secretary of State in the Foreign Office for many years, wrote in his capital work on the history of Britain's foreign policy that this consists in muddling through every matter from one case to another. This perhaps oversevere judgment can in lesser or greater degree be applied to the policy of many of the great powers. Only, nobody wants to admit it so frankly as Lord Strang did.

"'But even if this were not so, would the world situation be any different? The great powers are usually charged with identifying might with right. I think it is a far more serious error to identify might with wisdom, and this mistake is really the most characteristic feature of power policy.

"'After all, Dr. Adenauer stated some time ago—on June 11th to be exact—that Belgium's oppositoin to certain proposals advanced at a conference on the European Common Market has no great significance. Once the Great Powers come to an understanding among themselves, the other ones will later have to reconcile themselves to this attitude. He was not concerned whether the smaller countries are right or not.

"'The Big Three did the same at Yalta. The opinions of the lesser states, who protested and with absolute precision foresaw the outcome of this disastrous agreement, were not only excluded from consideration but the views of the smaller countries were not even sought—for "might is wisdom." It is needless to cite further examples of such an attitude. During the interwar years, did not some powers do all possible to strengthen Germany? Do we not remember all the obstacles raised to obstruct Poland's foreign policy during the first few years of her restored independence merely in order to enfeeble allied France? And, what was the reception given to Marshal Pilsudski's proposal that moderation be forced upon Nazi Germany by threatening her with a preventive war?

"'But let us return to the present juncture. The situation today is nothing but an outcome of the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements. It is 17 years since the war ended, yet a peace treaty has yet to be signed, and in effect none of the matters stemming from the war has been definitively settled—from the primary question of frontier settlements to the secondary one of communications with West Berlin. Not only do these matters remain unsettled but nobody, literally no one, knows which approach will lead to their settlement. The only encouraging thing in this situation is the fact that nobody wants a great war since with modern weapons such a war might bring incalculable disasters. I have in mind, of course, a great war on the scale of the two World Wars—for minor wars are a virtually constant feature. Suffice it to mention that the hostilities in Laos came to an end because American and British troops landed in Thailand. But, who knows how long the understanding reached by the three Lao princes will last and how it will work in practice?'

"Question. The present fashion for Russia in the West and the cross-country run to Moscow by politicians, journalists, intellectuals and so on seems to me not only unwise and harmful but often even humiliating. What is your opinion on this point, Mr. President?

"Answer. I spoke just now about ascribing excessive rights to the mighty and the harm this brings to international relations. What can I say about this if it happens with regard to might erroneously evaluated? The Western world seems to be fascinated by Russia's power. This is reflected not only in the field of politics but also in a simply astounding adoration of all that is Russian. After all, communism has ruled Russia for the last 45 years and yet that country is not able even to feed her own population although she holds the Ukraine, that most fertile part of Europe, apart from huge areas in Asia. The very fact that in effect nearly all that happens in Russia is veiled in secrecy—that for a foreigner to show interest in even the most everyday features of life there is regarded as espionage by the Soviet Government—should be adequate proof that things in the Soviet Union are not so good as the West supposes. The West should, after all, remember that if not for the munitions supplied by the United States and Britain, Russia would have been unable to cope with the German invasion. Russia has certainly made some progress since then, but it cannot keep pace with the progress simultaneously made by the Western Powers: the tempo of Soviet progress is incomparably slower.

"Question. Mr. President, what are your views on the European Common Market?

"Answer. The successes of the Common Market to date and the harmonious cooperation of the member countries as also new strategical requirements have convinced Great Britain that she must take the fact into account that she is really an offshore island of Europe. Having taken cognizance of this fact, Britain has decided to accede to this Common Market. The decision was not easily made, the more so that at the beginning of the century England was proud she could follow a policy of splendid isolation while more or less disregarding happenings on the Continent. Britain must moreover allow for her commitments toward the British Commonwealth of Nations. But everything indicates that the difficulties will be overcome and that Great Britain will join the Common Market.

"So far, the Common Market primarily bears the character of an economic understanding, but there can be no doubt that such economic collaboration, if crowned with success, may lead to ever closer integration of the member countries likewise in the political field. It is not strange therefore that some circles in many countries fear their national character will be lost. But it seems to me the integration of Europe in the political sense will be a gradual process, whilst such strong national individualities as France, England, Italy, and Germany with their specific cultures and languages need fear no loss of individuality.

"Question. Mr. President, it seems to me that the endless small-talk at the Geneva Disarmament Conference should be described as more conversations and not as negotiations. It looks in fact as if the conference began at the wrong end. After all, there can be no word of real disarmament when no real international trust exists. What is your opinion, Mr. President?

"Answer. This is not the first disarmament conference nor the last, and we know from experience how great are the difficulties inherent in the problem. It suffices to review world history to acquire the conviction that it is most difficult to put ones trust on international commitments. In fact, the history of international relations can be treated as one long chain of broken treaties with new ones concluded in their place. To eliminate this danger, it would be necessary to establish very strict international inspection control over the execution of the commitments embodied in every disarmament treaty. In any case, such a country as Russia, which has the objective of establishing her rule over the world by spreading the Communist system everywhere through the recognition of the primacy of the Russian Communist Party over the other parties, cannot agree to real, effective inspection. It would undermine her principal purpose.

"Question. Mr. President, the Communist regime in Warsaw and its agents in other countries mendaciously and impudently charge us with not properly defending the Polish frontier on the Oder-Neisse.

"Answer. The legitimate authorities of the Polish Republic have never ceased to proclaim that they consider the Oder-Neisse frontier is the definitive western frontier of the Republic and they are making every possible effort to secure its definitive recognition by the Wester Powers. This is not our only solicitude with regard to frontiers. Our eastern frontier is also important for us, and the restoration of the frontier fixed by the Treaty of Riga is likewise one of our aims. The question of both these frontiers is moreover bound up with the recovery of absolute independence by Poland, who now in reality remains under Russian occupation."

Sharpen Safety, Prevent Injuries at Mowing Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, in the final months of this summer, the hazards to the weekend gardener have again been brought to my attention. One of the greatest hazards is the power mower, a tool which, when properly handled and dealt with is a great boon; but when carelessly or improperly worked with becomes a mechanical monster ready to wreak pain, suffering, and serious injury.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which lists simple rules which, if the home gardener will follow, will give him greater pleasure and free him from the dangers of the power mower:

SHARPEN SAFETY, PREVENT INJURIES AT MOWING TIME

(By Claire Cox)

NEW YORK.—Safety engineers would like a word with the Nation's weekend gardeners, now that it is time to start mowing the crabgrass.

Don't treat your power mower like a toy, they warned.

But handle it as carefully as you would maneuver your automobile.

The American Standards Association has established rigid requirements for manufacturers to follow in making mowers as safe as possible. Now, safety engineers wish a few safeguards could be built into the people who steer the mowers.

Simple rules do exist for operating power mowers and a new standard setting them forth has been approved by the association, providing for the following precautions:

All children, including teenagers, should be forbidden to operate a power mower under any circumstances and they should be banned from the area where a mower is in use. Children should be forbidden to ride as a passenger on a riding-type mower.

Debris must be cleared from a lawn before a mower is run over a single blade of grass. This includes toys, stones, clothespins, pieces of wire and glass and other objects, which should be raked up.

Operators must know how to stop a mower at a moment's notice.

Always stand behind a mower and move it forward, never pull it or guide it backward. Never run with the mower, but walk with it at an easy pace.

Never mow wet grass. One housewife did, and lost several toes when she slipped and her foot came in contact with the blade. The best time to mow is when the turf is dry, usually late in the day.

Never go barefoot.

When approached while mowing, shut the motor off.

Plan your mowing so the grass-discharge side of the mower never is aimed at passersby or neighbors. If the machine should pick up a stone, it will hurl it with the force of a bullet.

Operate the mower at the slowest speed that will cut satisfactorily.

When filling the tank, be careful not to spill gasoline on your clothing or the machine and never smoke while doing this job.

In other words, the American Standards Association says, treat your power mower with respect or it might turn against you.

They Are Training To Train Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article from the Indianapolis Star of August 12, 1962, concerning the program for the training of Peace Corps volunteers at Indiana University.

These volunteers are completing their training to serve in Tunisia.

The article follows:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Aug. 12, 1962]

THEY ARE TRAINING TO TRAIN OTHERS—A GROUP OF PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS, INCLUDING RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES AND RETIRED PERSONS, HAVE JUST COMPLETED THEIR PREPARATIONS TO SERVE IN TUNISIA

(By Patricia Brogneaux)

The Peace Corps was 17 months old on August 1. It is still so new that no volunteer has completed his first 2-year tour of service, so new that no one has come up for reenlistment. And a great segment of the American public still looks somewhat askance at anyone who would toss aside 24 wage-earning months in the United States to go abroad and work with countries which boldly asked for his services.

Its training programs are still so flexible that a great deal of the instruction preceding the oversea tour is left to the universities where it is carried out. At Indiana University, for example, 77 Peace Corps trainees arrived in early June to begin 9 weeks of preparation for service in Tunisia. But before they did, the university's representatives and members of Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver's staff had to work out a training program.

By June 4, when IU was graduating its own seniors, the Peace Corps trainees had already completed one day of what would be an intensive program to prepare them for a weeding out process this month—and then 2 years in the North African nation of Tunisia.

Why Tunisia? Because the country, young in independence but ancient in history, had asked for help. It needed architects to help plan low-income housing and multistory public buildings and building construction supervisors to carry out the projects. It needed mechanics to supervise repair and upkeep of equipment and to train Tunisians in modern methods. And it asked for physical education instructors to help at the National Institute of Physical Education and Sports near Tunis and to set up physical education and recreation programs in 10 children's villages for homeless and abandoned youngsters.

According to a representative from the Tunisian Embassy in Washington, Ismail Khelil, "Tunisia is committed to a big job, to build up her dignity, consolidate her freedom, and assure her advancement." And the job isn't an easy one.

Under the leadership of Habib Bourguiba, the candidate of the notables and intellectuals who founded the Constitutionalist Liberal Party, Tunisia won a battle for independence from France in the spring of 1956. The French began to withdraw from the country, and as they did they left the young nation in a state of underdevelopment and economic chaos.

So, Tunisia was a new country with all the problems of survival in the modern world. Some 350,000 of its 4 million persons were unemployed. Its economy was and is handicapped by a shortage of skilled personnel, widespread illiteracy, technical backwardness. An agrarian nation, Tunisia is a country where 73 percent of the populace receives less than $120 yearly and 14 percent survives on an annual income of about $216.

Struggling under its new and heavy load, the Bourguiba Government asked for help. Mrs. Nan McEvoy, deputy assistant for the African program, recommended that Tunisia be given aid.

The Corps recruited 77 persons to fill the areas in which Tunisia needed help and chose Indiana University because of its excelelnce in language instruction and physical education. About half the volunteers were college graduates—some were late to the campus because of their own commencement exercises—but some had less than high school education. What mattered were the skills they possessed and their ability to help get Tunisia to its feet.

The volunteers (technically they were still trainees) moved into Ruby Mason Hall, a new limestone building at the east edge of the Bloomington campus. Their counselor was Harry Whitesell, who recently completed a year in Tunisia with the Foreign Service. Also living with them were two graduate students from Tunisia, Nouredine Falfoul and Abdelwahab M'Rabet, who were there for consultation.

The volunteers were provided housing, meals, medical care and an allowance of $2 weekly for laundry and $2 daily for incidentals. When they do go abroad, they will have a living allowance and will return hom to a bank account equivalent to $75 for each month of their service abroad.

All 77 were launched on an intensive 10-hour-a-day, 6-day-a-week program directed by Arthur Glover, who was responsible for a staff of instructors, medics and consultants of approximately 35 persons. The program was under the supervision of Indiana University's Dean Samuel E. Braden and Albert Meisel, Peace Corps training officer. By midway the trainees had been reduced by 3 due to problems outside the Peace Corps program, leaving a total of 6 girls and 68 men.

The largest group of trainees comprised 27 heavy roadbuilding equipment mechanics who got the jump on their fellow volunteers by attending 6 weeks of intensive technical training at the Caterpillar Tractor Co. in Peoria, Ill.

Among these was 69-year-old Oscar Haugen of Argyle, Minn., currently listed as the oldest member of the entire Peace Corps. With a life-time of work behind him as a mechanic and in the roadbuilding business, Haugen believes that "if you can do something good for other people, you should be willing to do it."

Nearly matching Haugen in age are Virgil Moore of Aurora, Nebr., a 62-year-old farmer who left his Arizona land, a year after his wife died, to teach operation and maintenance of heavy equipment in Tunisia, and Canadian-born Jean Begin, 66, of Kaysville, Utah, with a background in sales engineering and heavy equipment.

Why did they join? It was an older volunteer who explained it this way: "When somebody asks me why I joined the Peace Corps, I ask him: 'What are you working for?' "

But many of the younger members have a different attitude.

"We're not 100 percent humanitarians," one boy pointed out. "There's something in it for us."

What appears to be "in it" for younger trainees are first, a sense of accomplishment; second, a unique education; third perhaps a bridge between the idealism of college and the jobs they will take later.

Take the case of Judy Julian of New Britain, Conn. A design artist, she was absent from her drawing board for several days because of an injury suffered in a skiing accident. "Nobody even missed me. I could have stayed away all week, and no one would have cared. There isn't much sense of accomplishment in a job like that."

Joan Ware, a 22-year-old architect from Schenectady, N.Y., welcomed an opportunity to plan government housing for Tunisia after "sitting over a drawing board for 5 years." To train for her service, she joined the construction supervisors Saturday mornings at Bloomington High School where they worked in teams to build and tear down concrete block walls.

For Patricia Merritt, a 21-year-old college graduate from Bloomfield, Mich., the Peace Corps is a "practical education." She anticipates a better teaching position when she comes back from organizing physical education programs in Tunisian schools.

But some volunteers joined at the expense of their jobs and some at the risk of personal relationships. One young man was scheduled to be married the day he left for the Corps. He didn't desert his fiancee—instead, the couple will wait until she finished 2 years more of college, giving him time to serve in Tunisia.

Most employers will welcome back the volunteer who left. Some corpsmen will go to better jobs because of their experience. Those who left school, as some did, plan to return. Among them is David Fischer of Pocatello, Idaho, who was a college instructor. After he sent six students off to the Corps, he decided to join, himself.

One young man said, "If you believe in this thing, you can't not join."

If their attitudes were frankly dubious when they arrived (one boy was disappointed when he found so many older volunteers but later credited them with being among the most dedicated of the group), the volunteers were enthusiastic. They had to be to carry out a strenuous schedule which required 10 hours of technical training weekly, 22½ hours of French, 6 on Tunisian studies and 6 on American studies, 5 on world affairs, 3 on health, and 7½ on physical training. Under the instruction of Mrs. Marian Walter and with the aid of Indiana University's language laboratories, the trainees absorbed 202½ hours of French by the time they left.

In class, the trainees studied Tunisian history, government, culture, and role in world affairs; U.S. history, Government, and social institutions, the U.S. role in world affairs, and international problems. Additional special lectures on the U.S. role in world affairs since World War II were nongraded, but they emphasized international communism's technique and ideology.

When they get to their posts, the volunteers will be there specifically to help Tunisians, to train them to help themselves. They are not officially representatives of the U.S. Government, nor will they be required to explain policies and programs of their Government. Relationships with Tunisia will be handled by an official Peace Corps representative, responsible to the Ambassador in that country, and the volunteers, themselves, will be treated as any other foreign visitor. The volunteers do not see themselves as missionaries nor even particularly dedicated patriots. They are idealistic and they are practical.

Perhaps their attitudes are best expressed by 36-year-old Saliba Ansara, born in Jerusalem, fluent in Arabic, raised in the turbulent Mideast. Ansara, who recognizes the need for help in that part of the world, became a citizen of the United States last October. He joined the Peace Corps as soon as his services were called.

Says Ansara:

"The President said in a speech, 'Ask what you can do for your country.' That is what I have done."

President Failed To Inspire the People in His Televised Tax Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following statement I issued to the press expressing my views on President Kennedy's discussion of taxes and the economy:

The harm done to American economy and business men and women by the President can only be undone by him through knowledge of basic economics, leadership, and restoration of confidence. In this he failed. He dismissed the threat of inflation, yet he is accelerating spending and deficit financing. He took pride in the balance of payments, yet the world holds $22 billion in claims against our $16 billion gold and a run on the dollar is imminent when confidence is lacking. He announced an extraordinary record in labor peace, which the facts belie, and he overlooks the strikes against our defense missiles, nuclear, and space programs. He proclaimed our standing still compared to growth of Germany and Japan, which fallaciously overlooks our tremendously high economic base and the war devastation of those countries. He disclaims wild spending, overlooking the increased outlays outside defense, and the cost of many new programs, some of which he outlined—public works, food stamps, education aid, etc.—and then erroneously pictured fiscal responsibility as a percentage of GNP, overlooking the increased debt, heavier taxes ($1 billion increase in social security next January). He proclaimed the economic drag of present tax, but proposed no specific reforms, which he admits are overdue.

Indeed, this was a speech of alleged performances and promises, not matched by facts. It's time for Americans to ask how much better times would be and will be with less government, not more; less spending, not more; less debt, not more; and less tax, not more; in short, the plain unvarnished truth of capitalism and private enterprise, untrammeled by paternal government and the regimentation and planning of President Kennedy and the New Frontiersmen (like Schlesinger) who believe that "democratic socialism" must replace capitalism and freedom.

I concur with a statement issued by my colleague, Tom Curtis of Missouri, in which he pointed out the rigged economic statistics contained in the speech. The American people deserve something better than the empty promises of the President's speech and hope for the future based on inaccuracies.

Conditions on Railroads Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Congress to the August 10, 1962, release of the Railway Labor Executives Association concerning the conditions which exist on the railroads today.

This release portrays quite well the workers' side of the story and I believe should be read by all the Members:

RAILROAD LABOR SAYS RECENT PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD WRECKS PROVE CARRIER IS ALREADY TOO LARGE FOR EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT AND SHOULD BAR MERGER WITH CENTRAL: RLEA ALSO DEMANDS CONGRESS ACT ON RAILROAD SAFETY BILL

The chief executives of the 24 standard railway labor organizations, convened at the August meeting of the Railway Labor Executives' Association this week in Washington, today adopted the following statement concerning recent wrecks on the Pennsylvania Railroad in which 19 persons were killed and over 100 injured:

Several immediate actions by Congress and the administration are clearly and urgently called for as the result of the recent wrecks on the Pennsylvania Railroad which caused 19 needless deaths, maimed and injured over 100 others and resulted in damages to freight and other property running into scores of millions of dollars.

Deferred and inadequate maintenance, the result of unwise policies on the part of railroad management, appear to be largely responsible for not only the fatal derailment of the baseball excursion train at Steelton, Pa., on July 28, but also a second wreck a few days later when 12 cars of a Pennsylvania mail train went off the rails at Vandalia, Ill., reportedly because of a broken rail. These accidents, and other recent ones which have sent railroad accident figures soaring, bear out the repeated warnings of the Railway Labor Executives' Association over the last few years that inadequate safety practices and dangerous undermaintenance of both track and equipment on the part of the Nation's railroads can only lead to a repetition and increase of such tragedies.

The toll of railroad accidents rose from a total of 12,910 railroad employees and 1,363 passengers killed and injured in 1959 to 13,441 workers and 1,495 passengers killed and injured in 1960, and preliminary figures, compiled on a more accurate basis, show 19,821 workers and 1,898 passengers killed and injured in 1961. This huge increase is all the more inexcusable in that while the number of injured workers was rising, average monthly railroad employment declined from 815,474 in 1959 to 718,352 last year. With still a further drop in employment, the number of employees and passengers killed and injured in the first 4 months of this year again showed a substantial increase over the same period last year.

What is particularly shocking is that, despite the soaring accident rate, railroad management has flatly turned down railroad labor's request for the establishment of a joint labor-management committee on safety, and the RLEA therefore has been compelled to establish its own Committee on Safety on a unilateral basis. Since the carriers have thus indicated that they are not properly concerned about safety matters, the American people must look to the administration and Congress to provide a much-needed remedy to the present intolerable situation.

The cost of these two wrecks on the Pennsylvania alone would have paid for many hundreds of miles of track maintenance which would have saved the many lives and prevented much human misery involved. Yet in recent weeks, despite the fact that in the second quarter of this year the railroad industry reported the highest percentage increase in net income of any American industry, many railroad managements have announced that they were curtailing their maintenance forces still further, allegedly to offset the costs of a wage increase won by the non-operating employees. The public can no longer afford to tolerate indifference to human welfare. It now must be clear to all thinking Americans that the statistical evidence shows each new cutback in rail employment is coincident with an increase in the accident rate with staggering resultant monetary losses to the railroads.

Moreover, the public surely must demand from the Interstate Commerce Commission more adequate action with respect to its responsibilities in the field of safety. Although railroad labor has constantly reminded the ICC of the unsafe conditions and deferred maintenance existing on many railroads in the United States, the Commission has failed and refused to undertake formal and extensive investigations of the various unsafe practices of the rail carriers and to ask Congress to enact remedial legislation. Instead of showing proper concern about the rising accident rate, however, the Commission right now is proposing by administrative action to virtually wipe out all of the protective safety requirements which Congress sought to provide when it adopted the Railroad Signal Inspection Act.

The unsafe conditions on the Pennsylvania Railroad, which resulted in two disastrous wrecks in less than a week as the result of faulty track as far apart as Pennsylvania and Indiana, also prove the validity of the recent testimony of the Nation's top transportation economists before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee that this carrier is already too large for efficient management and sound railroad operations, so that its proposed merger with the New York Central must be prevented. Thus the wrecks are another warning that Congress and the administration must act to halt the pending railroad merger movement which proposes to create many other similar giant rail monopolies, also too large for efficient management and safe operations.

For the foregoing reasons, the Railway Labor Executives' Association, speaking for substantially all railroad workers, urges the following immediate actions by Congress as essential to protect the American people from other similar rail tragedies in the future:

1. The immediate enactment of S. 3097 and H.R. 11841, sponsored by Senator KEFAUVER and a number of other Senators and Representatives, to call a temporary halt to certain railroad merger proposals which, through exemption from the antitrust laws, would not only create many other monopolistic giants like the Pennsylvania Railroad but would also even compound the present structural weaknesses and inefficiency of the Nation's largest railroad by permitting it to become even more unmanageable and less safe through merger with the New York Central. Hearings on this legislation have been completed and it has been favorably reported by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. Its enactment is essential at this session in order to give Congress time to draft new legislation to protect the public interest against the kind of harmful railroad mergers now being proposed.

2. The immediate enactment of the track and bridge inspection bill S. 1669 and H.R. 1220, which would give the ICC authority it does not now have to prescribe rules to require the railroads to properly maintain and inspect track, bridges and roadbeds. The need for such legislation is clearly demonstrated by the causes of the recent wrecks. All such safety legislation should provide fines or penalties on thec arriers for violations to such an extent that the carriers cannot afford to ignore the provisions and should require the ICC to impose such penalty in each and every instance and for each day the violation exists.

3. The launching by the House and Senate Commerce Committees of full scale investigations of the dangerous operating condition which has developed on many railroads as the result of improper safety practices and the grave undermaintenance situation which presently exists. Such investigations also should look into the present practices and policies of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the field of safety.

Finally, we ask President Kennedy to take whatever administrative actions are possible to insure more adequate concern for safety standards and enforcement by the Interstate Commerce Commission. We also urge him to support the legislative proposals outlined above.

Why Not Listen to Khrushchev?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the majority of the American people favor a firm foreign policy. The following editorial "Why Not Listen to Khrushchev?" which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette of July 31, does good service in calling to the attention of the American people some of the dangers inherent in a foreign policy based on the thesis that the Russians are "changing." It is to be hoped that people like Mr. Rostow will remember what happened to a world which did not believe a book written by an Austrian house-painter named Hitler.

WHY NOT LISTEN TO KHRUSHCHEV?

Much has been written and said in recent weeks about the foreign policy proposals of Presidential Adviser Walt Whitman Rostow.

As we know, Rostow has advanced the thesis that the Communist leaders are mellowing, that the Soviet Union is becoming a mature state and that the direction of communism is now toward a nonaggressive socialism. If, says Rostow, the United States acts friendly toward the Soviets, reduces its aggressive power and makes unilateral moves toward disarmament, the mellow Communists will respond by doing the same.

Well, instead of trying to answer that argument ourselves, let us let Mr. Khrushchev do it for us. Last March 16, when the "mellow" Mr. Khrushchev was in the midst of submitting his proposals for "universal and complete disarmament under strict international controls" he said this to the Supreme Soviet: "We have maintained, and still maintain, that the peoples which have not yet freed themselves from the fetters of colonialism can attain their liberation (become Communist) only through struggle and by relying on force. And those people which have already won their freedom (like Red China) can maintain their independence only through struggle, only by taking up arms in order to resist the colonialists and imperialists, who are armed to the teeth. Moreover, we do not merely talk about this but give considerable economic aid, including military aid, to those states which turn to us with requests for support in their struggle for the consolidation of their independence (the triumph of communism)."

As the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. points out, Khrushchev's disarmament proposal "contrasts strangely with his promises of continued military aid to the 'peoples fighting imperialism.' It is the sort of dual attitude which Lenin approved when he referred to the Communist attitude toward disarmament. Lenin stressed the idea that until the Socialist revolution triumphed throughout the world, the idea of disarmament was utopian.

"At the same time he advocated the advancement of radical and totally unrealistic Communist proposals (like Khrushchev's), purely for the purpose of 'unmasking the bourgeois pacifists' in the eyes of the masses.

"According to Lenin himself, 'Only after disarming the bourgeoisie can the proletariat, without betraying its universal and historic task (of winning world communism), scrap armaments altogether, and the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but only then and under no circumstances before."

This is why Khrushchev uses the time tested method of applying to us the "carrot and the stick." He holds out a dramatic offer of universal disarmament on the one hand and rattles his rockets and atomic bombs at us on the other. The idea is to scare and woo us into weakening our ability to destroy his military forces. If he can, by the policy of "peaceful coexistence," convince people like Rostow that we should begin a policy of unilateral disarmament—to prove we have no aggressive intentions—he will soon be able to embark on a whole series of Communist led "revolutions" without fear of attack by us. If he can get us to drop our nuclear guard, he can proceed to communize the world without fear of American nuclear retaliation.

That is what he himself tells us. At the 1960 meeting of the World Communist Parties he told his comrades that "revolutionary wars" for "national liberation," and guerrilla wars—like that in Vietnam—are both possible and legitimate as long as they are Communist led.

So if Mr. Rostow, and Mr. Rusk, and Mr. Kennedy are basing American policy toward Russia on Khrushchev and company being "mellow fellows" they are playing right into his bloody hands and laying the rest of the world open to rapid Communist domination.

Why don't they listen to Khrushchev—instead of to each other?

Better Drug Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, events of the past few weeks have focused the attention of America and all the world on the problems of new drugs. Last week, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee—of which I am a member—met in executive session to consider legislation designed, among other purposes, to assure that new drugs are proven safe and effective before being placed on the market.

On Friday last week, in an editorial, the Newark Evening News, pointed up the need of the Congress to respond to the dangers that have been pointed out. I believe it appropriate that all our colleagues recognize this need, preparatory to consideration of the legislation that will come before the House. Certainly the newly appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has done his bit to protect the public interest. We must no less do ours. The article follows:

BETTER DRUG CONTROL

The Government's new regulations for testing drugs must lead the public to wonder why such precautions had not before been exercised in its behalf.

The new provisions can neither damage free enterprise nor arbitrarily burden the medical profession. If there should arise complaints of needless paperwork that may easily be justified in the overriding consideration of safeguarding lives.

Certainly, in the light of thalidomide, MER-29, and others, there can be no quarrel with the requirement that henceforth the Food and Drug Administration be notified when doctors are given a new drug to test among their patients. Nor is it too much to ask that doctors meet high standards as investigators or employ strict clinical methods.

Progress reports would be required, with the FDA to be notified immediately if disturbing side effects from new drugs are detected. These provisions would repair weaknesses that have become evident in a voluntary system that lacked uniform testing, prompt communication of danger signs or quick withdrawal of suspect drugs. Quite fairly the drug industry has 60 days to present its objections to the changes.

Secretary Celebrezze has responded forthrightly to the danger signals. It now is up to Congress to do the same.

Trade Bill and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a very able article by Mr. Edson B. Smith, financial writer for the Boston Sunday Herald entitled "Lower Tariffs in United States Likely To Increase Unemployment."

I think Mr. Smith in his article makes several very good points which would appear to be virtually unanswerable, in fact, the first point that lower tariffs would increase unemployment is already admitted by the sponsors of the trade expansion bill who have provided business subsidies and unemployment roll benefits for the victims of cheap imports into this country.

The second point seems to be equally tenable and unanswerable and that seems to be that lower taxes have been largely responsible for increased business in the Common Market countries.

Since I have been urging lower taxes across the board for a long while now, naturally I am convinced that action to this end should have been taken a long time ago. I hope however, that it will soon be taken because time is running against us in the matter, indeed, in my opinion, it has already run so far with regard to development of recessionary forces and factors in our economy that perhaps even substantial tax cuts now might not completely serve to immediately revitalize the economy.

However, it is clear that this action should be taken now and that is what should be done, as Mr. Smith indicates, and as I have urged before—faster depreciation and reduced taxes, writeoffs to spur business.

I also think that the corporate rate should be substantially reduced. Small business has already been gravely affected throughout the country by a combination of oppressive taxation, extravagant and expensive bureaucratic regulations, labor troubles, and extremely difficult competition from big business and foreign imports in many instances, and also an unfair, picayune share of Government procurement as compared to big business. Unless these problems are tackled, and tackled vigorously, and soon, the prospects for adequate national growth, business prosperity, and full employment in this country could not be viewed with much optimism; in fact, the contrary would be the case, as I see it.

I hope that something will be done to tackle these various factors that are working out so adversely to our economic system and to spur adequate profits upon which it depends. I hope action will be taken at a very early date. The recent decision of our great President Kennedy to recommend tax revision and reduction at the next session should do much to improve our economic posture and I hope Congress will take appropriate action.

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, July 15, 1962]

LOWER TARIFFS IN UNITED STATES LIKELY TO INCREASE UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Edson B. Smith)

President Kennedy's trade bill has gone through the House with a margin or more than two votes to one. There is very little doubt that it will go through the Senate a few weeks hence and be signed into law by fall.

In a general way this measure gives the President wide latitude in adjusting tariffs. The basic theory seems to be that the European Common Market is the most important single economic fact in the world today and that we over here have some important adjustments to make to keep up with it. It is obviously President Kennedy's hope that he will be able to make some deals with the Common Market which will prove beneficial to the American economy.

We make no pretense of being able to understand just what it is which makes the Common Market click. And particularly do we not know whether this recent remarkable period of prosperity in Western Europe is due mainly to the fact of the Common Market or whether to the huge pent-up post-World War II demands.

Nearly everybody seems to assume that because of the Common Market working so well there will be more or less permanent prosperity from now on in Western Europe.

So far nobody has been able to explain to our satisfaction just how reducing tariffs by the United States is going to make more profits for American manufacturers. To a simple minded person such as we are the thought occurs that the most likely result from lower tariffs would be greater imports. And insomuch as wage costs in Western Europe are far and away below what they are in the United States we cannot see how a flood of European manufactured goods is going to do anything but increase unemployment over here.

BUSY BUILDING FALLOUT SHELTERS

It is interesting as one looks back, to note that a year ago the stock market was booming and we were all busily engaged in building fallout shelters. Kennedy had met Khrushchev in Vienna and came home wondering how war could be avoided. A year ago we were afraid Africa and South America would go Communist and we added hundreds of thousands of men to our Armed Forces and billions to our defense spending.

In the summer of 1961 the world looked as though it might be falling apart, and stocks boomed.

Of course, one never can be sure what lies around the corner, with half of the world's population governed by Communist dictatorships. But at the moment, at least, our world position looks a lot better than it did a year ago. South America has shown no disposition to follow Castro's Cuba. Africa is not Communist and it is quieting down. China is starving and Russia is having trouble raising the food it needs. And Moscow seems to be even less happy about the European Common Market than are we in the United States.

The big problem facing the United States today is how to get profit margins up to where they ought to be. The surest prediction is that until business in the United States becomes adequately profitable, there will be excessive unemployment and there will be frequent recessions of greater or less severity.

A year ago it appeared that our problems were mainly military and diplomatic. Today they seem to be mainly economic.

COMMON MARKET TAXES LOWER

Some of the reasons why Western Europe is doing so much better than we are businesswise is that the Common Market countries business taxes are lower, depreciation allowance much higher, and labor unions function more in harmony with the overall welfare. One way or another costs are kept down.

A lot of people talk a lot about how we must bring our economy into closed association with the Common Market and how this is going to be good for us. Former President Eisenhower was for Kennedy's free trade bill, so at the moment the matter is not likely to develop into a partisan political issue.

As we say, we do not know enough about the overall Common Market situation in respect to our own economy to know whether what President Kennedy wants to do is going to work out well or not. We can recall many occasions in the past when many very well informed people turned out to be very wrong about economic sequences.

Every day somebody asks us what the stock market is going to do over the months ahead. How can anybody answer such a question in the absence of a firm opinion as to what corporate earnings are going to be 6 months and year hence.

Our own idea at the moment is that something like 525 or a little over the Dow Jones industrials (which is where the market stopped going down in June) is low enough if the Dow earnings will in fact be $35 this year and if they are not going lower in 1963. On the other hand if corporate earnings are going to decline substantially over the months ahead, it is close to a certainty that stock prices will be lower.

This Kennedy trade bill might turn out to be a bull argument. On the other hand, it might not.

Port Authority of Allegheny County Urges Action on Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1962, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, with broad bipartisan support, reported favorably on H.R. 11158, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962.

The people of my congressional district and in Allegheny County recognize that passage of this bill during this session of Congress is vital to their economic welfare.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Harley L. Swift, executive director of the Port Authority of Allegheny County, urging congressional action on the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962:

Port Authority of
Allegheny County,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 10, 1962.

Hon. William S. Moorhead,
Representative, 28th District, Pennsylvania, Old House of Representatives Office Building, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Moorhead: The passage of the the so-called Williams bills in the House and in the Senate, I think that the House bill is No. 11158, providing aid for mass transit throughout the United States, are in my opinion and in the opinion of others as well, so vitally important to the economic welfare and to the development and growth of cities and areas of even as low as 100,000 in population that even though I talked to you at length via long distance telephone this morning I am writing you tonight to again urge you to do everything in your power to get the bills out of committee and onto the floors of both the House and the Senate and passed.

You are familiar with the transit problem in Pittsburgh and what we are doing to solve, salve, and improve it. We have spent more than a year now attempting to acquire via purchase the properties and franchises of some 33 bus and street railway companies in Allegheny County and weld them into one coordinated, well-managed system. By the end of the year we will have agreements to sell from all of them. The sum of money required to accomplish this will be large, larger than the county can carry and larger than can be privately financed through revenue bonds. Under the provisions of the Williams bills this vital coordination of mass transit in Allegheny County can be accomplished.

The early passage of these bills is therefore vital to the economic welfare of the cities and communities in Allegheny County and to Pittsburgh proper.

While I am writing this letter as executive director of the Port Authority of Allegheny County, the agency charged with and responsible for coordinating mass transportation in the Pittsburgh area, I also as a director and general consultant of American Transportation Enterprises, Inc., who operate transit companies in Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, Harrisburg, and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Wilmington, Del.; Covington and Newport, Ky.; Omaha, Nebr.; Richmond and Portsmouth, Va.; Chattanooga and Nashville, Tenn.; Akron and Youngstown, Ohio; Springfield, Ill.; and Baton Rouge, La.; am authorized to speak for them as well in urging prompt passage of these bills as essential to metropolitan area welfare even though the assistance under the act may never be necessary in these cities.

Again, Bill, I urge you to please put forth all of the influence and power that you command to secure action on and passage of these bills very soon. If I can assist you by coming to Washington and telling our story, please call on me.

Most sincerely,
Harley L. Swift,
Executive Director.

Tribute to Former U.S. Representative Lowell Stockman

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last week I was greatly shocked to read of the death of Lowell Stockman who served in the House of Representatives in the 78th, 79th, 80th, and 81st and 82d Congresses.

Lowell Stockman represented the Second Congressional District of Oregon, having been raised in Pendleton, Oreg. After retiring voluntarily in 1952, he went into business as a wheat rancher and in 1958 moved his residence into my district in Washington State after buying the Eastgate Mobile Manor.

Mr. Speaker, Lowell Stockman never lost his keen interest in politics. He came back to Washington, D.C., regularly and always came and sat at the Republican roundtable in the House Restaurant and had lunch and visited with old friends. I first learned he had moved into my congressional district when I was making a speech in Bellevue and found he had done me the honor by coming to hear me. Just a few days before he died he had stopped by my office here in the Nation's Capital to visit.

The privilege of serving in Congress with Lowell was never mine because I came here the year he left, but I know of the respect which this tall, handsome Member of Congress enjoyed from his colleagues. He was modest, considerate, and unassuming but more than that he was of sound judgment and held in the highest esteem by all who knew him.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, better for my acquaintance with Lowell Stockman. I know he was a friend although he was always careful not to impose on my time.

His untimely death is a real loss. He was a conscientious and good citizen. He set a good example in his own character and way of life. Our country and the new neighborhood where he had been living of recent years need men like Lowell Stockman. Men in active political life like myself need well informed men of high integrity on the homefront. He was only 61 years of age and had much yet to contribute to the well-being of his fellow citizens.

I regret deeply his passing and extend to his son, two daughters, and wife my profound sympathy in their loss.

The Russian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this week I read an excellent editorial which displayed so much understanding and which was so well written that I wanted my colleagues and the many other readers of the Congressional Record to have the opportunity of seeing it also. The article, entitled "The Russian People," gives deep insight into the Russian mentality and helps to explain what must happen before the Russians will throw off their system of state slavery and adopt a form of government which allows its citizens some degree of individual freedom.

The editorial appeared in the Metter Advertiser, Metter, Ga., published by my constituent, the Honorable R. G. Daniell, outstanding newspaper publisher, farmer, businessman, civic leader, and former State legislator of progressive Candler County.

The article follows:

[From the Metter (Ga.) Advertiser, July 30, 1962]

The Russian People

The people of the West, most of whom believe in both freedom of the individual and the democratic process, must understand the mentality of the Russian people if we are to exploit the limited chance of influencing those currently under the yoke of Communist totalitarianism.

It is often asked how the Russian people patiently put up with the evils and limitations of the Communist system. First of all, one must remember that these people have never known real personal freedom and democracy and know nothing better than what they have today.

The standard of living in Russia was lower under the Tsar than it is today under communism. The Communists, helped to power in 1917 by the Germans, to whom the Communists surrendered, have had 45 years now to indoctrinate the people and only the elderly can remember the times of the Tsar. And the last years of the Tsar's reign were years of terrible hardship.

So how much can we expect from the Russian people, blindfolded for all these years and knowing only that today, little as they have, they are better off than they were under the Tsar, materially? Our expectations must be reasonable.

We can expect the Russian people to eventually demand more freedom and democratic process, and we must do everything we can to penetrate the Iron Curtain and tell the Russian people the true story of the free enterprise system. But it may be a slow development.

We cannot expect the Russian people to suddenly and immediately understand or desire our system. Nor can we assume that our system is so perfect that merely as an example to the world it will eventually win over everyone to its cause. That will have to come in good time, as we succeed in penetrating the censorship and Iron Curtain with our message, and improving our system.

Perhaps the germ we can spread which will do more good than any other is the germ of individual freedom we hold so dear. This spark has been the igniting force behind most of the world's great democratic movements, and in time, it will produce a ground swell of antitotalitarian sentiment which will overthrow repression.

It took the American colonists some years before they resolved to fight and die for independence. It is disappointing that the Russian people do not feel this way even as late as 1962. But then the Russian peasant has endured an incredibly hard existence for centuries and knows little of freedom. He has never enjoyed it.

He must learn about it from others, then, from abroad. This is why we must do our best to tell our story inside Russia and get the message to the people of Russia. Even if we do our best, it may take some time before the Russian people demand the freedoms and rights which many Western peoples have long enjoyed.

But, eventually, the Russian people will demand individual freedom, and overthrow dictatorship. That is the trend and history of the world. It could be a long time before this reaction is successful. Meanwhile, we can aggressively tell the story of the free enterprise system, to all the world, and do what we can to show the light to the people of the U.S.S.R. That is our hope since Communist Party leaders, in possession of the power of state, will not reform themselves. And they are not interested in a just solution to world problems or real democracy.

No $280,000 for Brazilian Soccer Club From AID

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday; August 14, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most foolish rumors which has appeared lately is one which states that the Agency for International Development, through the Alliance for Progress, has allocated $280,000 to a Brazilian soccer club. This particular information appeared in a syndicated column.

To kill this rumor I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter which I received from the Agency for International Development with reference thereto:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1962.

The Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: Thank you for your letter of August 2, requesting information concerning the statement quoted by Miss Kilgallen to the effect that the Alliance for Progress is about to allocate $280,000 to the Flamingo Soccer Club of Rio de Janeiro.

Obviously, there has been some misunderstanding, as there is absolutely no foundation to the statement made by the Brazilian newspaper, Diario de Noticias, which she quoted, that such an allocation would be made.

Ambassador Gordon did congratulate the national Brazilian soccer team on its winning the world championship, but no funds have been granted or even considered for any activity connected with the Brazilian soccer club.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SALTER,
Assistant Administrator, AID, Congressional Liaison.

Pharmaceuticals: Study of Industry a Boon to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I quoted an editorial from one of the papers in my district that called upon the Congress to act in protecting the public interest with respect to the use of newly discovered drugs. From this it should not be inferred that the American pharmaceutical industry itself is working against that interest. To the contrary, leaders throughout this vitally important industry—so well represented in my own State of New Jersey—have consistently pledged themselves and acted in behalf of that public interest.

One of the most energetic and distinguished among the younger leaders of the pharmaceutical industry is Dr. V. D. Mattia, vice president and director, Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc., of Nutley, N.J. In addition to being one of my constituents, Dr. Barney Mattia is one of my dearest, most respected personal friends. Though he is an acknowledged leader in his industry, the doctor is first of all a dedicated citizen, who thinks and acts in terms of what he can to do to contribute to the citizens of our community, and of our whole Nation. How strongly Barney Mattia considers and respects his responsibility as a citizen is reflected in an article that he wrote which appeared on August 10 in John Soloway's column, "Jersey Business," a regular feature of the Newark Star-Ledger.

I am sure that when my colleagues read Dr. Mattia's piece, they will be heartened, as I am, that in our legislative actions, we have behind us in the search for the ultimate in protecting the public the actions of highly intelligent, completely ethical industrial leaders.

PHARMACEUTICAL: STUDY OF INDUSTRY A BOON TO ALL

(By Dr. V. D. Mattia)

Today, American medicine has reached crossroads in history. The whole system of medical care is under intense public scrutiny because people feel entitled to benefit from advances in medical sciences, no matter what their cost.

Progress in this field has been impressive. For example, during the period of 1900–60 the average life expectancy has increased from 47 to 69 years, today, 4.4 million Americans are alive who would have died if the 1937 death rate had continued at that level.

These figures show that the majority of the people in this country have benefited from medical advances. Yet we must acknowledge the existence of serious problems.

They may affect only a small number of people; but to the retired couple living on social security the cost of modern drugs may be a heavy burden. Granted that a $12 prescription for an antibiotic may save a life and prevent expensive hospitalization, it is still beyond the means of a man who is rearing a large family on $90 a week. Obviously a workable solution to the cost of medication must be found in the near future.

It cannot be denied that those who develop, manufacture, dispense, and prescribe modern drugs hold a position of public trust. Understandably enough, the pharmaceutical industry has recently come under close scrutiny, especially by Senator KEFAUVER. His investigation has received extensive publicity, for the explosive growth of this relatively young industry has resulted in both benefits and problems for the patient and the physician in true democratic tradition, the policies and practices of the drug industry had to be analyzed and appraised. No doubt the industry has made some mistakes. In my opinion, their frank discussion has made it a better industry and the public is the beneficiary.

What was not made clear during the investigation is the importance of competition. The American public greatly benefits from this competition since it is the spur that leads to greater emphasis on research, resulting in the development of better, more effective drugs.

Another benefit of competition has been the shortened gap between scientific advances and their availability in medical practice. Formerly, major discoveries often shared the fate of penicillin which was found in 1929, prior to the growth of the pharmaceutical industry, but became available only in 1942. Today's relentless competitive pressure has minimized such delays.

Competition has also resulted in emphasis on greater efficiency, producing substantial savings for the American public. In spite of steep increases in the cost of raw materials and labor, the price of prescription drugs has increased less than the cost of living.

As may be expected, public attention has been focused on the economic aspects of medical care—a subject likely to arouse considerable passion. It would be a tragedy if this passion—frequently aggravated by political factors—were to drive a wedge between the various elements so essential to medical progress.

In a system like ours, confronted by serious problems, it is absolutely folly for any one group—be it the pharmaceutical industry, the medical profession or the Government—to "go it alone." The inescapable truth is that Government, industry, organized medicine and research institutions have a joint responsibility to the public. Fair solutions to the economic problems of medical care must be worked out; but other problems of equal magnitude remain to be solved if the all-out battle against cancer, heart attacks, arthritis and other serious scourges is to be won.

President Kennedy has expressed a desire to lower the cost of medical care and to promote medical research. This will best be accomplished only when each member of the team—Government, industry, the medical profession, and medical research centers—

takes a constructive approach to public scrutiny.

In particular, the pharmaceutical industry has to face the need for new legislation, for months of intensive inquiry leave little doubt about its desirability. In the public interest, it is to be hoped that Congress will pass a sound, reasonable law rather than listen to the advocates of punitive, restrictive measures. The public must be protected and the industry needs scope to intensify its search for better drugs.

Some brokers have become disillusioned with the pharmaceutical industry but most stockholders will in the long run reap satisfactory benefits from investment in progressive pharmaceutical companies. The unique responsibility of the pharmaceutical industry demands that these benefits be shared by the patient and the physician, as well as the stockholders.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Great and Hospitable Community of Mount Carmel, Pa., Is Gloriously Celebrating Its 100th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening I had the honor and privilege of attending the opening of the centennial celebration at Mount Carmel, Pa., with the week's great activities opening with an Americanism program at the fine Catholic high school field.

My good friend and colleague, Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, for 3 consecutive years national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and a leader in the activities of all veterans' organizations, was the principal speaker. In his usual forceful manner JIMMY delivered an excellent discourse.

Mr. Speaker, Mount Carmel and its people are among the most hospitable in the United States. I have many close and dear friends in Mount Carmel, and I certainly would have liked to be present for the entire week and renew acquaintances with those who came from far and near to join in the celebration.

However, Mr. Speaker, I was present at the opening program in Mount Carmel and I know the people of that fine American community realize it was more important for me to return to Washington to represent their interests in the busy schedule and important matters we are having this week both in committees and on the floor of the House.

The Mount Carmel Item, Mr. Speaker, estimated that more than 35,000 persons witnessed the great opening spectacle, fittingly designated as "Americanism Day." Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the progressive and alert Mount Carmel Item published an excellent centennial edition on Monday which consisted of 40 pages and contains much information about good old Mount Carmel, which was incorporated as a borough on November 3, 1862.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was a wonderful opening for Mount Carmel's 100th anniversary celebration, and the many committees in charge, as well as all the citizens of Mount Carmel can well feel proud of their accomplishments during the past century.

Mount Carmel is a community of all nationalities. It is a real and typical American community whose sons and daughters have fought in many wars. Many of them went on to win national acclaim, and the list is so extensive that to mention them individually might result in some one being overlooked. However, suffice to say that many of these names have and will go down in history; for Mount Carmel has always stood ready to give its all under the Stars and Stripes.

Mount Carmel is a community that has also gone through many domestic battles to maintain its economy, but each time it emerges bigger and greater. From a onetime area who activities were almost confined to the production of anthracite, its citizens have forged forward and today are engaged in an expansion of industrial activities which will create greater advancement and progress for all the citizens of this fair community.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the opening centennial program having as its guest speaker, it had another star-studded attraction in the appearance and participation of its native-born daughter, Miss Marie Powers, internationally famous opera star.

Miss Powers, who has thrilled music lovers throughout the world, was brilliant and enchanting in her hometown appearance. The local folk will long remember their vocal pride for the great voice and fine renditions she give to opening her home community's centennial celebration.

In all, Mr. Speaker, it was a wonderful Americanism program to open Mount Carmel's centennial and was presented as follows: master of ceremonies, Mr. Arthur A. Bressi; invocation, the Reverend Robert G. Detwiler; greetings by the mayor, the Honorable Lawrence R. Joyce; greetings by centennial chairman, Dr. Robert E. Allen; Americanism address, Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT; concert, Miss Marie Powers, accompanied by Mr. George Corty, presenting "The Lord's Prayer," "My Days Have Been So Wondrous Fair," "Peace of Mind," "Song for the Lonely," "The Hero," "O Mio Fernando"—from "La Favorita"—and "Air Dido."

Benediction, Most Rev. Lawrence F. Schott, D.D., LL.D., "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," with soloist Marie Powers accompanied by the Mount Carmel High School Band and Centennial Chorus conducted by Mr. Edmund Nejaimey.

The great audience joined the program participants in singing "The Star-Spangled Banner," and it was a thrilling climax as music and voices reverberated throughout a community which is proudly proclaiming to the world this is our centennial, our community is 100 years old and ready to go forward with greater enthusiasm and spirit in the dawn and twilight of "Onward Christian Soldiers."

Yes, these citizens and soldiers of Americanism in Mount Carmel are celebrating the 100th natal anniversary of the borough's birthday, and that they will go on to many more centennial and glorious celebrations I know is the wish of all the Members of this House.

Independence Day of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the Acting President of Korea, General Park Chung Hee; and His Excellency the Korean Ambassador to the United States, General Il Kwon Chung, on the occasion of the 14th anniversary of Korea's independence.

When on August 15, 1948, the U.S. administration of South Korea was terminated, a new era of Korean independence was inaugurated. It is the anniversary of this occasion that we celebrate today.

In fulfillment of pledges made at the 1943 Cairo Conference the United States and other nations set out at the conclusion of the Second World War to help Korea gain freedom and self-government. Although some 35 years of Japanese colonial rule was ended, the joy of Koreans was dampened by the separation of the two halves of their country. Originally designed merely to expedite the surrender of Japanese forces, this division of the country at the 38th parallel became fixed, because of Soviet recalcitrance. The elections which were to have reunited the country were never held, as the Communists in the north refused to allow the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea to enter the territory under their control. Consequently, the U.N.-supervised free election was held only in South Korea. This election led to the installation of the Republic of Korea's first independent government.

It has been Korea's fate to have had to provide the unhappy battlefield for one of the major confrontations between freedom and totalitarianism in the modern era. Tragically miscalculating free world willingness to deter Communist aggression, the North Korean puppet government mounted a fierce attack on the south in June 1950. Finally, after millions of casualties had been suffered, an armistice was reached in July 1953. Although the fighting has now been over for 9 years, South Korea still bears a heavy burden from the war's cruel legacy of misery. Millions of refugees poured into the country during the Korean war, thereby adding to the already considerable population pressure on the Nation's land resources. Furthermore, because of the ominous threat posed by the Communists to the north, South Korea has had to keep some 600,000 men in the military services, and now has the fourth largest standing army in the world. Half of the South Korean budget goes for defense, which necessarily puts great strains on Korea's attempts to achieve economic prosperity.

The first 5-year economic development program, which is now in progress, seeks to eliminate waste, usury, bribery, and corruption, and to lay the groundwork for broad economic advance. I believe that with the successful implementation of this plan, Korea's traditional dead hand of poverty can be replaced by the seeds of long-term national prosperity. Among its major exports, the South Korean Government has undertaken the construction of the great Ulsan industrial complex, about which Acting President Chung Hee Park has said:

> It is no exaggeration to say that the development of Korean industry depends on the success of this project.

President Park has pledged that control of the country will be returned to civilian hands not later than the summer of 1963. While not detracting from the positive aspects of the present Government, most Americans will welcome this restoration.

I believe that the Korean people are today experiencing a new awakening and consolidation of their national spirit. I offer them my best wishes in this great effort, and I am pleased to extend my congratulations to the people of Korea on this 14th anniversary of Korean Independence Day.

Dresden Nuclear Powerplant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article which appeared in the Thursday, August 9, 1962, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, of St. Louis, Mo.:

DRESDEN, ILL., NUCLEAR PLANT TOPS IN OUTPUT

WASHINGTON.—Dresden nuclear power station in Illinois has generated more electricity than any other nuclear powerplant in the Nation, Dresden's general superintendent said Wednesday.

From the beginning of its operation last December through August 1, the plant generated 898,540,600 kilowatt-hours of electrical power, Superintendent I. L. Wade said.

Furthermore, Mr. Wade told Examiner Samuel W. Jensch, of the Atomic Energy Commission, the reactor in Grundy County on the Illinois River has operated safely to date and is expected to continue to do so.

Mr. Wade's testimony came in a hearing on a request by the Commonwealth Edison Co., Chicago, to amend the operating license.

The amendment would permit an increase in the rated power of the reactor to about 200,000 electrical kilowatts from approximately 180,000.

Private Enterprise Almost Ignored in Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will shortly be considering the foreign aid appropriation, the following suggestions by Dr. Salera are most timely:

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE ALMOST IGNORED IN ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: DR. VIRGIL SALERA OF EISENHOWER ADVISERS REVIEWS LATIN SCENE

The Alliance for Progress program for Latin American development was seen as undoubtedly helpful—but far too costly for anticipated benefits, in a talk before the international relations section by Dr. Virgil Salera, professor of economics, Alameda County State College.

Dr. Salera, who has had extensive research experience in Argentina, Venezuela, and Peru, is a former senior staff member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers.

DOUBTS 2½ PERCENT INCREASE AVAILABLE

"One of the key objectives of the Alliance for Progress," he pointed out, "is per capita increase in real income of 2½ percent per year for Latin American nations. It is highly doubtful that this objective will be achieved. The Alliance's prototype—the Marshall plan—faced a vastly different task—restoring an already advanced technology in a period when other countries were short of dollars. Today, in contrast, the U.S. balance of payments is wobbly and in Latin America we have to start from scratch."

Professor Salera stated that the Punta del Este agreement contained virtually nothing regarding the role of private enterprise—the first time in any inter-American economic agreement this most vital factor was almost completely ignored.

He said his four main criticisms of the program were, first, capitulation to the Latin American rationale in regard to the terms of trade—the belief that Latin American countries are entitled to virtual financial grants on the theory they have suffered a disadvantageous position over the years in regard to the products they sell as against the products they buy. What they seek is essentially an international farm parity program.

NO TRADE DISADVANTAGE FOR LATIN AMERICANS

Actually, the Latin American theory that terms of trade have been disadvantageous to them is based on faulty interpretation of almost totally inadequate statistics. If allowance were made for the transportation revolution and resulting price changes, the same data would show a sharp improvement in terms of trade. Also ignored is the relationship of product improvement to price.

Yet these questionable statistics have raised the pulse rate of millions, and were the basis for the demand for U.S. generosity.

Latin Americans are convinced that the U.S. left—and I don't mean Communists, but I do mean to be vague—will win in our internal contest over the generosity of our aid. To the extent that we capitulate to this viewpoint, we strongly discourage private investment by Latinos in their own countries.

NAIVE FAITH IN GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Professor Salera's second main criticism was the naive faith in government-to-government operations as the main vehicle for achieving economic development. "In the last analysis," he said, "we have to rely on the drive and initiative of millions of private individuals. With some exceptions, moreover, the quality of public administration in most Latin American countries is horrible."

Industrialization is easiest when a strong agriculture provides buying power.

JOKER IN KENNEDY COFFEE AGREEMENT

Third, Dr. Salera said, there is an enormous joker in the Kennedy commitment to a coffee agreement.

Coffee is the oldest commodity involving experimentation with so-called stabilization—dating back to São Paulo's attempt in 1902. Unlike the 1940 coffee agreement, the new one has a price provision, and if you use parity in coffee, you shell out big money fast in disregard of economic forces.

The Common Market will shake American habits to the roots, eventually in the best interest of American society.

Incentive To Steal and Cheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Government controls over production of crops create a strange new property value, representing the right to grow. The price tag on what used to be a universal right varies with the degree to which the heavy hand of Government is laid upon the land.

In wheat, the right to grow is worth about $50 an acre. The tighter the controls, the greater the property value. Controls over wheat, for example, are relatively loose, and here the right to grow is worth about $50 an acre. In cotton, more tightly controlled, the right to grow is worth about $200 an acre. Tobacco is the most tightly controlled of all crops, and here the right to grow ranges as high as $3,000 an acre.

Here is an interesting comment on this topic published August 13 in the Washington D.C., News:

MORE OF SAME

And now a Texas farmer and a Texas employee of the Agriculture Department have pleaded guilty to participating in fraudulent sales of Federal rice-planting allotments.

The right to grow rice is so valuable the farmer had been bribing the Agriculture employee to let him sell illegally his rice allotments.

These two crooks had nothing to do with Billie Sol Estes and his cotton allotment shenanigans. But the case serves to underscore again, if any underscoring were needed, the sad state existing in the agriculture program which was set up years ago to save the so-called family-sized farm and ward off farm bankruptcy.

The family-size farm is fast disappearing and the billions poured out to maintain prices way above the cost of production are so lush they provide an incentive for many to steal and cheat. As Senator FULBRIGHT put it in the recent debate on the sugar bill: "Where there is sugar, there you will find the flies."

And, the way we see it, if Agriculture Secretary Freeman has his way, we can expect more of this sort of thing—because with increased curtailment of production and continued support of prices at well above the cost of production, the right to grow will become just that much more valuable and the skulduggery will increase.

The way out is, as a special panel of the privately financed and nonpartisan Committee for Economic Development recently recommended, a 5-year program to set American agriculture free, using almost every conceivable Federal tool and aid to help the farmer during the period of adjustment.

The American farmers, once they've taken off the federally administered narcotics, will do fine. And there'll be none going to jail for allotment shenanigans.

Policy in Peru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Lima, Peru, written presumably by two Americans residing there, appeared in this morning's Washington Post, August 15.

The letter is timely and brings out once again that we apparently have no policy, only a strong inclination to be soft on communism, while proclaiming the reverse, and of course very rough on anticommunism wherever it appears.

Why, for instance, is the policy toward Peru totally different to the policy toward Argentina? As is well said in the letter:

> Ironically, while today Frondizi remains a prisoner, Manuel Prado is a freeman.

Maybe this is due to the benign influence of Juan Peron and his Peronistas.

The letter follows:

POLICY IN PERU

> As Americans living in Peru, who are deeply concerned about Peru's democratic evolution, we feel that the United States has taken an unrealistic approach toward recent events. Although we condemn the military coup in principle and deplore its overthrow of a democratic regime, we think we should look at the situation as it is and not as we think it ought to be.
>
> The military junta is in firm control of the country, resting upon a broad base of popular support. It has restored all constitutional guarantees of civil liberties, and it has promised to discharge its international obligations. In addition, the junta, which is vigorously anti-Communist, has pledged to hold free elections within a year, and its leaders have disqualified themselves as candidates.
>
> What makes the U.S. policy of drastic sanctions against the new Government even more untenable is its hypocrisy. Four months ago in Argentina, when the army deposed the constitutional ruler of the country, Arturo Frondizi, Uncle Sam never blinked an eyelash. The United States maintained diplomatic relations and continued intact its extensive aid program. Ironically, while today Frondizi remains a prisoner, Manuel Prado is a freeman.
>
> Furthermore, by withholding recognition and all assistance, we run the risk of forcing the new Government into the arms of the Communists.
>
> The final note of unrealism has been struck by the suspension of the Peace Corps program of Peru. The Peace Corps should not be primarily an instrument of U.S. foreign policy subject to the same contingencies as economic and military aid, but rather a humanitarian enterprise immune to political changes.
>
> For all these reasons we urge recognition of the Perez Godoy regime and prompt renewal of all assistance.
>
> LLOYD SYMINGTON, Jr.
> JOHN H. DAVIS.
>
> LIMA, PERU.

Independence Day of the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Congo, the Abbe Fulbert Youlou, on the occasion of the second anniversary of the Congo's independence.

The advent of the former French Congo as an independent nation has been far overshadowed by the more dramatic entrance of its sister republic, the former Belgian Congo, into the community of sovereign states. Thus, it would be well if, on this second anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Congo—Brazzaville—we look a moment at its political structure and at its accomplishments since independence.

The Constitution of the Republic of the Congo rests on the principle of popular sovereignty and specifically states that the Republic is "indivisible, democratic, and social." It provides for a separation of powers and a parliamentary system whereby the President is elected by the National Assembly. Its preamble invokes the French declaration of the rights of man. Thus, the Republic of the Congo is undeniably a democracy in the Western sense, since it has evolved a political system which guarantees individual liberties and balanced parliamentary government.

In the economic sphere the Congo Government has shown wisdom and forethought. Recognizing the continuing need for foreign advisers in a number of technical fields, the newly independent government retained some 500 French technicians. The Congo has remained a member of the franc zone, an important factor in the stabilization of its currency. It has applied for membership in numerous international organizations interested in economic development programs, such as the U.N. specialized agencies and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. For the purpose of encouraging both domestic and foreign investment, the Government has adopted a code providing guarantees for qualified business ventures. A National Development Bank has been created in order to assist financially and technically in economic and social development projects. All of these actions are important and well reasoned steps for a country which is attempting to raise its standard of living to the maximum possible in a minimum amount of time.

But social programs have not been neglected. Education has improved at all levels, and approximately 31 percent of the 1961 budget was allocated to educational expansion. Nearly 80 percent of the elementary school age population was attending school, as compared with 75 percent in 1960 and 65 percent in 1959. A center offering university-level training was opened in Brazzaville in 1959, and there are now over 200 students attending it.

In the field of inter-African cooperation, too, the Congo has asserted its leadership and has been a moderating influence. The Brazzaville group of 12 French-speaking states takes its name from the capital of the Congo, where it met in December 1960 to discuss the situation in Léopoldville, across the river. The group endorsed U.N. technical assistance and rejected intervention by African states. Its decisions of later meetings, at which plans for economic and political coordination were formulated, were equally moderate.

The Congo has continued to maintain close economic links with France and has remained a member of the French community. Soon after its accession to independence it became a member of the United Nations under French sponsorship. Its domestic policy has been well reasoned. In foreign affairs it has been cooperative and constructive. We commend the Republic of the Congo and President Fulbert Youlou for a noteworthy record of accomplishment.

The Power of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, we are at present living in a period of turmoil and uncertainty. Our country's interests need the best thought and cooperation of all our citizens and our leaders.

In this crucial period it is fitting that all God-fearing peoples of the world, and particularly all our citizens and leaders, constantly remember the omnipotence of Almighty God and the need for His aid and guidance. We should, through fervent and earnest prayer, ask

Him to watch over the people of our great Nation, our local, State, and National leaders, and to grant us the wisdom and knowledge to steer us through this critical period in our Nation's history. All of us are aware that it is through God's blessing that our great country has made such progress and become the most powerful Nation on earth. We therefore should be anxious to express our gratefulness and thanks to God for these many blessings bestowed upon the people of our country, and ask through prayer for His continued guidance and blessings.

In this connection, I would like to include herewith an article which appeared in the November 1961 issue of the Masonic Messenger written by Chaplain Wilmer C. Tolleson of the Morningside Lodge No. 295, F. & A.M., Atlanta, Ga., on the subject of prayer:

PRAYER

(By Wilmer C. Tolleson, chaplain, Morningside Lodge No. 295, F. & A.M., Atlanta, Ga.)

My subject is "Prayer," the most valuable power that Almighty God has bestowed upon us. By the gift of prayer, we are enabled to communicate with our Creator immediately and without a time interval. Prayer travels with greater speed than any space vehicle that man will ever be able to create. Prayer is more valuable than all of the gold, rubies, and diamonds in all of this great universe which Almighty God created long ago. It seems to me that when a prayer has been answered we should give thanks right away for God's goodness in answering our pleas and supplications. Be thankful and He will bless thee. When we come into this world a prayer is on our mother's lips for her newborn babe. And when we pass out of this world and have served the days that God has blessed us with, a final prayer is offered for us by the minister at our graveside.

FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

To quote the Holy Bible, Joe said of prayer, fifth chapter, 8th to 10th versus: "I would seek unto God, and unto God would I commit my cause, which doeth great things and unsearchable marvelous things without number, who giveth rain upon the earth and sendeth waters upon the fields."

FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT

Again quoting the Holy Bible in Revelation, 21st chapter: "I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, behold the tabernacle of God is with men * * * and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things have passed away."

All healing whether it is immediate or of long duration is done by divine power. Let us not be unmindful of the instruments that God uses to heal the sick. The power and skill that He gives to physicians and surgeons and how He opens the way to new discoveries in medicines, many of which are known as miracle drugs. But let us remember also that we also live and exist in miracles. The power of communication to each other by voice, the power of sight, the power of knowledge, the power of strength, and the power of God's love to us.

The heavens are telling the glory of God, the unweary sun from day to day does His creative power display. The beauties of the stars in the heavens, the moon with all of its beauty answers the atheist when he says that he does not believe in God. The almighty hands of God placed the stars and the planets in their positions and proved that Almighty God is divine and the greatest of all mathematicians. "All glory, laud, and honor to Thee, Redeemer King, to whom the lips of children make sweet hosannas ring."

Cotton Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the full effect of Secretary Freeman's unwise action on cotton supports is just now coming to light. Mr. Freeman's action was away from competitive pricing, and it has invited use of synthetics and substitutes.

I invite attention to this article which appeared August 8 in the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal:

COTTON COMMENT: LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN FUTURE OF COTTON, BROUGHT ON BY FREEMAN'S POLICIES, TURNS MARKETS TO OTHER FIBERS, OTHER GROWTHS

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

The administration of the laws covering cotton have been administered in such a way by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman that customers of cotton at home and abroad have lost confidence in the staple and are turning to other growths and fibers abroad and other fibers at home.

Until Secretary Freeman undertook to wreck the cotton economy, there was a feeling of confidence that cotton was on the track toward competitive pricing in domestic and world markets; that crops would be of sufficient size to meet demands, and that there would be some measure of stability of price.

Since the start of the reign of Freeman, there has been no stability, no assurance, no confidence. His first action against cotton was to jack the price higher at a time when it was believed the trend would be gradually lower. To compound the confusion, he juggled the export subsidy in a manner to raise the price of cotton in foreign markets between 1 and 2 cents a pound.

In spite of dwindling exports, he maintained the same price levels and the same export subsidy for the current season. Registrations for export this season already are more than a million bales behind those of last year, and the season has barely started.

He has encouraged the use of rayon and other fibers in the place of cotton as no single man has ever done. New blends of rayon and cotton are being produced in increasing volume and with every blend the use of cotton suffers.

Already towels are being produced that are 30 percent rayon. Sheets will be available this fall that are 40 percent. Dress fabrics will have a 50-50 division between rayon and cotton.

The main reason is that mill after mill is losing confidence in the future availability of cotton as a competing fiber. To meet their competition they are being forced—because of pricing—to turn to rayon. Some do it reluctantly. Some welcome the change from uncertainty to assurance.

The price of cotton does not have to be lowered materially in the domestic market to restore it to its competitive position with rayon. The export subsidy can and should be maintained until farmers find that new practices, new methods permit the production of cotton in competition with the world.

The effect of the transition to rayon has not been noticeable to many because of the high textile production in recent months. The full impact will come with the current season, when the projects which have just been started get into full production.

Also of interest is this open letter to thinking farmers published in the May–June issue of Cotton Farming magazine:

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
May 21, 1962.

GENTLEMEN: I made my annual trip to the cotton mill area of Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee April 15 to May 5. I drove 3,159 miles and saw 54 mills which will this year spin 5,905,500 bales of cotton.

I ran into a situation which is very disturbing. I found that 34 mills are blending some synthetics with cotton and trying to work out consumer acceptance of these products. This is at least three or four times as many mills as the number blending synthetics on my trip last year. Rayon staple fiber is selling on a basis of 26 cents per pound net weight delivered to mill.

I found one mill who could buy first-quality foreign staple fiber at 25 cents delivered to mill net weight. When you consider cotton at present prices and add the expense of bagging and ties (tare) and giving consideration to the waste factor in cotton, you can see how much higher cotton is at present prices than is rayon. I have found consistently that most cotton mills would rather spin cotton, but in their present situation, they are going to use fibers which will show them more profit, if the consumers will accept these blends.

It is a known fact that a towel manufacturer is making some towels for Sears, Roebuck, and you would do well to secure a copy of the summer catalog of Sears. You will see towels advertised on page 316, and the first 17 pages of this catalog features synthetic and cotton blends. If you will look through the catalog you will find various other advertisements of articles made from blends. Sears is not the type of organization that will invest its money in something unless they feel that they can develop consumer acceptance. If it were not for the labeling law, I am certain that we would be in much more serious trouble in domestic consumption this year. If, however, consumers accept the product at a cheaper price, we are in serious trouble down the road.

The present price of cotton is simply lending every encouragement to the development of blends. At one mill I found five men with doctors' degrees who were in the mill representing various synthetic companies, showing the mill how they could use synthetics to advantage. The present price of cotton, in my judgment, is giving just as much of an umbrella to synthetics in the domestic market as our foreign price of cotton did to foreign cotton production several years ago.

We will consume more bales of cotton this year than last season but our per capita consumption of cotton is going down. I do not feel that we can be satisfied with the consumption running from 8 to 9 million bales a year but that consumption should increase as the textile market increases. We can never have satisfactory acreage with small cotton consumption.

I am simply writing you the facts as I see them, and I can say to you very frankly that it is the most disturbing situation that I have found in the mill area in the 10 years that I have made these trips to that area. I feel that you men, as leaders in the industry and thinking farmers, will want to be acquainted with the facts. It is true that as yet the percentage of consumption of synthetics at many mills is less than 5 percent of their total production but the fact remains that the "foot is in the door" and in a much larger way than any previous season.

Sincerely,

C. C. Smith,
Vice President,
National Bank of Commerce.

My Rating's Slipped, Start World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Art Hoppe, columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, has the unique ability of approaching some of our problems by means of humorous satire.

I include the column published in the San Francisco Chronicle on Monday, August 13, 1962:

MY RATING'S SLIPPED, START WORLD WAR III

(By Art Hoppe)

I was about to warn you this morning to grit your teeth and gird your loins for another peace scare. Laos is over, Berlin is relatively quiet, Mr. Castro is likewise, there's some hope of a nuclear test ban, and the world is in pretty good shape. Comparatively speaking.

But then I saw where Mr. Kennedy's popularity is down to 69 percent. So we can all relax, peace scarewise.

Mr. Kennedy's popularity is terribly important. Particularly to Mr. Kennedy. When he took office, the polls showed his popularity was only 69 percent. Three points lower than Lassie. The other 31 percent said he was too young and inexperienced and would make some horrendous mistake.

This, obviously, was a challenge. Mr. Kennedy vigorously set about to meet it. He went and made a horrendous mistake.

Three months after taking office, he sponsored a little old invasion of Cuba. The liberals screamed he shouldn't have done it. The conservatives screamed he should have done it better. And everybody in the whole country, including Mr. Kennedy, agreed it was a horrendous mistake. Ranking with the worst any American President had ever made.

The following week his popularity zoomed up to a record 83 percent. Topping "I Love Lucy."

Mr. Kennedy naturally relaxed. He went to work on a rationally reasonable domestic program and a reasonably rational foreign affairs program. After 3 perfectly blameless months, his popularity had rocketed downward to 71 percent.

Something had to be done. So we had the Berlin crisis. The conservatives demanded Mr. Kennedy knock the wall down. The liberals demanded he back away from it. Mr. Kennedy did neither. War seemed imminent. Most Americans agreed he had made a horrendous mistake. One way or another. Not as horrendous as Cuba, but pretty horrendous.

So his popularity soared back up to 79 percent.

Then Mr. Kennedy made a real mistake. He got mad at Mr. Roger Blough. Stocks plummeted. And because the stock market, unlike world peace, affects people personally, a good many Americans got sore. And Mr. Kennedy today is right back where he started at a crumby 69 percent.

It's a challenge. Clearly he must capitalize on his maturity and experience and make some fantastically horrendous mistake in international affairs. Like invading Red China and thereby losing several divisions of Marines.

For it is obvious from the pollsters' findings that the more awful a mistake a President makes abroad, the more popular he is at home. And any President who achieved a lasting peace would promptly get impeached.

So, while it was touch and go there, I'm sure we don't have worry about a possible peace scare. Because Mr. Kennedy, above all, wishes to be loved by everybody. We should live so long.

A Visit to Soviet Russia and Other Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, recently a constituent of our Eighth Congressional District, Mr. Horace C. Colvett, of Alamo, Tenn., visited Soviet Russia and other countries with a group of Tennesseans.

Mr. Colvett is an outstanding educator and is now with the Tennessee State Department of Education.

There appeared in the Crockett Times, an outstanding weekly newspaper of Alamo, Tenn., his observations of this trip. This article is so outstanding that I felt that I should bring it to the attention of the membership of hte Congress.

The article follows:

[From the Alamo (Tenn.) Crockett Times, July 26, 1962]

A VISIT TO SOVIET RUSSIA AND OTHER COUNTRIES

(By H. C. Colvett)

The question might be asked, Why would a man want to go to Russia and the satellite countries? Also if he did want to go, how could he get into Russia and these countries?

A few years ago President Eisenhower and his coworkers established a program called The people-to-people program. Through this program tours are established. These tours are primarily informative, educational good-will missions dedicated to improving relations and understanding between Americans and the people of Eastern Europe.

No Federal or State funds were provided. Each person going on these tours agrees to pay his own expenses or be sent by a sponsoring organization. My expenses were paid by the Tennessee Vocational Education Association, an organization made up of vocational education personnel in Tennessee, having an approximate membership of 1,200.

A group of 34 Tennesseans interested in studying the agricultural situations that exist, also the people and their customs in Belgium, Russia, Hungary, Poland, France, and England, left New York June 23 for a 3-week visit.

The group left New York on a Boeing 707 jet for Brussels, Belgium, and arrived in time for an early breakfast on June 24 after a 6½-hour flight. On a tour of Brussels Sunday afternoon we found the people extremely friendly and happy to see Americans. On Monday the group traveled into rural Belgium to visit a dairy farm. Again we found the people happy and proud; the kind of pride that goes with owning your own home and farm.

Before going on the farm tour we were briefed by American Ambassador to Belgium Douglas MacArthur II. He explained the Common Market and named the countries that are members. These countries are Germany, Belgium, France, Italy, Holland, and Luxembourg. The U.S. businessmen no longer enjoy the virtual monopoly left by the destruction of industrial Germany, Japan, and other war-devasted countries. From now on we must get out and sell our products.

After a brief visit to Amsterdam, Holland, the next stop was Moscow, the seat of the Soviet Government. A 2-day tour of the city was on the agenda before traveling into the Russian interior.

A traveler should never limit his tour of Russia to a visit of Moscow, because the Soviets have gone to some lengths to make it and a few other cities a showplace for tourists and people they want to impress.

Once inside of Russia, the Intourist Bureau takes full control and unless the tourist specifically requests special side trips he will see exactly what the Soviets want him to see. The Intourist Bureau is a Government agency which takes care of every phase of the trip, including hotel and transportation reservations. The guides are highly indoctrinated party-line people, but not always members of the party.

One aspect of Moscow and everywhere else in Russia was the constant, well-organized propaganda, network. Wherever we went there were billboards and posters telling the Russian people what they had once had, what they have now, and what they are going to have.

The group stayed at the Ukraine Hotel, which has 26 floors, and over 2,000 rooms. This hotel was built in 1955, but looks much older.

Intourist had tours arranged for three showplaces of Moscow: the Kremlin, Lenin's tomb, and Moscow University. Within the Kremlin, which is really a walled city within the city of Moscow, was St. Basile's Church, now a museum, as are a great many of the Russian churches. Our guide proudly told us she did not believe in God, and that religion there is taught "as a part of history."

Moscow University, completed in 1953, is a massive building. Eighty percent of the 18,000 students enrolled at the university are Government subsidized. Several hard-to-believe statements were made by our guide. She said proudly that Russia has 18 doctors per 10,000 population. America has only 12, England, 10. A peculiar thing, however, is that with the exception of one of our group who got sick and was sent to a hospital, other members of the group did not see a single hospital. This one member states from his experience that socialized medicine has nothing to offer.

Propaganda, the constant selling of the people's paradise by the Soviets, was one important aspect of our visit by all members of the group. Unified efforts are always put forth in spreading their propaganda.

We have a far better system in the United States, but we've always lacked this type of unified salesmanship when it comes to our country. I believe with people from all walks of life benefiting from our free society, that all of us should become better salesmen for freedom and America.

The group went from Moscow to Krasnodar, which is 800 miles deeper into Russia. This city was selected by the Russians for the group to visit. It is south of Moscow near the Black Sea. This is one of the best agricultural sections of Russia. Here we saw firsthand the black-and-white difference of Soviet and U.S. agricultural policies.

During the 1930's, following the nationalization of all land in 1929, more than 20 million small peasant holdings were consolidated into collective or state farms.

Unlike Poland where collective and state farms account for only 14 percent, the Soviet Union has 95 percent of all sown acreage under their direct control (70 percent collective and 25 percent state farms). Today, there are 76,500 collective and 7,000 state farms, but all are government owned.

On the collective share of profits, the farmers have the status of factory workers, but do not receive a regular wage, only a share of the profits. The average family wage which they receive only after all other bills are paid, is reported to be $100 to $150 per month per family. But on this prize-winning farm we visited the average wage figured to be about $750 per year for the whole family.

The similarity between a factory job and working on a state farm is almost exact. Both receive a regular wage, which is roughly the same, with no profit sharing.

While the Soviet collective farm averages about 4,200 acres (the U.S. average farm acreage is 310) the state-owned farms average more than 20,000 acres.

Theoretically, management of the collective farm is done through worker-elected supervisors, but they are replaced at will by Communist Party administrators if they do not follow party dictates. Operation of the farm is carried out through appointed supervisors in control of work brigades of from 40 to 60 men and women.

One collective farm had an active work force of 1,900 workers (both men and women) drawn from the 1,400 families who live at the farm. They operated 68 tractors, 36 combines and 30 trucks. Numbers of horses are also being used.

The farm had 3,500 cattle of which 1,500 were milk cows, 8,000 pigs, and 90,000 poultry (so they said).

Everybody works in Soviet Russia. The women share physical tasks with the men. One collective farm had 3,200 in the fields and 1,700 were women. Women also sweep the streets with antiquated brush brooms. It is a common sight to see women driving trucks and tractors, along with working on highways handling blacktop mix with shovels.

The Russian farmer is some 40 years behind the American farmer. One U.S. farmer feeds 26 people; one Russian farmer feeds 3 people.

The people in Budapest were cordial and openly scorned the Russians. Conditions in Hungary are more like those in Russia than in Poland. The Soviets are controlling the Polish economy, but in my opinion, they cannot control the people. It is evident that their intense faith in tradition, heritage, and religion has saved the Polish people. Following an uprising in 1956 the Soviets moved to lessen some of the economic problems. They instituted a voluntary program for collective farms, and as a result the number of such farms dropped sharply. Today, only a small percentage of the farms are still Government collectivized. Less than 2,000 of the original 10,000 collective farms remain, and private farms outproduce the Government farms by 25 percent per unit of land.

We went from Warsaw to East Berlin. The East Germans moved in fear and showed little interest in our presence. We had a short trip through the East Berlin sector, sufficient enough to show us the poor conditions that exist.

A spontaneous cheer went up from the group when we finally wended our way through the redtape and the roadblocks separating the two Berlins. Even though the statement was not made at first, but it was evident from the expression on 34 Tennessee faces that it was a relief to know that we were out from behind the Iron Curtain after a 14-day visit. West Berlin, although surrounded by barbed wire on three sides and a horrible wall in front, was cheerful, hospitable and inspiring. In fact we felt like we were at home.

It has been said, and I believe truthfully so, that the Russians are a curious, suspicious, determined people. Suspicious of everyone, especially Americans and determined to dominate this country. I am thoroughly convinced that this is their major objective.

We visited Paris and London observing the people and their customs, along with sightseeing. We enjoyed our visits to these cities very much.

In analyzing our 25-day visit, 14 behind the Iron Curtain, on foreign soil, observing the people, their customs, and especially seeing firsthand how communism works, I feel that the trip was educational and that our time and money was well spent.

In conclusion, I feel that our No. 1 need in America is a sales force of 180 million American salesmen who will sell America to its citizens. Americans will profit with a greater America and continued freedoms which are offered by the American way of life. America will grow stronger as a fortress of freedom and a republic which will inspire freedom-seeking people throughout the world. Freedom will win over slavery.

We might ask ourselves the question: How can we sell Americanism?

1. Be aware of what you have.
2. Be alert to communism
3. Help the church to grow.
4. Be aware of your power.
5. Help with community and government affairs.
6. Think positively about tomorrow.
7. Be thankful that we are citizens of a free country.

Address by Theodore C. Sorensen, Special Counsel to the President, Before the Western States Democratic Conference, Seattle, Wash., August 6, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an address delivered by the very able, devoted, and articulate special counsel to the President, Theodore C. Sorensen, before the Western States Democratic Conference in Seattle, Wash., on August 6, 1962.

The address contains an excellent summary of the accomplishments and goals of the Democratic Party and the administration of President Kennedy.

Mr. Sorsensen's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY THEODORE C. SORENSEN, SPECIAL COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT, BEFORE THE WESTERN STATES DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, SEATTLE, WASH., AUGUST 6, 1962

We meet in a year of decision. The American people must choose whether this Nation is to "sail or anchor down"—whether we are to blaze new trails for century 21 or return to the well-worn paths of century 19.

The 21st century is but 38 years away. We who are here tonight know that we must educate our children to meet its challenges. We must conserve our resources to meet its needs. We must expand our economy to realize its promise. And we must preserve the human race to enjoy that century in freedom.

But while our eyes are on the century ahead, our opponents are looking back, increasingly united in the blindness of their opposition and in the bitterness of their abuse. They call for cuts in Federal spending, but they do not say where. They tell our older citizens to purchase health insurance, but they do not say how. They predict unemployment will dissolve without public action, but they do not say when.

They do say they are for balancing the budget, not by stating it more accurately, separating capital assets from current expenditures, not by closing tax loopholes or cutting farm surpluses, not by boosting the economy to boost tax revenues, but by blocking all efforts for education, for conservation, for public works and public health.

They do say they believe in free enterprise, and so do we all, but they mean freedom to pollute our air and our water, freedom to raid our forests and public lands, freedom to pay substandard wages, to make windfall profits on the national stockpile, and to cut people off of public welfare as inveterate frauds or loafers. Oh, to be sure, they are not always, hardhearted, all humans weep, but they weep for that 7 percent of the taxpayers who receive 80 percent of dividend income. They weep for those speculators who considered themselves geniuses when the stock market rose after Kennedy's election, and then blamed him when it fell back to the same level this year. They weep, not for the farmer or rancher who is struggling to make ends meet, but for the storage operator who enjoyed a threefold increase in surpluses under Mr. Benson and wants to keep it that way. They weep for the AMA, not those without funds for hospitalization. They weep for the billboard owners, not those who are denied our scenic beauties.

But too often, let us face the fact, their views have prevailed in the Congress. In neither House do we have a solid majority consistently supporting the policies of the Democratic Party and President Kennedy. We have lost important battles, often by a handful of votes, on the floor of both Houses and in most of the major committees. But by and large these are battles which have been lost before, in sessions with even larger Democratic proportions, they are the old familiar battles over education, health insurance, agriculture, and tax loopholes. And in no instance has the loss of any one of those battles meant the end of the war.

GAINS FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM

For whatever may be said about those Democrats who oppose us, the fact remains that every single seat gained by the Democratic Party in this fall's election will be a gain for the Democratic program. And I learned as a boy from the life and lips of George Norris that those "who sow in tears shall reap in joy", and that today's defeats often pave the way for tomorrow's victories.

There are some who attribute these defeats to the fact that the program is too extreme. And perhaps it is.

For we have proposed that human consumers receive the same protection against worthless drugs that has been enjoyed by American hogs, sheep and cattle since 1913. That is rather extreme.

We have proposed that the special concerns of the 125 million people who live in our urban areas receive the same Cabinet-level representation as those of the 13 million who live on the farm. That is rather extreme.

We have proposed helping our public schools pay those to whom we entrust the minds of our children an annual income comparable to the income of those to whom we entrust the care of our plumbing.

We have proposed that Federal help should be available to those local systems of mass transportation that now convey us through the streets at speeds averaging slightly below the 12 miles per hour averaged by the public horsecars of 2 generations ago.

We have proposed investing in new national parks, forests and wildlife refuges an amount equal to one-fifth of our annual investment in chewing gum.

We have proposed that the corn farmer and the wheat rancher be treated with at least as much commonsense as our farm laws now accord the peanut grower.

And we have proposed that our working men and women contribute throughout their working careers to their own health insurance program under social security instead of being forced, once their jobs and their savings are gone, to seek help from public charity.

Perhaps these goals seem extreme to some, but to me they spell out the means of securing "the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Others say: the program is not extreme, but the President's popularity has declined. There is no denying the increasing tempo of abuse, but I would refer you to the recent poll of historians evaluating all our previous Chief Executives. Every Democratic President since the Civil War was judged to rank in the "great" or "near great" category. And all of our greatest Presidents in their time were bitterly abused, and hated, and reelected. For no one gets this country moving again without disturbing the status quo, without stirring up the vested interests, and without doing what is necessary instead of what is popular.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CONCERN

To be sure, President Kennedy is concerned; concerned, however, not about his critics but about his country; about the 1 million young Americans who are both out of school and out of work; about the 150,000 unemployed workers who every month exhaust their benefit rights before they can find a job; about the growing shortage of doctors and medical students, when nearly half of those students come from the wealthiest 12 percent of our families. He is concerned about the 8 million adults who are classified as functionally illiterate; about the thousands of migrant workers whose families lack the basic safeguards of decency; about those untold numbers of American consumers who have been scarred by untested cosmetics, misled by worthless drugs, or made ill by improper foods. So, criticism or no criticism, John Kennedy intends to "stick to his guns."

But when he looks ahead to the peaks that are yet to be scaled, the President is not unmindful of the distance already climbed. The 87th Congress, breaking a legislative stalemate, has thus far passed a score of key bills that could never be passed before, including bills for area redevelopment, higher minimum wages, better housing and urban renewal, new attacks on crime and delinquency and water pollution.

More was done by this Congress to combat the recession than by any Congress since the thirties. And today this Nation has achieved the highest GNP and the highest industrial production in its history. Our working men and women are earning $27 billion more a year. Our businessmen are netting $10 billion more a year. And these are not phony inflation dollars that cannot buy more groceries, but sound dollars, backed by our Nation's best postwar record of price stability in any comparable period of recovery, and backed by our best record of balancing our international accounts since they declined in 1958. The national debt is a smaller portion of our gross national product now than it was in 1960, after our predecessors had increased it by $27 billion. And the budget deficits caused by the recession they left us are far smaller now than the $12 billion deficit they ran up in 1959, one of the 5 deficits they incurred in 8 years of preaching fiscal solvency.

And in those areas where the Congress has not acted, the President has acted, particularly in civil rights. The man who broke down the walls of intolerance to enter the White House has been breaking them down ever since on behalf of Negro children who want a better education, on behalf of their parents who want to vote and to travel and to work. Those who stand up for their rights are being protected and so are those who sit down.

THE WINDS OF WAR HAVE NOT BEEN LOOSED

But if events on the domestic scene have confounded those critics who predicted disaster under Democratic rule, events around the world have junked their pessimistic prophecies even more. The foul winds of war have not been loosed; and the fair winds of peace have calmed the troubled land of Laos. Mr. Khrushchev has not taken over West Berlin. Mr. Castro has not taken over Latin America. Mr. Ho Chi Min has not taken over Vietnam. And Mr. Ginzenga has not taken over the Congo.

Those who once scoffed at the Peace Corps as a haven for misguided visionaries have been touched by the moving tributes to American idealism that come from dozens of far-off huts and villages. Those who once jeered at our efforts in space as a wasteful, useless science-fiction charade now hail our striking successes as symbols of American initiative, ingenuity and power. And those who once assailed the Alliance for Progress as part of a no-win policy this year joined in the applause when the 20 American Republics, in conference at Punta del Este, decreed unanimously to isolate the Castro-Communist offensive as a clear and present danger.

When President and Mrs. Kennedy twice toured Latin America, they were greeted with milling mobs. But this time the mobs were not jeering, they were cheering. They were not throwing stones but lifting banners, banners hailing the greatest new era in U.S.-Latin relations since the days of the good-neighbor policy, banners proclaiming the new hemispheric hope of the sixties: Alianza Para Progresso.

And, finally, it is increasingly recognized, at home and abroad, that this nation, for the first time, has a coherent, consistent effort to launch a peace race instead of an arms race to foster world law instead of world war.

TO FOSTER WORLD LAW INSTEAD OF WORLD WAR

For the first time we have a full-time full-scale Disarmament Agency working out ways and means of reaching this goal.

For the first time we are attending a disarmament conference with a specific, step-by-step plan for general and complete disarmament.

For the first time we are on record, along with the United Kingdom, with the actual draft of an effective treaty to ban all nuclear tests, a treaty which may yet be accepted now that the Soviets realize they can no longer prevent the West from testing by pretending to talk while preparing to test themselves.

For the first time we have a long-term foreign aid program, strengthening the basis for peace and freedom in those nations willing to help themselves.

For the first time we have an expanded, independent food for peace program, providing school lunches and famine relief and daily bread for the hungry and needy of many lands, shipping abroad more food in the last 18 months than Herbert Hoover and his associates shipped in 10 years of World War I relief efforts.

For the first time we have enough authority at the bargaining table to get an agreement on the disarmament of outer space because we are no longer second in outer space.

For the first time we have launched our own initiatives in the United Nations on disarmament, development and space and pledged our participation in a U.N. bond issue which will require those nations now trying to starve that organization to death to pay up or get out.

And, for the first time, we have an agency to encourage others to travel to this country and see what we are really like and an organized effort to secure better housing and better treatment for the diplomats of other countries and other colors and a new cultural exchange agreement with the Soviet Union and, of lasting importance, a program both to weld and to build the economies of the free world through increased tariff reduction and trade expansion.

THE WAR WE MUST DETER

This administration also knows that until all arms are abolished, we can preserve the peace, and convince others to parley for peace, only by preparing for war—the war we must deter. And I believe one reason the peace prevails today is the buildup we have undertaken to make certain no aggressor is ever tempted by our weakness. We have strengthened the missile power and the air power and the manpower of our Armed Forces. And the President knows that, if we are not only to survive but to prevail in the long run, we must strengthen our brainpower and our willpower, with all the measures he has proposed to build a bulwark of healthy minds, healthy bodies, and a healthy American economy.

It is in this spirit, bearing in mind both our achievements and our goals, that the people of Western America are called upon to fulfill their proud traditions and to send men of wisdom and vision to Washington this fall. No other group of 13 States will play so key a role in shaping our Nation's future with 12 Senate races, 10 Governors' races, and 69 House seats at stake. If our opponents are to gain in the Senate, it is here they will try hardest to gain. If we are to gain in the House, it is here that we must make those gains. And, moved by the enthusiasm and dedication I have seen here tonight, it is my prediction that when, in November next, the defenders of privilege and opponents of progress are swept from their seats of power, it will be a wind from the West that uproots them.

But our concern is not merely the future of our program, or our party, or even our Nation. Our concern is for the future of mankind. And when the youngest of my sons has grown to the cares of manhood, the world in which he lives will be shaped by what we do today. If men today are moved by greed and pride alone, if nations blind themselves with hatred and with habit, if we shrink back from the new and the untried and the unknown, then his world may well be a world of sorrow instead of hope. But if we can strive for the good society as well as the good life if "mercy and truth are met together," not only in the hearts of men but in the seats of power, then surely my son in century 21 will be "neither Red nor dead but alive and free," in a world of peace and abundance.

Independence Day of Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Pakistan, Field Marshal Mohammed Ayub Khan; and His Excellency the Pakistani Ambassador to the United States, Aziz Ahmed, on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of Pakistani independence.

Pakistan became an independent nation of Asia on August 15, 1947, 15 years ago today. Born in the strife-torn aftermath of World War II, Pakistan faced staggering problems of national consolidation. The tragic days of partition had uprooted whole communities, and some 10 million refugees had to be resettled in the new State. Conflicts with India over the status of Kashmir imposed further strains.

And finally, the young country had to overcome what appeared to be immense problems arising from the physical separation of the nation into two parts, divided by 1,000 miles of Indian territory. Although over half of the population lives in East Pakistan, this region has only 15 percent of the land area. East Pakistan has a monsoon economy, while West Pakistan has a river economy. East speaks Bengali, while Urdu is used in the West. East grows jute and tea and eats rice and fish; West grows cotton and wool and eats wheat and meat. East Pakistan seems almost a part of southeast Asia, while West Pakistan is contiguous to the Middle East.

In 1947 many observers confidently predicted the imminent disintegration of the Pakistani nation. These observers have been proven wrong, for they did not realize that the Moslem heritage which unites 85 percent of the people of Pakistan would prove capable of overcoming the divisive forces arising from geographical separation. Furthermore, they did not understand that the experience of previous decades had aroused within the Pakistanis a common, living conviction that they were of one nation and one state.

Pakistan is truly a nation inspired by an idea, an idea of independence that led from the formation of the Moslem League in 1906, to the successful formation of the independent state in 1947. The ideal of a self-governing Pakistan found its greatest prophet in the person of Quaid-i-Azam Mohammed Ali Jinnah, who consolidated the movement in its later stages and was the major architect of Pakistan's subsequent independence.

The Quaid-i-Azam once summarized the national goals of Pakistan by saying:

> The people of Pakistan desire nothing which is not their own, nothing more than the goodwill and friendship of all the free nations of the world. We in Pakistan are determined that having won our long-lost freedom we will work to the utmost limit of our capacity not only to build up a strong and happy state of our own but to contribute in the fullest possible measure to international peace and prosperity.

Pakistan is not only an active member of the United Nations and the Commonwealth of Nations, but has also elected to join free nations of Asia and the West in two of the key defense pacts aimed at containing Sino-Soviet expansionism, CENTO and SEATO.

Having overcome many of the problems which plagued the early postpartition years, Pakistan is today a nation that looks proudly to a future which will bring even greater fulfillment to its people. It is encouraging among the people a greater political awareness and a sense of responsibility in representative institutions, through the medium of "basic democracies." Its new constitution, promulgated in March 1962, provides for the full restoration of civil liberties and representative government in Pakistan. The economy is also making impressive advances. It is estimated that the second 5-year plan, now in progress, will bring a 24-percent increase in gross national product by 1965. Also, by 1975, Pakistan will be providing all children of school age with an 8-year primary education.

It is with great pleasure that I extend my congratulations to President Mohammad Ayub Khan and the people of Pakistan on this the 15th anniversary of Pakistan's independence.

Israel Foreign Ministry Statement on Soblen Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a statement from the Foreign Ministry of Israel dealing with the Soblen case, which sets forth reasons and background for its actions in the matter. In order that the American people may be apprised of the facts, I include this statement in the Record:

Israel Foreign Ministry Statement on Soblen Case

Attached hereto is a statement on the Soblen case issued last night in Jerusalem by the spokesman of the Israel Ministry for Foreign Affairs. A perusal of some of the main points in this document reveals the following facts:

(a) Britain's deportation order against Soblen shows that Israel's attitude during this period has, in fact, been correct: Steps can be taken toward finding a solution without requiring one of the governments to violate its own laws. It will be recalled that Israel has stressed throughout that its part in the Soblen case terminated with Soblen's resolute expulsion from Israel on July 1, and that, therefore, there was no basis for involving Israel or El Al in further steps in this matter; the action which Britain requested of Israel would have been obviously contrary to Israel law and thus barred to the Israel Government. Israel made this fact perfectly clear from the very beginning.

(b) It must be pointed out that at no stage did the United States ask Israel for action in violation of Israel law.

(c) Israel will not provide asylum for criminals; Soblen was not only refused permission to stay in Israel, but his subsequent application from London to be admitted to Israel under the law of return has been rejected by the Government of Israel.

It is hoped that these facts will serve finally to dispel an image which seems to have arisen and which falsely portrayed the solution of the Soblen problem as being in some way dependent upon a shotgun marriage between Soblen and Israel, or its carriers.

Text of Statement

1. On June 26, 1962, Dr. Robert Soblen arrived in Israel under an assumed name with false papers. When his true identity was discovered, he was immediately detained and an order for his expulsion from Israel was issued by the Minister of Interior in accordance with section 13 of the entry into Israel law.

2. On July 1, 1962, the order was carried out and Dr. Soblen was expelled from Israel.

3. The Government of Israel never intended that a person who was a fugitive from justice, who had been properly tried by the courts of the United States and found guilty of criminal acts, should enjoy the benefit of the law of return, and, therefore, Soblen was refused permission to stay in Israel. The Prime Minister of Israel expressed these views in the Knesset on July 11, 1962, when he said: "The law of return, and the concept on which it is based, do not only mean that we passed a law for ourselves. We are deeply interested first and foremost in the opinion of the Jewish people throughout the world, and in the opinion of the whole world. We are thinking of a refuge for Jews who do not wish, or are unable, to remain where they are, but not of an asylum for criminals."

This position of the Government of Israel was endorsed by a majority in the Knesset.

For the same reason Soblen's subsequent application, submitted in London, to be admitted into Israel under the law of return, was rejected.

4. Dr. Soblen has now been 6 weeks in the United Kingdom owing to circumstances over which the Government of Israel had no control and for which it has no responsibility.

5. Upon his expulsion from Israel, Israel's part in this case was terminated. Dr. Soblen is no longer under Israel's jurisdiction, and therefore, there was no basis for involving Israel or El Al in any further steps regarding Dr. Soblen. Any participation by the Government of Israel, or an Israel aircraft, or an Israel vessel in the removal or deportation of Dr. Soblen from the United Kingdom to the United States is contrary to Israel law, and, therefore, the Government of Israel cannot take any such action.

6. From the outset, this position has been made clear on various occasions to the Government of the United States and to the Government of the United Kingdom. The Government of Israel was entitled to assume that the Governments concerned would take this position into account in their dealings with the Soblen case.

7. The Government of Israel notes that at no stage was it asked by the United States

to take action which would not be in conformity with the laws of Israel. In this connection, the Government of Israel recalls the statement made by the official spokesman of the U.S. Department of State on June 28, 1962: "We are not asking them (Israel) to break their own laws, of course." He added: "The situation is that we and Israel do not have an extradition treaty. In January of this year, we negotiated such a treaty with Israel. But it has not been submitted to the Senate for ratification. One cautionary note: Even if we had such a treaty and it were in force, it would not cover extradition for espionage."

8. In the light of this situation, the Government of Israel, while fully sharing the concerns of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States, could not see its way to authorize Et Al to comply with the direction issued by the British Government, since the laws of Israel do not permit it to do so.

9. The Government of Israel expresses its hope that it will now be possible for a solution to be reached. The procedure now initiated by the Government of the United Kingdom indicates the correctness of the assumption of the Israel Government, that a satisfactory solution can be found without any of the parties being required to act against its own laws.

Yonkers Through the Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, history, like charity, should begin at home. Our youngsters, as they pursue their studies in high school and college, are as a matter of course exposed to both world and national history. Far too often, however, the history of their own community remains to them—as to many of their elders—an almost total mystery.

Often the fault for this lack of local knowledge does not lie with the State or the school, but with the scarcity of appropriate study material. Such was, until recently, the case with Yonkers, N.Y., a city which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress. Although the Education Department of the State of New York requires that boys and girls study the history of their local communities in the seventh grade, most of the historical material at hand was beyond the reach of those in that age group. To remedy this situation, a group of teachers in the social studies department in the Yonkers secondary schools wrote an excellent booklet entitled "Yonkers Through the Years." This material was first run as a serial in the Yonkers Herald-Statesman, and the cost of printing it in booklet form was underwritten by the Peoples Savings Bank of Yonkers.

Such cooperation between the schools, the press, and the business community is an excellent example of what local communities can accomplish by and for themselves, unaided by the intervention or assistance of any outside authority. I wish to commend all those whose joint efforts resulted in the publication of "Yonkers Through the Years," and to commend it to all of my colleagues in the Congress. I am sure that schoolchildren for many years to come will greatly benefit from their increased knowledge of the history of their own hometown.

Immigration Official Sees Summer Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of western New York are indeed fortunate to have an outstanding man such as Mr. William J. King to head the Buffalo district office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Each year thousands and thousands of foreign visitors flow through this district which is one of the major gateways between Canada and the United States. The responsibility for the operation of this office is great and Mr. King has proven equal to the task.

Since my congressional district is in Buffalo, I have had numerous occasions to call upon Mr. King for assistance and advice on problems pertaining to immigration and naturalization matters. He has been among the most cooperative Federal officials it has been my privilege to contact. I have found him to be a sincere, conscientious, and dedicated public servant.

Miss H. Catherine Smith, the author of an article which appeared in Buffalo's only Sunday newspaper on August 12, is to be commended for her excellent portrayal of the magnitude and scope of the work of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in our area, and of the man who is doing such an excellent job as its Director.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Miss Smith's article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express on August 12, 1962:

PROFILES IN GOVERNMENT: IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL SEES SUMMER INCREASE OF FOREIGN VISITORS

(By Katherine Smith)

During June, July, and August, a larger number of foreigners enter the United States through Niagara frontier ports than anywhere else in the country.

This statement was made by William J. King, Director of Immigration and Naturalization for District No. 7 which includes all of this State north of Ulster, Duchess, and Sullivan Counties.

FROM CANADA

The majority of the millions of foreigners who come here through local ports of entry are visitors, predominantly from Canada. White foreign-born residents of the Buffalo area registered at Immigration and Naturalization Headquarters in the U.S. Court Building number nearly three-quarters of a million. Buffalo has received no influx of refugees from Communist China, Mr. King reports.

Most of the Hungarian immigrants who settled here after the 1956 revolt have become U.S. citizens. Foreign-born children automatically become citizens through the naturalization of their parents. Only older immigrants do not apply for citizenship. Mr. King believes they are deterred by the difficulty of learning English and the literacy test that must be passed.

TEXTBOOK

Mr. King and his subordinates cooperate with the New York State Department of Adult Education to facilitate preparation for citizenship. The naturalization staff produced a textbook covering the subjects new citizens are required to know and a film on preparation for citizenship. Frank Pompi, an officer of Mr. King's district, plays a part in the motion picture.

"It is designed to aid teachers of the foreign born and to alleviate the latters' fear of that test that results in citizenship or disappointment," said Mr. King.

JOB PROMISE

The film is shown throughout this country. Half our quota of immigrants are persons proficient in skills of which the United States has a shortage. Several tailors from Italy have settled in western New York lately. Foreign physicists also find ready employment here.

Before entering the United States, these men must show a promise of employment from an American corporation or institution. Spouses of American citizens can come here to live without regard to quota.

ILLEGAL ENTRY

Thirty-four years ago, Mr. King joined the staff of the U.S. Immigration Service. Illegal entry into this country was attempted so frequently that border officers had to train their ears to detect the slightest foreign accent.

Today, Mr. King says Canada and other countries offer so many opportunities for employment to immigrants that this country has become merely one of several where the European can make a new start. Therefore, illegal entry attempts have been reduced greatly.

CHECK CREWS

In addition to the routine border inspection at bridges familiar to most western New Yorkers, local immigration officers check passengers and crews of ships and planes arriving from foreign ports. An office is maintained at the Toronto Airport for examination of persons flying from Canada to the United States. In June, 228 ships and 514 planes came under the watchful eye of our immigration officers.

Mr. King has lived in 26 American cities from Honolulu to New York, and also in London and several cities of West Germany. Shortly after moving to our Queen City, 5 years ago, he said:

"Buffalo is by far the friendliest place I have called home."

He and his wife still hold that opinion.

LAST OUTPOST

"The only place comparable to Buffalo in friendliness is Ireland," Mr. King says, adding, "Ireland is the last outpost of leisurely living and love of culture. The slightest good fortune is a reason for a party, and if no reason can be found, the party is given anyway."

The southern coast of Ireland, where palm trees and other semitropical verdure flourish, is the place to which Mr. King dreams of retiring. His progenitors came from Ireland to New England in 1812. If Mr. King fulfills his dream, he will reverse their procedure and, after decades of ministering to immigrants, become an immigrant himself. The lure of the British Isles is due in large measure to the residence in London of Mr. King's only daughter, Mrs. Peter Thwaites, and her three children. Her husband is a member of the famed Grenadier Guards of England.

JOINED ARMY

Born in Springfield, Mass., Mr. King married his high school sweetheart, who has moved with him to cities circling half the world. A graduate of the Foreign Service School of Georgetown University, Washington, he speaks German fluently. During World War II he enlisted in the U.S. Army in which he served 14 years, attaining the rank of colonel.

He organized and commanded the Criminal Investigation Division of the U.S. Army in Europe. During several years in England, he was attached to Scotland Yard. His division investigated crimes of GI's all the way from petit larceny to homicide.

DICKENS FAN

In 1954, he returned to the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Every day Mr. King swims at the Buffalo Athletic Club, of which he became a member shortly after arriving in Buffalo. He reads widely in the field of history and biography. While stationed in England, he joined the devotees of Dickens for the annual Christmas Eve walk from Scrooge's office to the vicinity of the home of Bob Cratchit of the immortal "Christmas Carol."

WIDE CIRCLE

Our District Director of Immigration and Naturalization has made several trips to England to renew friendships there. He plans to visit his daughter and friends in October.

He likes people and finds it a privilege to know a wide variety of them through his work. As District Director of Immigration, he has met the President of Finland and Queen Elizabeth of England. A longtime member of the International Association of Police Chiefs, he regularly attends that organization's conventions.

Independence Day of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of India, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan; and His Excellency the Ambassador of India to the United States, Braj Kumar Nehru, on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of India's independence.

On August 15, 1947, the world's largest democracy was born on the south Asian subcontinent. Nurtured by such world-renowned statesmen as Mohandas K. Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, the new nation promised a new birth of freedom. Americans in all walks of life cheered India's birth, and each of us welcomed its strong adherence to the ideals of human dignity. By bringing democracy to the village level, India has shown the world what inspired leadership can do to give the people of a less-developed country the reality of active participation in government. As its development program brings India greater prosperity, economic freedom and personal dignity will move ahead in firm alliance with political liberty. The spirit of Indian democracy was effectively expressed in these words of President Radhakrishnan, upon his recent assumption of office:

> In our national concerns we adopt democracy not merely as a political arrangement but as a moral temper. It is of piece with our great traditional habits of behavior. We realize that freedom has no meaning save in the context of equality and there can be no equality without economic justice. These ideals of freedom, equality, and justice are not possessions to be defended but goals to be reached.

India's literary tradition extends back thousands of years, and has given India a rich cultural legacy of enormous range and depth. The spiritual resolve inherited from its past gives India great strength, and finds its noble embodiment in such present-day leaders as Prime Minister Nehru and President Radhakrishnan. With guidance from truly inspired men like these, India cannot help but continue along the road of idealism, enlightenment, and progress which is the treasure of Indian culture.

On the international level India has chosen to act as a positive, neutral exponent of the views of a large part of the Afro-Asian world. India aims at being a constructive mediator between the two major blocs in the cold war. Its goal of constructive service in the cause of world peace has been seen in its generous assistance to the United Nations operation in the Congo.

India seeks to provide a better life for its people through the successful execution of carefully drafted 5-year plans. The third 5-year plan, which will be completed in 1965–66, envisages a 30 percent increase in national income over the plan period. If this goal can be reached, India will show itself well on the way to overcoming the obstacles to economic growth. One of the most imposing of these problems is India's population, which is increasing at a yearly rate of over 2 percent. With its 438 million inhabitants, India is the second most populous nation in the world; within 35 years this number will reach some 900 million. To surmount these strains great efforts will be required. Fortunately for the people of India, the planning authorities have taken rational cognizance of the various barriers to development and have shown their ability to guide the nation along the path of progress. In the great tradition of its independence movement, India is today devoting its national energy to a social and economic revolution which promises a new threshold of liberty for the Indian people.

I am most pleased to offer my felicitations to the people of the Republic of India on the happy occasion of this 15th anniversary of India's independence.

Address by Mayor Robert P. Wagner of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Italian extraction have long been aware that the distinguished mayor of the city of New York, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, is one of their stanchest friends and a sincere supporter of their causes. Italian-Americans appreciate his loyalty and they have supported him in tremendous numbers on every occasion he ran for public office, and they will gladly do so again in the future.

Mayor Wagner is one of the ablest and most dedicated leaders of New York in the history of our great city. Under his administration, New York is making great progress in many respects, especially in the eradication of slums, the improvement of living conditions, and the conduct of municipal affairs. His job as mayor of New York is one of the most difficult and arduous tasks in the whole Nation, perhaps next to that of the Presidency, and Mayor Wagner has performed his duties magnificently. New Yorkers are very proud of him.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address by Mayor Wagner at the national convention of the Order of Italian Sons and Daughters of America, held at the Commodore Hotel in New York, on Monday, August 13, 1962.

His address was as follows:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE ORDER OF ITALIAN SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA, COMMODORE HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1962

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, President Aldisert, officers, delegates, ladies and gentlemen: In the name of all the citizens of New York I am happy to greet you.

As you know, I have just recently returned from my first trip to Europe in 7 years. With my wife and sons I visited France, West Germany, Italy, England and Ireland. Nowhere did we receive more cordial and friendly receptions than in the cities of Italy.

In Rome, the Eternal City, we were received in audience by His Holiness Pope John, and that was the most moving single experience I had on my trip. While in Rome we were the guests of the acting mayor, the Honorable Gaetano Barbagallo. In Florence, we were received by Mayor Giorgio Lapira; and in Venice, by Mayor Giovanni Favoretto Fioca.

But pleasant as it is for me to tell about my trip, I am here this morning for another purpose. In extending the greetings of this city to the Order of Italian Sons and Daughters of America, I want to pay New York's tribute to this organization which was founded 32 years ago by first and second generation Italian-Americans. The purpose of your organization was to assist Americans of Italian origin with their many problems of adaptation as newcomers, while at the same time preserving the language and culture of the land of their birth. These are still, I understand, among the major aspects of your organizational activities.

Your organization has been one of those to show most clearly that there is no contradiction in combining pride in one's past with loyalty to one's present. It is perfectly consistent with the American way to play bocce on Monday and baseball on Tuesday.

I am aware of your philanthropic activities on behalf of the "Boys Town of Italy," and I have heard of your efforts to have Italian language courses introduced into high school curricula in our country. Both of these endeavors are worthy of notice: One involves concern for the less fortunate; the other involves raising our own country's cultural standards. Both are among this country's finest purposes.

As you may know, for many years I have been deeply concerned with the plight of many of the residents of our city who are separated from members of their families in foreign lands; these relatives are unable to come here because of our restrictive immigration laws and, specifically, the national origins quota system.

Some of you in this room are doubtless familiar with one or more families split in two by the Atlantic Ocean and by our needlessly cruel and outmoded immigration laws. At present, there is pending before Congress in Washington a bill introduced by Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, and cosponsored by legislators from both parties, which would do much to reunite divided families and reduce the inequities of the present quota system.

An important feature of this proposal woud give three out of every five immigration visas to the blood relatives of people already resident in the United States, whether or not they are American citizens. The bill is a humane and forthright attempt to deal intelligently with present immigration needs. I hope that all of you will support its passage.

Liberty, unity, and duty are the three principles of your order. They are principles of which all Americans are justly proud. On behalf of the city of New York, may I wish you wisdom in your deliberations at this convention, enjoyment in your fellowship, and again welcome to our city.

Mayor Wagner, Our Good-Will Ambassador, Hits Communists' Wall of Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York City, recently visited West Germany and did an excellent job of creating good will between the United States and those people with whom he came into contact.

In a sense, it was somewhat of a sentimental journey, for Germany was the birthplace of Mayor Wagner's father, who left the small village of Nataetten to become a distinguished U.S. Senator and the author of the National Labor Relations Act.

The details of Mayor Wagner's visit are recorded in the news bulletin, Overseas Report, which is published by the Julius Klein public relations organization. General Klein, of course, is known and respected on both sides of the aisle as one of our most distinguished patriots.

Mayor Wagner visited Berlin and was tremendously impressed with the "wall of shame" which divides the people of that city. I think his remarks on that subject are certainly worthy of attention, and for that reason I should like to have the article from Overseas Report inserted in the RECORD:

WE CAN'T LOSE SYMBOL OF FREEDOM: WAGNER, NEW YORK'S MAYOR, VISITS DIVIDED CITY BERLIN—INTERVIEWED BY JULIUS KLEIN PUBLIC RELATIONS EDITORS

(By Eckardt F. Bechler and Don Henry)

FRANKFURT, GERMANY.—What was foreseen as a nostalgic vacation period turned into a dramatic lesson in democracy when New York City Mayor Robert F. Wagner and his family visited Germany last month for 8 days.

Five of those days were spent in Berlin, where Mayor Wagner, whose German-born father later became a leading U.S. Senator, was inspired to comment, "You have to admire the people of West Berlin. They are very determined to carry on for democracy. They are in the frontline of the cold war struggle, yet their morale is very high."

BERLIN WALL POOREST ADVERTISEMENT FOR COMMUNISM

The 52-year-old mayor added that "the 'wall of shame' is the poorest advertisement communism could use. It is hard for us in the United States to visualize it. One has to see it to understand all its implications. The Communists are truly afraid to let the people of their sector come over and see the prosperity and freedom in a democracy where the individual dignity of each man is guaranteed."

The mayor of America's largest city continued: "Berlin is a symbol of democracy surrounded as it is by a way of life to which we are opposed. The United States has to maintain a strong position to support Berlin. We can't lose this symbol which is so obvious throughout the world."

The Gotham mayor noted that "Berlin means a great deal to the people of New York City where we have 74 different nationality groups who feel very strongly about things like this."

VISITS HIS FATHER'S BIRTHPLACE

"In fact," said the mayor, "some of our people appreciate such a situation more than the old families of the United States who have been in America generation after generation and can't comprehend; they're so far removed from the reality of it."

Wagner, in Frankfurt with his family on a sort of "homecoming" visit to the nearby birthplace of his father, previously had been praised by Julius Klein, retired major general and an international public relations counselor, for his public appearances in the divided city.

"Wagner did an excellent job in Berlin," Klein remarked. "The people of New York and America can be proud of him. His public and television appearances created a lot of good will for America with the people of West Berlin and the Federal Republic by reassuring them that America stands firmly behind Berlin."

TALKS WITH MEN ON THE STREET AND GI'S

Klein, who terms the "wall of shame" a "ghettomauer" (ghetto wall) because it "reminds me of Warsaw," noted that though West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt is accustomed to receiving officials from the United States, Wagner's visit gave him an added sense of value since Wagner is a mayoral colleague representing America's largest city and thus is close to the people.

Wagner spent 5 days in Berlin talking to German officials, men on the street and American soldiers, whose morale he said also was extremely high.

Nastaetten, a small village in the Taunus Mountains of Hesse not far from the Rhine River, didn't lose the opportunity to show the Wagner family what it thought of the descendants of the Nastaetten citizen who left Germany in 1885 to become a leading U.S. Senator and author of the National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act) which was later amended by the Taft-Hartley Act.

HONORARY CITIZEN OF NASTAETTEN

The entire population turned out to greet the Wagners, waving banners and bestowing honorary citizenships in a spirited display of cordiality and friendship.

On the way to Nastaetten and throughout his travels in Germany, Mayor Wagner had ample opportunity to view the economic progress of West Germany.

Having made periodic visits to the Federal Republic since the end of World War II, Wagner stated last week, "It's just fantastic what the years have brought in betterment for the people here. I can remember when Frankfurt was flat. Now it is a great city.

"In fact," the mayor remarked, "the housing developments of West Germany are excellent. They are attractive and utilitarian, and I hope that we can send some of our housing people over here to confer with the Germans to the benefit of future housing projects in both countries through an exchange of ideas."

Wagner also noted that the roadbuilding advances in Germany are remarkable. He specifically pointed to the backroads development in such areas as the Taunus Mountains of Hesse, where he said, American tourists would delight in off-the-beaten-path travel now made available by new thoroughfares.

"This trip has been especially valuable for my (teenage) sons," he commented. "It's their first visit to Europe and it has been very instructive."

Concluding his remarks, after stating that he hoped New York City and others would be able to institute a memorial celebration each August 13 to commemorate the erection of the "wall of shame" and subsequent shackling of freedom in the East, Wagner returned to the aspect of his trip which most fascinated him:

"I was talking to the president of the National Bricklayers Union," he related, "and he said that not only was the wall a blight on the progress of humanity, it was also poorly constructed."

The mayor of America's greatest city didn't laugh at this observation; he merely shook his head sadly. "It's hard for us in America to realize," he muttered, "awfully hard to realize. All of us should see it. Only then do we understand."

Pastor of Our Lady Star of the Sea Delivers Opening Prayer Before House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, the beloved pastor of Our Lady Star of the Sea Church in Bayonne, N.J., the Right Reverend Monsignor Leo J. Martin, opened the daily session of the House of Representatives with a moving prayer. Our Lady Star of the Sea was the first Catholic Church established in Bayonne, and I am proud to say that Monsignor Martin has added greatly to the rich tradition that has been established by its former outstanding pastors. Monsignor Martin has been a lifelong friend and I take great pride in the fact that I graduated from Our Lady Star of the Sea grammar school. It is also with pride that I call to the attention of my colleagues the prayer offered by Monsignor Martin:

Almighty and most benevolent God, the plans of whose divine providence rest upon wisdom and love for the welfare of nations and peoples, look down with paternal kindness and goodness on this august assemblage of our Nation's rulers. Not by earthbound wisdom, but with the light of Thy infinite knowledge direct their minds, and strengthen with fortitude their deliberations; for upon them rests the welfare and security of those over whom they rule, and to whose good they are committed.

Enlighten and bless with prudence and justice each Member of this assemblage. May they, by Thy help, faithfully keep the stewardship entrusted to them; so that through them in the faithful discharge of their office, our Nation and its people will continue to be blessed in the order of nature and of grace by Thee, who are in truth nature's God and the source of all strength. Amen.

Veterans Rise Against Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following material revealing the action of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. to combat the revival of nazism. It is heartening that the men who helped defeat nazism in World War II are alert to recent attemps in this country, England, and elsewhere to bring back nazism. I think that veterans, regardless of religion, will share the concern of the Jewish War Veterans at this obnoxious Nazi revival that mocks the martyrs of the Allied armies and undermines NATO. I commend this information to the attention of the Congress who, I am sure, feel as I do that the veterans who once crushed the scourge of nazism deserve the Government's full support in any new action required:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—An international Nazi conclave in England and the recent movement of neo-Nazi agitators from country to country has evoked a plan for unified counteraction by American and British veterans, the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. made known today.

Seeking international cooperation by Allied veterans against Nazi resurgence, National Commander Theodore Brooks, of the Jewish War Veterans, wrote the national chairman of the British Association of Jewish Ex-Service Men and Women in London, the Association des Anciens Combattants et Engages Volontaires Juifs in Paris, and the Australian Federation of Jewish Ex-Service Associations in Australia. Mindful of the current presence in England of neo-Nazi agitators from the United States, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Argentina, and other countries, Commander Brooks offered the British veterans assistance and cooperation.

Commander Brooks said the time had come when "we must work together to assure that our comrades who fell in battle (against nazism) did not die in vain." He said that a Nazi virus has reappeared and Allied veterans "must unite and cooperate internationally to eradicate for all time the scourge we thought had been stamped out in 1945."

He called for an alert against "the Fascist rodents who gnaw at the foundations of our unity while we are preoccupied with the world crisis brought about by Communist totalitarianism."

The Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. is the Nation's oldest active veterans organization.

Maj. H. BERNSTEIN,
National Chairman, Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen, London, England:

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America respectfully greets its esteemed coreligionists and comrades in arms. We are shocked by the apparent resurgence of Nazi agitation. We agree that the forthcoming international conference of neo-Nazis in your country must not be permitted to pass unnoticed by the authorities of the countries concerned. We are shocked by the apparent laxity of the British authorities.

The editorial in the London Sunday Telegraph supporting the battle of Jewish ex-servicemen against the agitators gave hope that something may yet be done. It is ironic that England, the bastion against Hitler, has been selected as a conference site by the Nazis and neo-Nazis of Germany, Austria, Hungary, France, Argentina, the United States, and other countries.

Our own organization has been in the forefront of the anti-Nazi struggle in the United States. If we may assist you in any manner, we stand ready and willing to cooperate.

It is our sincere belief that if the Nazi virus is again spreading from nation to nation, ex-soldiers of the Jewish faith and all other veterans of good will, must unite and cooperate internationally to eradicate for all time the scourge we thought had been stamped out in 1945.

The time has come for the Allied Nations, linked today through NATO, to be alerted to the Fascist rodents who gnaw at the foundations of our unity while we are preoccupied with the world crisis brought about by Communist machinations.

As veterans and Jews who abhor the totalitarianism of nazism as well as communism, we must work together to assure that our comrades who fell in battle did not die in vain.

Any suggestions you may offer on cooperation will be welcomed. Meanwhile, we assure you we stand with you in the conviction that mutual vigilance will once more smash nazism. At the forthcoming (Israeli) conference of veterans of the Jewish faith from all parts of the world we submit this as a priority.

THEODORE BROOKS,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.

Republican Breakthrough in Political Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it has often been inferred that the Democratic Party has a monopoly on intellectuals and eggheads and that the Republican Party somehow manages to exist without the assistance of any detectable higher nervous system.

Yet, no less authority than Raymond Moley, a distinguished scholar and professor for many years at Columbia University and a top adviser to President Roosevelt in the 1930's, writes in his Newsweek column of August 13 that the Republican congressional committee has, in sponsoring the development of the precinct education program, achieved a third major educational breakthrough in the teaching of political science.

In arranging for this do-it-yourself course in how to win elections, our aim was to show people how to be effective in political campaigns. If it has intellectual and educational merit, Mr. Speaker, it is only because we Republicans, in seeking to produce high quality, effective material, just naturally turn to the best brains and research as well as the finest in practical experience. This is why the Republican Party has achieved so many outstanding breakthroughs in the art of government, and now, in the field of higher education.

Mr. Moley's column follows:

YOU WIN IN THE PRECINCTS

(By Raymond Moley)

In my years as a college teacher of what is called political science I attempted to get away from theory and history and help students learn some of the realities of everyday politics. I decided to have practical and successful politicians talk to my classes. But I discovered that while these were excellent practitioners and engaging speakers, they were unable to describe systematically how they did their job. Now and then there were bits of precious insight in what they said, but it was impossible to put these bits together in anything like a formula or text.

Thus there was need for a real educational breakthrough in an art which is as old as civilization and vitally important to millions. There was no way to provide schooling and training for practical political workers.

Political workers continued, as they had for generations, to learn by trial and costly error. Perceptive people have realized for a long time that lavish publicity and speeches of candidates, even with the help of mass meetings, radio, and television, are not only of questionable value but exceedingly wasteful. Voters are moved by persons who are close to them in their homes, offices, workshops, clubs, and saloons. Somebody must sell by personal contact.

LABOR'S HOW TO WIN

A few years ago there was an educational breakthrough unnoticed by the formal world of education. Organized labor got into politics, and in 1945 the CIO Political Action Committee wrote and published a small book called "How To Win." After the labor merger, the AFL–CIO COPE continued to publish this amazing text in various editions. Innumerable candidates who have been elected or defeated by labor can testify to the book's effectiveneses. For it brought an ancient art down to the level of American politics.

Labor's "How To Win" stimulated efforts by other organizations to train volunteers in practical politics. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce produced its well-known "Action Course in Practical Politics," composed of small texts and leaders' manuals. The latest figures show that 250,000 have taken the course in 1,800 communities under the sponsorship of local chambers and companies.

More recently, the Republican Associates in Los Angeles created a remarkable tool for training political workers. This material is specifically designed for Los Angeles County and California generally.

A major purpose of these courses was to change attitudes toward political activity and to provide for thousands of volunteers the know-how to participate in campaigns.

DO-IT-YOURSELF POLITICS

This year Biehl P. Clarke's Civic Affairs Associates in Washington published a new text and leaders' manual called the Precinct Education Program. This is restricted to personal operations at the grassroots and neighborhood level. It was prepared at the instance of Representative BOB WILSON's Republican congressional committee.

Clarke points out that this material "goes to the heart of political action by supplying a do-it-yourself program to be conducted by groups numbering as few as from 4 to 12 neighbors. It is equally usable by inexperienced people who need an understanding of what to do and how to do it, and also by experienced precinct workers who train volunteers. It combines formal instruction with on-the-job training. It changes attitudes and communicates knowledge at the same time."

In the past few years many political science teachers in colleges and some secondary schools have been enlarging their offerings of dry theory with some instruction in practical politics. Materials developed wholly outside the field of formal education would help every college and secondary school student to become a more useful citizen.

So, too, might those self-satisfied people profit who now talk a great deal about politics but never turn a hand to help make free institutions work. This applies to 99 of every 100 people I know. For unless they do something other than talk, someone else will care for politics. And what someone else does will not be to their liking. Politics needs a massive infusion of new blood.

Dedication at Maynard, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a speech that I made at the dedication of the beautiful new townhouse and library at Maynard, Mass., July 29, 1962:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN AT DEDICATION OF TOWNHOUSE AND LIBRARY, MAYNARD, MASS., JULY 29, 1962

Reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a very great pleasure and privilege for me to join you in these historic exercises here this afternoon.

The town of Maynard is very close to my heart, and I rejoice with your officials and all your people upon the completion of this very beautiful new townhouse and library.

With great satisfaction, I compliment and congratulate the chairman and members of the committee who have been responsible for the conduct of this constructive work, the architect, the builders and all those who have had anything to do with the completion of this magnificent new facility.

Your community has long been noted for the high quality of its leadership and the industry, civic spirit, and partiotism of its people. Indeed, there are few, if any, communities anywhere that have given such a splendid example of courage and fortitude in times of adversity and discouragement as the town of Maynard.

Time and again you have shown your mettle, you have demonstrated your ability to stand together and join, intelligently and wholeheartedly, to overcome obstacles confronting you.

Time and again you have gladly responded to the call of our country when our liberties were at stake, and this memorable service goes back to the very earliest days of our Nation, and has continued up to this very moment.

You may well be proud, therefore, of the outstanding record which your fellow townspeople and your community as a whole has made throughout the years, and I may state without question that your unflinching loyalty and devotion to the principles of our great democracy is a source of great pride to me as it must be to you, and all our fellow Americans who have had the opportunity to observe your sterling contributions to our State and Nation.

The loyal spirit you have manifested in this community, and particularly your devotion to the cause of freedom, is needed as much, if not more, today, than ever before in our history.

Those who would destroy every vestige of freedom and democracy, not only here, but throughout the world, are striving with unceasing vigor and skill to achieve their nefarious purpose of enslaving mankind.

They do not hesitate to use threats, blandishments, and every tactic of deceit, artifice and falsehood to plant seeds of distrust and strife, and weaken the resolve of the free world to resist the tyranny and dictatorship of the Communist police state.

But they will not succeed in their evil aims, because the people of this Nation and this world will not be deluded by their trickery, will not be deceived by their insincere promises, and will not be intimidated by their dire threats.

This Nation, born in freedom, pledged to freedom, intends to preserve that freedom, and we will not allow any other nation, or group of nations, to steal away our hard-won liberties or to challenge the safety of our shores and the security of our homes.

Let every leader and conspirator seeking the destruction of freedom in this Nation and the world well understand that Americans propose to defend and preserve our great heritage, that we are unalterably pledged to the perpetuation of free government, just as we are resolutely committed to the cause of world peace.

It is for us to maintain our strength at every level, military, economic, and spiritual and, above all, to uphold at all times the moral precepts and spiritual truths upon which our great nation was founded.

It is for us to try to build and shape a greater and stronger and more prosperous nation, and to hold out the hand of friendship, amity and assistance to other nations who earnestly seek peace and who wish to live and develop under institutions of freedom.

Above all, it is for us to work for the holy cause of peace and human brotherhood as devoutly and vigorously as some other nations are working to spread hatred, instead of love, turmoil, instead of order, and tyranny and slavery, instead of good will, mutual helpfulness, and freedom.

The world can have peace, good will, and a golden age of brotherhood and prosperity for all, if the leaders of the Communist conspiracy would tomorrow agree to outlaw war, provide international control for nuclear weapons and substances, and divert them to the ways of peace rather than unspeakable violence, if they would agree to universal disarmament and world legal institutions to promote world cooperation, unity of the human family, and order and justice for all mankind.

To be sure, it is encouraging that, to no inconsiderable extent, we are moving toward these goals, slowly but perceptibly, and the Soviet Union, as well as all other nations, must come to realize—and I hope and pray that they will soon do so—that lasting peace must be assured, if the world is to be spared an unprecedented blood bath of destruction and devastation.

As we work for peace with all our hearts and energies, let us work with more vigor than ever before and with vigilance and resolution to build our own strength, preserve our great free system and carry out our commitments to the free peoples of the earth that we will not stand idly by while tyranny overruns the world.

This splendid new facility will serve your beautiful town and its devoted people for many years to come. It will do much to strengthen your municipal posture and to provide for the convenience of your people. Not only this generation, but future generations, will have reason to be grateful for the concern you have shown to conduct your town government with efficiency and effectiveness. I am very happy for you today.

May you continue to grow in strength, union, prosperity and the ways of freedom.

Is the Gerrymandering in New York State Illegal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, recent decisions by the Supreme Court held that discrimination in reapportionment of districts electing Federal and State legislators are within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Several States have been ordered to equalize the vote under the threat of invalidating the reapportionment or the failure to reapportion. New York State is one of the worst offenders of the gerrymandering of congressional districts and the Republican-dominated State legislature has failed to reapportion the State legislative districts.

One of the enterprising citizens, Mr. Peter Strauss, the owner of station WMCA, has appealed to the courts in an effort to prove that discrimination exists in the present apportionment of legislative seats. The Democratic Party leadership in New York County and private citizens have also applied to the Federal court to eliminate the discriminatory congressional reapportionment. Two of the seats in Manhattan have been eliminated and inasmuch as the Republicans controlled the New York State Legislature, the apportionment of congressional seats was done in such a way as to favor the Republican incumbents or to make difficult the election of Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats of the newly created 24th Congressional District have a very special job on their hands. It is to show the little man with the pencil up in Albany that it takes more than a Rockymandered district to keep Democratic candidates out of office.

When the reapportionment made necessary by the 1960 census was put into effect, new district lines had to be drawn and the Republican Party gentlemen who drew them, under the tutelage of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, followed only two precepts: Where there is a Republican in office keep him there and create as many new "Republican districts" as you can. They never heard of symmetry. They seem not to have heard of identity of social and economic interests or for that matter, historical proximity. They just have heard of votes.

One of the worst aberrations of this current reapportionment is the newly created 24th Congressional District. Based on the old 25th Congressional District, it has been cleverly redrawn to keep many of our neighbors out—because they usually vote Democratic. The people of lower economic levels are eliminated, also those who normally vote Democratic were eliminated from the district. The New York Times in an editorial describes this district as a "slightly tattered gingham dog; except for a scrawny neck, its head is separated from its body by a narrow sliver of the adjoining 24th District. Its tail wags feebly in Long Island Sound and one ear juts into neighboring Westchester County."

The district lines try to ignore as the New York Times points out, the fact that in the last 10 years, this area has been the scene of a great deal of building activity. Not only have many new apartment houses been built, but a number of new Government-subsidized housing projects have been developed in this vicinity.

The Albany supporters of the Republican boss of Bronx County seemingly worked on the assumption that only Republicans own their own homes or perhaps that only Democrats like to live in apartments. It is up to us to show them that they are wrong to believe so strongly in their economic labels. Maybe only the rich are Republicans, but many respectably affluent homeowners, or maybe just hard-working people who own their own homes, can still stick to their principles and remain Democrats.

Over 100 years ago, Eldridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, brought the system of districting for political purposes to such a degree of infamy that it bears his name to this day. Many Americans who have heard of "gerrymandering" have forgotten that Elbridge Gerry was a member of the Constitutional Convention and one of the Ambassadors to France who upheld our honor during the X-Y-Z affair."

Today his name and memory is tainted by the stigma of political chicanery. Let those who have foisted the current districts on New York remember and beware. Meanwhile it is up to us to prove that crime does not pay, whether it is a political crime or a felony.

Meanwhile each one of us has a responsibility as well, and that is to prove that a man with a pencil cannot make us into a permanent minority vainly casting our votes in a Republican stronghold. We are not going to be forced into living under a one-party system in a Democratic city in a Democratic nation.

The Republican boss of Bronx County must indeed have little faith in his own abilities to feel that this is the only way he can win. Let us show him that while he may be right about his abilities, he is wrong about us. We are still living under a two-party system and no walls or artificial barriers can contain people yearning to be free and to choose their representatives freely.

More Evidence of Economic Sloppiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the following article from the Washington Evening Star inserted in the RECORD because it points up the sloppiness of the economic indicators used by the administration and the press in connection with the proposed tax cut. It also points out the oft-forgotten fact that the unemployment statistics are not lead indicators but the result of economic conditions.

Finally the article notes several new trends in the type of workers seeking employment. This is further evidence that unemployment is not a problem that can be solved merely by cutting taxes or increasing Federal expenditures, but must be met with further study and well-planned retraining programs. The article follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—HOW WORKERS ARE DISAPPEARING

(By Sylvia Porter)

The reason for the recent decline in unemployment to about 5.3 percent of the labor force is not that the economy is gaining new strength. The reason is that fewer men and women have been looking for jobs than experts anticipated would be jobseekers at this time.

In July, the total labor force, including the Armed Forces, came to 76,437,000, about 500,000 above the level of summer, 1961.

According to the official projections there should be 1 million more men and women in the labor now than a year ago—and these year-to-year projections usually have been safe, because we know how many babies of the 1940's are reaching working age in the 1960's and we certainly can count our adult workers.

The latest employment-unemployment statistics have been woefully underanalyzed, a real drawback in view of their impact on policy.

DECLINE VERY SMALL

In the first place, the drop from June to July was not from 5.5 to 5.3 percent, as officially reported. It was in unrounded figures, from 5.46 to 5.35 percent, a decline of only 0.12 percent, so tiny that its statistically insignificant.

In the second place, any interpretation of this small decline as a signal that no new moves are needed to spur the economy ignores the fact that the unemployment rate does not forecast where the economy is going. It reflects where the economy is. This rate is not one of the so-called leading indicators of a business turn. It is one of the "coincident indicators" which show what is happening.

In the third place, many news stories have ignored the reasons for the extent of the unemployment. Here are three major reasons why.

1. The disappearance of many adult women—in the words of a Labor Department manpower expert I checked, "the most important deviation from what we expected." Abruptly, the persistent postwar return of women in the 35–54 age brackets to the labor force has slowed.

Why? Is it because they can't get jobs in this sluggish economy? Is it because the women haven't the skills to fill the jobs available? Is it because so many have gone back to work that the movement is slowing naturally. The answer I received repeatedly to the questions was "we don't know, we're puzzled we have to study this."

2. The disappearance of many young men in the 14–19 age group. The proportion in this group in the labor force was due to drop from 49 percent in 1955 to under 48 percent as of new; instead, it's down to 46.5 percent.

FASTER RETIREMENTS

Why? Is it because the youngsters are responding to pleas to stay in school, get the skills to fill the jobs? Is it because they've tried to get jobs, have found it impossible without training, have left the labor force to go back to school? The suspicion is "Yes" on both counts.

3. The disappearance of many men over 62 and over 65 at a rate "far faster than anyone foresaw." The projection was that by 1975, the over-65 would account for 31 percent of the labor force; the proportion is down to 31.7 percent now, already almost at the 1975 level.

Why? Is it because as the jobs of many of these older people have been erased, they have dropped out to live on whatever pensions and savings they have? Is it because the steady rise in social security and pension protection permits them to retire voluntarily? Probably both.

The unexpected shrinkage in the labor force has good and bad aspects, is part of the mixed bag of statistics of which President Kennedy and Labor Secretary Goldberg have been speaking. It's a befuddling picture, leaving an observer with a flat feeling. And that's what the economy is today—flat at a high level.

New York City's Veterans Service Center a Guide to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 11, 1962, I had the pleasure of interviewing on a radio program over WEVD a young man, Edward Papandrea, assistant director of the Veterans' Service Center of New York City Division of Veterans' Affairs. During my interrogation of Mr. Papandrea I learned in detail the services which the veterans' service center has been rendering to the veterans of the city and State of New York. I discussed with Mr. Papandrea the reasons why legislation authorizing the reinstatement of the lapsed life insurance policies was necessary, and also the reasons justifying granting a pension to veterans of World War I. Mr. Papandrea pointed out that the veterans of World War I received only $30 per month in defending their country, whereas the veterans of World War II and the Korean war received a higher pay and, in addition, received GI benefits, medical care, life insurance at reduced premiums, and other opportunities. With certain limitations, Mr. Papandrea advised the audience and me that such a pension plan would equalize the benefits between the veterans of the different wars. At my request Mr. Papandrea set forth the services which the veterans' service center renders daily and annually. Following is the statement which Mr. Edward Papandrea made to me which I believe to be informative and of great interest:

DEAR MR. SANTANGELO: Pursuant to your request to summarize the activities of the New York City Division of Veterans' Affairs, I forward you this brief statement.

As you know, our office is a part of the municipal government of the city of New York under Mayor Wagner and Paul Rutheiser, who is our director. The division has served over 2 million veterans of all wars, helping them to solve their problems and assisting them in the proper application of their veterans' benefits.

Our staff consists of 25 employees, most of whom are disabled veterans and veterans who are expert in their various counseling specialties. Every year, they assist over 50,000 veterans and their families.

The facilities available at the New York City Division of Veterans' Affairs include the following:

(a) Business and home counseling: This service is provided for veterans who are going into business or purchasing homes.

(b) Federal benefits counseling involving advice and applications for the various benefits available through the Veterans' Administration and insurance advice relative to conversion to permanent plans, change of beneficiary, etc.

(c) Claims service counseling: This unit advises veterans, widows and next of kin on their various rights and benefits and initiates correspondence for review of discharge.

(d) Personal service counseling: Counselors in this unit are available to discuss family and personal problems with the veteran.

(e) Employment counseling: This unit specializes in assisting veterans with employment problems and aiding them in seeking positions, especially those who are disabled.

(f) Educational counseling: Advice is rendered to veterans seeking to further their education. A complete listing of the major colleges and trade schools is maintained for this purpose.

(g) Health unit: This unit is staffed by doctors who give physical examinations to veterans for civil service. Premarital blood tests are also done by this unit.

Frequently, many veterans come to our agency as a last resort. The have been unable to solve their problems elsewhere and seek our assistance. In cases of this type, we have been remarkably successful. Many veterans seek us out as a place where they can receive sympathetic consideration. Our files are full of letters thanking us for the services we have rendered.

At this time, we are enthused about the bill now before Congress which would permit veterans of World War II and Korea to reinstate their National Service Life Insurance protection. At the time of their discharge from service, many of these men not realizing the value of this protection dropped it only to find after they had married and had a family that this insurance is a valuable protection. The New York City Division of Veterans' Affairs has conducted a campaign over a period of 5 years for enactment of this bill permitting reinstatement of G.I. insurance. Included with this reinstatement provision is a 9-percent increase in service-connected disability pensions which will assist disabled veterans in meeting the high cost of living. Our office will have full information and necessary insurance applications when this bill becomes law.

Another important benefit that is available to veterans of New York is the real estate tax exemption. Every year we strive to alert veterans to the money-saving features of this exemption which provides a reduction in real estate taxes for veterans. Veterans can save as much as $200 a year or more on their real estate taxes by taking advantage of this exemption. For full information, we would suggest veterans visit our office at 300 West 43d Street in Manhattan.

The New York City Division of Veterans' Affairs publishes a monthly newsletter for veterans and their families called the Veterans' Voice. The Voice provides an up-to-date account of what is happening in the field of veterans affairs and legislation and is widely read and commented on by veterans. The Voice is free to anyone wishing to receive it. Simply drop us a card at the New York City Division of Veterans' Affairs, 300 West 43d Street, New York 36, requesting that you be placed on the mailing list. We will be happy to see to it that you receive the Voice every month.

In conclusion, I would earnestly suggest to all veterans to come see us if they have a problem or seek assistance in filing for any veterans benefits. We will be glad to talk with them and do everything in our power to assist them. I want to thank you for the privilege of coming here this evening and describing the work done by the New York City Division of Veterans' Affairs.

The Meaning of the Trade Expansion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State:

THE MEANING OF THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT

(Address by the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, before the American Bar Association, San Francisco, Calif., Tuesday, August 7, 1962)

Ever since I was admitted to the bar—sometime about the turn of the century, or so it seems—I have held firmly to a simple and straightforward thesis: Whatever anyone can do, lawyers can do better. You will be amazed to learn, however, that this is not universally accepted.

Within the past 18 months I have sought to demonstrate that this thesis is relevant not only to gaining votes or making money, but also to the esoteric business of diplomacy. If my demonstration has not wholly persuaded all of the critics of the State Department—whether in Congress or the press—that is presumably my fault; it does not reflect upon the inherent validity of the thesis.

Eighteen months is a long period, as we measure time on the New Frontier. During that time I must confress to occasional moments of nostalgia for the good life of the legal practitioner—in fact I feel that nostalgia seven mornings of the week when I arrive at the State Department at 8 o'clock. (An obscenely early hour, as any self-respecting barrister knows.) And so I am pleased and gratified to find myself—even as a transient emigre—back in the affluent society once more.

When I was asked to come here today I browbeat my staff into letting me accept your invitation. My motivations were complex. I always enjoy having an excuse to visit this beautiful city, particularly to meet old friends, and also the President's trade program—which was suggested as the subject for these remarks—is a matter dear to my heart. Not only do I regard it as an economic measure of epic consequence but it is a major beginning toward giving meaning and substance to the Atlantic partnership.

I

The proposed legislation, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, has both a brave future and a distinguished heritage. It is in the great tradition of the reciprocal trade agreements program first conceived by Cordell Hull almost 30 years ago. But it has been drafted to take account of the requirements of American policy in a world that has undergone, and is still undergoing, swift and pervasive change.

Since the end of the Second World War, the political and economic shape of the world has been altered more profoundly than in any two centuries in the past.

An Iron Curtain has dropped down to form a cage around one-third of the human population.

Relationships among the other two-thirds have been radically revised. The great colonial systems that controlled the destiny of more than half of the people in what we have come to call the free world have either disappeared or are on their way toward ultimate disappearance—to be replaced by a whole geography book of new independent nations (46 since 1943) that are shaping a new set of relations with the old colonial powers based on the principle of mutual self-respect.

These former colonial powers—our allies, the great industrial nations of Western Europe—far from being weakened or destroyed by the passing of this outmoded form of power relationship have instead turned their energies with remarkable success toward the monumental tasks of building a strong and united Europe.

By the mutual consent of peoples expressed in the Treaty of Rome—which is the organic document of the European Economic Community—six nations of Europe have achieved a greater unity today than could ever be imposed by military might in the past, and this new "Europe" may soon be expanded. Last August the United Kingdom applied for membership in the European Community. Since then, Denmark, Norway, and Ireland have made similar applications.

It would not be appropriate for me to comment today on the negotiations now in progress between the United Kingdom and the member states of the Community. But if those negotiations do lead to the accession of the United Kingdom to the Treaty of Rome—and I think they will—the Common Market will embrace a population of about one-quarter of a billion people with a gross national product, on the basis of 1961, exceeding $340 billion. It will be an expanding market. The creation of internal free trade within the area of the Community is unleashing strong forces that are giving a new energy both to industry and agriculture. As a result, the member nations today are experiencing a rate of growth half again higher than that of the current growth rate of the United States.

Since the end of the Second World War, consistently through three administrations, the United States has encouraged and supported those forces in Europe pressing toward unity. Our interest in a united Europe, our interest in the European Economic Community, is primarily political. We recognize, as President Kennedy so eloquently said on the Fourth of July in Philadelphia, that the United States and the great nations that are forming the new Europe are interdependent, and that a united Europe can be a "partner with whom we can deal on a basis of full equality in all the great and burdensome task of building and defending a community of free nations."

II

In current discussions of the European Economic Community there is sometimes a tendency to think only of the most conspicuous of its achievements; to regard it merely as a customs union, a commercial arrangement for the advancement of the trading interests of the member nations. Yet the main driving force that has brought the Community into being has stemmed from larger aspirations—a relentless drive toward the ancient goal of a United States of Europe.

Signatory nations to the Treaty of Rome have taken far-reaching commitments. They have agreed not only to create a Common Market but also to undertake a wide spectrum of common action covering all aspects of economic integration—including the concerting of monetary and fiscal policy, the harmonization of social security systems, the development of a common antitrust law, common provisions for the regulation of transport, the free movement not only of goods but of labor, capital, and services, and so on.

Equally as important, they have created a set of institutions, comprising an executive in the form of a commission and a council of ministers, a parliamentary body in the form of an assembly, and a court—the Court of Justice of the Community—that by its decisions has already begun to build up a formidable body of European jurisprudence.

If we think of the European Community not as a static concept, but a living process, we can begin to comprehend its larger political implications. If the negotiations for British accession to the Community succeed, we shall have on either side of the Atlantic two enormous entities; on our side, a federation of states tied together by developed institutions and a century and a half of common experience to form a nation that is the world's leading power; on the other, a community of states, trading as a single market, and seeking among themselves to perfect the common policies and institutional arrangements that can lead toward increasing economic and political integration.

Between them these two entities will account for 90 percent of the free world's trade in industrial goods and almost as much of the free world's production of such goods. Between them they will represent the world's key currencies; they will provide the world's principal markets for raw materials; and they will constitute the world's principal source of capital to assist the less-developed countries to move toward decent living standards.

The degree of interdependence between the great economies flanking the Atlantic—the interdependence to which President Kennedy so eloquently adverted—has been demonstrated repeatedly in recent years. Imbalances within the trade or payments arrangements among the major economically advanced nations can create serious problems. Our own troubling and persistent balance-of-payments deficit is, in a very real sense, the mirror image of surpluses in the accounts of certain of our European friends.

We have been working to achieve the high degree of coordination of domestic economic policies through the OECD in order to minimize these imbalances just as we have been working with our European friends through NATO to achieve an effective defense of the free world or through the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD to coordinate national programs for aid to less developed countries.

III

If the growing partnership between the United States and the new Europe is to result in the strengthening of the free world, our pursuit of common policies on the two sides of the Atlantic must be extended to the construction of a new and more liberal set of commercial relationships.

We in the United States have much to gain by this. For many reasons the development of the European Common Market will provide an unparalleled opportunity for the sale of our products. Our trade with the nations of an expanded Community is today very much in our favor. Our exports of all products to the member nations are about 50 percent higher than our imports. Most Europeans are only just beginning to enjoy many of the consumer goods Americans have known for years—automobiles, electric refrigerators, air conditioning. Using automobile ownership as an index, one may say that the European market is about at the level of consumer demand which existed in the United States in the late twenties—and think of the expansion which has taken place in our market since that day.

We alone in the free world have fully developed the techniques of mass production, for we alone have had a great mass market open to us. If American industry invests the will and energy, and if access to the Common Market can be assured to it by the tools provided by the Trade Expansion Act, we should find in Europe new trading opportunities of a kind not dreamed of a few years ago.

I do not mean to suggest that the development of the European market for American products will be easy. It will require a considerable effort of merchandising of a kind few American firms have ever attempted in Europe because in the past the potential of limited national markets has never seemed to justify the trouble. It will require us to do much more than merely ship abroad the surplus of the goods we produce for Americans. It will mean far greater attention to the tailoring of products designed expressly for European tastes and European conditions.

But we are a creative nation, and there is every reason to suppose that we shall remain so. And we respond with vigor when the challenge is great enough. That we can turn turn our creative genius to use in this new and promising mass market of Europe, I have no doubt. The gains for the American economy will be extraordinary.

IV

From this you will understand that, when I said a few moments ago that America's primary interest in the European Economic Community was political, I did not at all underestimate its economic implications.

Consider the opportunities for us.

By the mid-1950's Europe had effectively completed the major task of postwar reconstruction—assisted, of course, by the Marshall plan. European production was back to the level of prewar days. Since that time, it has been given a prodigious impetus by the bright promise of a Common Market.

In spite of some signs of a slowing down, this extraordinary drive continues. As the full economic benefits of a mass market are progressively made available, Europe may be expected to continue its giant march toward a higher living standard.

But, you may ask, granted that the Common Market will mean a greatly enhanced consumption of goods, what are the chances for American suppliers who produce outside the walls of the common external tariff?

Notwithstanding a common belief to the contrary, the two great common markets of the Free World—the common market of Europe and that of the United States—enjoy with respect to industrial goods about the same level of protection from outside competition. This has been established by recent studies of the Tariff Commission and the Department of Commerce.

In suggesting that the average tariff rates on industrial imports are roughly similar in these two great common markets and that the median rates of duty are about the same, I do not mean to imply that the two areas have the same tariff structure. Our own tariff rates range from the very low to the very high. We admit nearly 1,000 of the 5,000 items on our tariff schedule on a duty-free basis. At the same time there are about 900 items on which we levy a duty of 30 percent or more. Products governed by such high rates are largely excluded from the American market, while the duty-free items to a considerable extent are products not suited to production in the United States.

The common external tariff of the European Community has a quite different structure, because it has developed under the provisions of the Rome Treaty by averaging the rates that existed at the beginning of 1957 in France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux Customs Union. As a result of this averaging process, practically all the high tariff rates existing in the individual countries have been greatly reduced. Whereas over one-sixth of the rates in the United States are above 30 percent, less than one-fiftieth of European rates are over 30 percent. There are few rates in the European Community as protective as are many rates in our own tariff schedule; at the same time there are fewer items on the free list.

These facts are significant for two reasons. In the first place, they show that in any new trade negotiation, the United States and the European Community would be starting at substantially the same levels of protection. It should be possible to phase down the levels of protection at roughly the same pace.

But these studies also demonstrate that, contrary to that prevailing mythology, our trade negotiators have effectively defended U.S. interests. There is a tendency in discussing these matters to cite rates that are markedly higher in Europe than in the United States—such as the current rate on automobiles, which is 22 percent under the common external tariff of the Common Market, and only 6½ percent under the U.S. tariff: But one should not ignore cases where the reverse is true, such as clocks and watches where our rate is 51 percent, and the Common Market rate is one-fourth as much—or such items as safety razors where our rates run from 85 to 255 percent and the Common Market rate is 17 percent.

The myth has somehow grown up that America has been foolishly improvident in past negotiations and that our negotiators have consistently gotten the worst of it. This attitude is, in part perhaps, the reflection of an ancient sense of inferiority—a hangover of colonial psychology; a feeling born of disillusion over early experiences, such as John Jay's superficially bad bargain with the British in 1794; a feeling that persisted during the 19th century throughout a rural America which mistrusted the city slickers—particularly those wearing striped pants and knee breeches in the chancelleries of Europe. We continually tell ourselves that when our diplomats go abroad they are too naive and too high principled to protect their country's interests. Regardless of his demonstrated hardheadedness in private life, it is a pervasive myth that when an American enters the service of his Government he automatically becomes a foolish and dangerous fellow not worthy of being trusted in his dealings with other nations.

Such a view does more credit to our modesty than our judgment. Speaking for the Department of State, which has had the major responsibility for the actual negotiation of trade agreements, I can assure you quite categorically that this view is held nowhere outside of the United States. It is a myth that stops, so to speak, at the water's edge.

The officials of our Government, who over the years have participated in trade agreement negotiations, have served their country well. If this were not so, we could expect to find the tariff rates of Europe today well above those of the United States—and they are not.

With the advent of the European Common Market—and particularly if that market is expanded by the accession of Great Britain—future negotiations will depend to a large extent on the bargain that can be struck not between our representatives and those of a dozen smaller states, as has hitherto been the case, but between the negotiators who speak for our own large market and their European counterparts who speak for a market of almost comparable size. This, in itself, should greatly facilitate the achievement of deals that will be beneficial not only to the Europeans and ourselves but to the whole free world.

V

I have so far dealt primarily with the problem of trade in industrial goods. But we also have a vital interest in maintaining and expanding access for our agriculture products. Our commercial agricultural exports to the countries that would make up an enlarged Common Market are now around $1.6 billion annually and represent nearly half of our total commercial exports of U.S. agricultural products to all countries.

Two developments have an important effect on our position as a major supplier of farm commodities to Europe. One is the technological revolution in agriculture, which Europe is only now beginning to experience. Just as the United States has enjoyed a tremendous growth in agricultural productivity as a result of new scientific techniques, so is Europe now proceeding along the same path. Over the long pull we can expect Europe to produce more grains and other temperate zone products with fewer farmers. Though the vitality generated by the Common Market may accelerate this trend, it is one that would have existed even in the absence of the treaty of Rome.

Another factor affecting our position is the common agricultural policy developed by the Common Market countries early this year after the most intense and difficult negotiations. Those countries began on July 30 to put this common agricultural policy into effect. By 1970, there will be free trade in virtually all agricultural products among the member states.

These are the two factors that we must take into account in seeking to maintain the U.S. position as a principal supplier of agricultural production to the crucial markets of Western Europe—but there are also others of only slightly less significance. With the steady growth of personal income Europeans will tend to shift toward a greater consumption of protein and a reduced direct consumption of cereals. Since farm animals are relatively inefficient meat factories, this means a substantially increased requirement for certain cereal imports—but at the expense of others.

The extent to which an advancing agricultural technology will move Europe toward a higher degree of self-sufficiency in its food requirements—to the disadvantage of imports—will depend upon the price and access policies that the European Community may adopt. It is at this point that negotiations by the Trade Expansion Act can be of critical importance. At the same time it is clear that the major producing and consuming nations must face the hard necessity of achieving global solutions to the difficult problems that exist in certain agricultural sectors.

In insuring a bright future for our agricultural exports we shall need all the bargaining counters we can mobilize—and the Trade Expansion Act was drawn with this fact firmly in mind.

VI

I have up to this point dealt largely with our vital trading interests in Western Europe, but I have very much in mind the fact that our direct trading interests as well as our security interests are global in scope. We need to expand our exports to markets throughout the free world. We have important trading partners in many areas. I need only mention that our trade with Canada alone is of the same order of magnitude as our trade with the six member states of the Common Market. Across the Pacific, Japan is a major market for manufactured goods and the most important single customer anywhere in the world for our agricultural exports. Last year we sold to Japan nearly $700 million more in goods of every kind than we bought from Japan—to the great benefit of our balance of payments. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will provide effective authority for negotiations with these countries—as well as with the less developed countries and the Common Market.

VII

Let me now return for a final moment to the proposition I put to you at the beginning of these observations: that the Trade Expansion Act should be viewed not merely as an instrument for expanding free world commerce and thus benefiting our own economy, but as a solemn political act taken in recognition of the interdependence of which President Kennedy has spoken and of the need for forging an effective Atlantic partnership if the free world is to be strong and secure.

With the progress of Europe toward unity we have for the first time the possibility of a partnership that can become, over the years, a common enterprise in which power and responsibility can be fully and freely shared. We have never been altogether happy with our postwar arrangements in which the preponderance, not only of power but of responsibility, has been so heavily on one side. Now with the prospects of a strong and united Europe we can, for the first time, see the possibility of a partnership of coequals.

Already we are making substantial progress within that partnership in tackling a broad spectrum of common problems: the coordination of economic policies to avoid persistent imbalances, the perfection of techniques for meeting our common responsibilities toward the less-developed areas of the world, the agreement on common objectives of economic growth. Through the Trade Expansion Act we should move rapidly ahead in a further vital area—the expansion of trade not only across the Atlantic but within the whole free world.

And by moving toward this great objective on a basis of agreements reached after patient bargaining we should establish a further strong link among those nations on whom the security of the free world largely depends.

Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD two articles by Mr. George Todt which appeared in the August 8 and 9 issues of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner.

I am sure these articles will be of interest to the many friends and admirers of former President Herbert Hoover, who has earned the heartfelt thanks and admiration of the Nation through his long years of distinguished public service.

The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald Examiner, Aug. 8, 1962]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: HOOVER'S WISDOM

"Not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."—11 Corinthians 3: 6.

We are floundering as a nation today. Scandal piles upon scandal, failure upon failure, defeat upon defeat.

With all the massive power at our command—enough to conquer the entire world if we desired to do so—we are being hurled from pillar to post on the world stage and at home.

Where lies the key to our problems?

Who will lead us out of the wilderness?

The thoughts of a great American citizen whose words are strong, brave, and true were spoken 11 years ago, are appropriate enough today.

Here are a few thought-provoking excerpts from an address made by Herbert Hoover Sr., former President of the United States.

"Something stronger than a new code of ethics is needed by America." "The issue is decency in public life against indecency.

"Without bitterness in our hearts, we are raising our eyes to the Creator of man who assured us that in American soil we can find the moral and spiritual forces which make free men and women. In His guidance, we shall find the fortitude to correct our errors, to straighten our courses, to resurrect the spirit that made our America so free and bountiful a nation."

VIRTUE ENTIRE

"No public man can be just a little crooked. There is no such thing as a no man's land between honesty and dishonesty. Our strength is not in politics—our strength lies in spiritual concepts. It lies in public sensitiveness to evil.

"There are already some old and tested codes of ethics. There are the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and the rules of the game which we learned at our mother's knee. Can a nation live if these are not the guides of public life?

"Dishonor in public life has a double poison. When people are dishonorable in private business, they injure only those with whom they deal or their own chances in the next world. But when there is a lack of honor in government, the morals of the whole people are poisoned."

FATAL ERROR

"I am less concerned at stealing public money than with all the more destructive forms of dishonor. What would the Founding Fathers have thought of those who coquette with traitorship?

"We thus have a cancerous growth of intellectual dishonesty in public life which is mostly beyond the law.

"Debate founded on disclosure of the whole truth and free of propaganda gadgets and slogans is the stuff that can save freemen.

"The term 'liberalism' has turned pink inside. The term 'welfare' never before meant the welfare state with its red or pink colors. The Chinese Communists were not 'agrarian liberals.' From that perversion alone, we suffered a gigantic defeat of freemen in China."

I will give you more of Mr. Hoover's incorruptible and down-to-earth philosophy in my next column.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald Examiner, Aug. 9, 1962]

George Todt's Opinion: Mr. Hoover's Credo

"Talent is nurtured in solitude; character is formed in the stormy billows of the world."—Goethe, "Torquato Tasso."

We are losing on the world stage today because of a recent decadence and degradation of our national character.

To recapture the basic American character as it ought to be, I commenced certain excerpts chosen from a remarkable address by ex-President Herbert Hoover, Sr., 11 years ago in yesterday's column.

Let me continue the quotations:

"Our greatest danger is not from invasion by foreign armies. Our dangers are that we may commit suicide from within by complaisance with evil. Or by cynical acceptance of dishonor. These evils have defeated nations many times in human history."

"The redemption of mankind by America will depend upon our ability to cope with these evils right here at home."

DISCOVERIES

"All things in government which bear the prefix 'new' are not necessarily new. They may not all of them even be good. Truly every generation discovers the world all new again and knows it can improve it. It is a good thing that they do—or our race would shrink in vitality and grow senile.

"Each generation also wants to find out for itself that the stove is hot. A renewal of that information is invaluable.

"But we have overworked this word 'new' in trying to get out of this age of misery from our 37 years of cold and hot wars, with intervals of hot and cold peace.

"The practical thing we can do if we really want to make the world over again is to try out the word 'old' for awhile. There are some old things that made this country."

BASTIONS

"There is the old virtue of religious faith.

"There are the old virtues of integrity and the whole truth.

"There is the old virtue of incorruptible service and honor in public office.

"There are the old virtues of economy in government, of self-reliance, thrift and individual liberty.

"There are the old virtues of patriotism, real love of country and willingness to sacrifice for it.

"Our strength is in character and truth and decent living. And it will triumph.

"It will triumph because I know America is turning its face away from the maudlin left-isms and the spread of untruth of the last two decades. We sense the frauds on men's minds and morals.

"Moral indignation is on the march again."

These excerpts came from an address by Mr. Hoover at Des Moines, Iowa, August 30, 1951, on the occasion of his receiving the first Iowa Award created by the State legislature.

The message fits 1962. Can we absorb it?

Porkbarrelling and Defense Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the issue of the Defense Supply Agency and the immense savings it can offer the taxpayer has occupied a good deal of the time of this body and a substantial portion of the press coverage of national affairs. On June 6 there appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat an editorial which placed the debate concerning Secretary McNamara's efforts to reduce duplication and waste in Defense procurement in its clearest light. The question is, will we allow the Secretary to be stymied in his efforts by porkbarrelling and parochial interests. Because it does so much to clarify the current debate I place this editorial, entitled "Off McNamara's Back" in the Record at this point.

Off McNamara's Back

In Washington, the number of Cabinet officials who are devoting their efforts to cutting costs could be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has brought more administrative ability, business sense, and determination to economize into Washington than probably any other member of the President's official family.

Now, it seems, he has done his job too well. He has made heroic efforts to bring order out of the chaos over which the Pentagon presides like a Colossus.

But in so doing, he has evidently stepped on tender toes.

The Defense Department spends almost half the national budget. It spends it in 50 States, and nearly every congressional district.

This means that any economies achieved come at the expense of some Congressman's constituents.

Mr. McNamara was grilled this week about his practice of setting up a single agency to buy for all of the Armed Forces. This is an overdue reform for which the Globe-Democrat has often called.

Representative Tom Curtis has frequently exhorted the Defense Department to eliminate the staggering waste that results when Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy all run separate purchasing agencies for items of common use.

Congressional critics raked Mr. McNamara over the coals for the trend toward increased centralization in the Defense Department.

The Secretary replied that the Defense Department will save hundreds of millions of dollars by combining buying activities.

Carl Vinson, Georgia Democrat, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, called for the investigation. His State has 19 military installations. "One more base would sink the State," a brave general once testified.

Porter Hardy, Virginia Democrat, charged the Defense Secretary with plotting to set up a single service, and thus do away with Air Force, Army, and Navy. This ridiculous accusation Mr. McNamara denied.

Doing away with the Navy would probably do away with Congressman Hardy. His district includes huge naval installations at Norfolk and Portsmouth, including an amphibious base, a fleet training center, a Marine barracks, a naval shipyard, and a naval supply center.

Obviously, if the Nation is to get the most out of its $48 billion defense budget, a fair-minded, able executive like Secretary McNamara must be allowed to make economies that are long overdue.

The Globe-Democrat thinks too much of men like Representative Vinson to believe that they would let selfish interests stand in the way of the Nation's welfare.

Others in Congress, who may be tempted, should remember that old slogan and be guided by it. Don't shoot the piano player, he's doing the best he can. Congressmen should get off Mr. McNamara's back and let him do a job of sensible economy.

World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to keep these remarks as short as possible for I would like them to be read by the Members of Congress rather than skipped over. To make a long story short, I, as one Member of Congress, am getting tired, disgusted, and a little sick of the way the World War I veterans are being ignored in regard to their pension. Since being elected to Congress 4 years ago, I have witnessed legislative sneaks, and the old bamboozle; but the action on H.R. 3745 beats anything I have seen yet. In 1958, there was a discharge petition filed and there were only 65 signers on this petition. In 1960, there were 145. In 1962, there were 199 signers. This interest shown by the Members who have signed this petition is a direct and clear mandate of the U.S. Congress wishes.

I disagree bitterly with the cost figures some people estimate is involved with this legislation. The cost of this program would only be a drop in the bucket compared to what we are throwing away overseas. As I understand the statistics, World War I veterans are now dying at the rate of 1 every 4 minutes. During the hour in which this statement is being given 15 World War I veterans will have passed on, and the World War I pension obligation will have been reduced by the amount of $1,500; by the amount of $36,000 per year; by the amount of $12,960,000 per year until the year of 1976, at which time only of 4 of 100 World War I veterans will be living and these at the average age of 82 years so that each year until 1976 the World War I pension obligation will be reduced 6 percent until the reduction has reached 96 percent; and thereafter, there will be left only a token amount to be paid out; and shortly thereafter, death will have permanently removed the governmental obligation to these defenders of our country entirely.

The World War I pension expense peak arrived before the year of 1960, and said expense is now fast receding toward the vanishing point.

These men suffered the tortures of hell in the trenches; some times belly deep in water, mud, filth, and blood, besides the other terrible rigors of war. It is not the will of the people that these veterans in their declining years be deprived of a little security long overdue. It is indeed a shame and an insult to these old veterans, to treat them as they have been treated in this and past sessions of Congress. I can tell you it surely leaves a bitter taste—not against their country or its citizens; but to those now in power. Did the big money interests fight against a $4 billion foreign aid bill to be doled out to Communist-controlled nations? No; and I am pleased to say I did not support or vote for the bill.

Private Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in all the discussions of the Government's efforts abroad we all to often forget that nongovernmental efforts are usually more successful in this field. Private efforts are trusted more by the people abroad, they cost less, and they can be improved more easily through the experience of their operations than can the larger, centrally controlled Government programs. Recently—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 9, 1962, pages A5198–A5199—I inserted remarks in the RECORD concerning the fine work being done throughout the world by the Society of Friends, the Quakers. Now, Peter Edson, of the New York World Telegram & Sun, reports on the establishment by Rotary International of its own peace corps. I wish we would understand how much more effective are the results of the work of Rotary and the Quakers in this area than are those of our Government programs.

Mr. Edson's article follows:

PERSON-TO-PERSON PROJECT: ROTARY OPENS OWN PEACE CORPS

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON, July 17.—Rotary International is establishing a peace corps of its own. The 57-year-old service organization is starting a new international small business clinics program for developing countries. It will be an adult educational aid program to help small merchants and manufacturers learn the ways of modern business in a free society.

This is the idea of Nitish C. Laharry, of Calcutta, India, newly installed as president of Rotary International. He is the first Asian to head Rotary, which now has 524,000 members in 11,279 service clubs of 128 countries.

In Washington for a courtesy call on President Kennedy and a speech to the Washington Rotary Club on its 50th anniversary, Mr. Laharry outlined his plans for developing world service on a person-to-person basis.

The idea grew out of a volunteer service by 15 Oklahoma doctors who last year gave 2 months of their time traveling abroad at their own expense to demonstrate modern medical practices for native doctors in their own clinics.

This service was so successful that Laharry, who had been designated this year's Rotary president at its Tokyo convention last year, began plans to spread the club's world community service to a larger field.

Educated as an economist, political scientist and lawyer in India, Laharry had served 32 years as southeast Asia distributor for Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer and Columbia films.

He had traveled in many lands. He knew that in the developing countries there were thousands of small merchants and small manufacturers making and selling one part for an assembled machine—bicycle chains, wheels and pedals, for example. There were also cottage industries, often family affairs with no real knowledge of accounting, merchandising or modern business methods.

If he could get experts from the more developed countries to go into the new countries and hold business clinics for these native businessmen, Laharry reasoned, he would be developing the stature and dignity of freemen. This is one of Rotary's goals.

He thought it could be achieved best by person-to-person contacts, not through the regimented processes of some international government agency.

There are Rotary clubs in practically every country outside the Iron Curtain. There are nearly 1,000 Rotary clubs in Asia, from Iran to Japan, with 37,000 members. There are 300 Rotary clubs in India, with 11,000 members. These clubs provide a natural bridge between the developed and developing countries.

With the help of Harvard University's School of Business Administration, two case study booklets were prepared. They tell how local Rotary clubs can involve every member in worldwide business clinic service.

The new nation of Tanganyika has asked to have the first Rotary business clinic. Panama's Rotary has asked for business clinic service. Laharry wants to send two missions to India this year. A book of Rotary requests from the various countries is being compiled.

Laharry feels that if a dozen clinics are conducted in his year in office, it will be a good start.

Power Preference Request

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the August 12, 1962, issue of the Los Angeles Times.

The editorial comments on a bill recently passed by the Senate proposing a public power preference for the Pacific Northwest. Similar legislation is pending in the House.

Since this proposal is a matter of concern to many of the Members of Congress, I believe the comments and observations of the Los Angeles Times on this legislation will be of interest:

CALIFORNIA UNPREFERRED

The problems of public power corkscrew among themselves like angleworms in a can. Pull at one and several come wriggling out along with it.

The U.S. Senate has just passed a bill about area preference for public power in the Northwest that is entwined with the interests of southern California, the Rocky Mountain States, even the Dakotas, which are in turn entangled with Senator GOLDWATER'S section of the Southwest, and touches wriggling tentacles with the rest of the United States.

FIRST CALL ON POWER

The House of Representatives is still to be heard from, but the Senate is trying to throw away the half-century-old precedent of preference in federally developed waterpower. The tradition and statutory practice are that because a Federal power project is paid for by all the taxpayers of the United States, public power-consuming agencies should have first call on that power if they are within reaching distance of it. Such agencies are cooperative, municipally owned systems such as that of Los Angeles, and as another example, the Metropolitan Water District. After public claims are satisfied, the remaining Federal power may be sold to private distributing companies and industries—but, as the public claims increase, private sales are cut down.

The Senate would change this general public preference to what is called area preference. Some time ago Interior Secretary Udall, who desires a Federal power empire under his command to cover the whole United States with its grid, proposed that electricity from the Bonneville Power Administration be wired to southern California. There was a great row at the time because Mr. Udall wanted to transmit this power on new Federal lines which might have cost all American taxpayers upward of $300 million while the private distributing companies were contending they already had the grid to carry it. But this debate was lost in the uproar from the Northwest, which realized that if the Bonneville Administration could sell power in southern California at production and transmission costs, the competition might raise prices at home. Consumers in the area near Bonneville—public and private—have been getting their electricity at less than cost, and all the taxpayers of the United States are picking up the deficit.

The result of the Northwest pressure was the Senate bill, which would require the Bonneville Administration to serve nearby customers first, whether they are public or private despite the fact that California taxpayers, as well as those of a number of other States, paid a good deal more for the Bonneville installations than the taxpayers of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, who would have a corner on the power.

Secretary Udall sponsored the bill, even though the uproar was fulminated by his own proposal for the power intertie with California, for as power emperor he could still say who was and who was not to have the Bonneville power in the preferential area of the Northwest. The private power companies have no immediate involvement in the case, for it has nothing to do with the transmission lines. Their greedy enemies are quarreling among themselves for cutrate power at the national taxpayers' expense.

How much firm power southern California could get for pumping in the Feather River water system or for helping to carry the load of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power is a hard question. Perhaps the amounts would not be very much, even without area preference. But if the Senate's attempt to put Chinese walls around the dams that everybody has paid for were to succeed, the settled patterns of public power and water consumption could be upset everywhere in revolutionary fashion.

HOUSE STILL HAS TO ACT

Senator GOLDWATER said, perhaps only half seriously, that if the Northwest area preference bill became law, he would introduce another which would "prefer" nearby consumers (read Arizona's) in the use of the lower Colorado's water—and its power, excluding Hoover Dam—which is a special case. And Senator MUNDT said he would have a bill declaring the two Dakotas' area preference on Missouri developments. They have logic with them, if not commonsense; their technical cases are quite as good as that of the subsidized Bonneville area consumers.

The House of Representatives has still to act in this matter, and the Congressmen are closer to the taxpayers than their colleagues of the upper House. Moreover, they all face an election this fall. As the word of this Senate outrage gets around, the chance of the bill becoming law is bound to diminish.

Congo Crisis Underlines Needs for U.N. Loan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations loan bill will come before the House in the near future and I believe its approval is necessary to the security of the United States and of the free world. If the U.N. loan bill is not approved, it is quite likely that the U.N. peace forces in the Congo will be withdrawn. If this happens, the risks of Communist penetration in the Congo will increase a hundredfold.

The Congo is a politically underdeveloped nation, rent by tribal jealousies and by a long-continuing crisis provoked by Moise Tshombe, leader of the mineral-rich, secessionist Katanga Province. The United Nations, under the dedicated leadership of the late Dag Hammarskjold and Secretary General U Thant, has been able, so far, to maintain some semblance of order and harmony in the Congo. House passage of the U.N. loan bill will permit the United Nations, with the support of the United States, to continue its quest for sanity and peace in the Congo.

An excellent analysis of the Congo crisis, and of the problems it creates for the United States and the U.N., is contained in the following article from the Wall Street Journal of August 14, 1962:

CONGO TIME BOMBS: IT THREATENS TO EXPLODE BEFORE UNITED STATES PERSUADES KATANGA TO JOIN NATION—TSHOMBE RESISTS PRESSURE—BRITISH, BELGIANS RELUCTANT TO FORCE HIM FURTHER—ADOULA FACES LEFTIST THREAT

(By Phillip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—For a good many hard-pressed U.S. diplomats, the reviving Congo crisis is taking on the aspect of a bad dream.

Like a giant time bomb, the Congo is ticking alarmingly. But the very Congolese leaders who have most to lose from an explosion keep giving the mechanism an occasional kick. And some of this country's closest allies persist in jostling delicate U.S. efforts to defuse the bomb.

After more than 2 weeks of urgent backstage haggling with Britain, Belgium, France, the United Nations high command, and key Congo figures, the Kennedy administration has managed to assemble a quite elaborate package of progressively more stringent political and economic sanctions against the secessionist Congo Province of Katanga and its intransigent leader, Moise Tshombe.

The aim is to pressure him back into the Congo fold under the Central Government in Léopoldville. By starting with softer measures, such as international refusal to handle Katanga mail, U.S. authorities hope to avoid inflaming pro-Tshombe sympathies; by confronting the Katanga strongman with the ultimate prospect of rougher stuff, such as a boycott of Katanga's mineral wares, they hope to convince him there's no real future in his present course.

But Mr. Tshombe is already breathing defiance of this pressure campaign. Central Congo Government Leader Cyrille Adoula has jumped the gun by trying to impose his own economic sanctions on Katanga ahead of schedule. And Britain and Belgium have let it be known their heart isn't really in the scheme, at least so far as any coercive measures are concerned.

PRIVATE DOUBTS

Result: While U.S. authorities argue officially that their program had a good chance of bringing Mr. Tshombe around eventually, most experts in Washington and at the U.N. privately confess to serious doubts. They fear the new approach will not work quickly enough to head off a political upheaval in the rest of the Congo and prevent the collapse of the Adoula regime.

Katanga's continued cold-shouldering of the Central Government fans secessionist sentiment in other provinces, notably Katanga's neighbor, Kasai, which also boasts valuable mineral resources. Mr. Adoula, who lacks the tribal affiliations that are so important to Congo politics, is under increasing fire for failure to produce on his year-old promise to bring Katanga back into the Congo. His economic problems approach total chaos; experts calculate the budget deficit this year may triple total revenue. Only the presence of U.N. forces prevents wide-scale looting, rioting or tribal bloodletting by units of the unruly Congo army, observers report.

But perhaps the major threat is a curious parliamentary alliance between political heirs of the late Patrice Lumumba, onetime Premier and rallying point for the more extreme leftist and nationalist political forces, and so-called rightwing Tshombeites in the Congo legislature. This combine just recently succeeded in killing off two important Adoula measures aimed at reforming fiscal management and Government administration.

Already, Mr. Tshombe is citing the weakness of the Central Government as one reason why he shouldn't be asked to reach a political settlement with Mr. Adoula; and some experts suspect his real aim may be to tumble Mr. Adoula from power; if, as seems almost inevitable, a successor government proves much more violently leftist, Mr. Tshombe could argue still more persuasively that he ought not be expected to ally himself with it in a political settlement.

NO BOON FOR TSHOMBE

The consensus of most Washington officials, however, is that Mr. Adoula's downfall would be no boon for Mr. Tshombe. The upshot would be fresh turmoil and tribal scuffling, at the very least. But more ominous is the likelihood that a more leftsit government would try to shoulder the U.N. Congo peace force aside and attempt to reconquer Katanga by force, quite possibly with Communist help.

"Tshombe can't win in the long run," declares one top Kennedy aid. But he quickly adds: "This is a race against time, and there are an awful lot of ways for us to lose."

Already some U.N. officials are talking gloomily of withdrawing their organization's 15,000-man Congo peace force if headway hasn't been made on the crucial Katanga question by the end of this year. Even if the U.S. Congress finally OK's this country's purchases of up to $100 million in U.N. bonds, and the rest of the $200 million bond issue is sold elsewhere, officials of the world organization contend that shaky finances alone might force a U.N. pullout from the Congo. Intimates add that Burma's U Thant, Acting Secretary General of the world body, would lean heavily toward withdrawal rather than have his peacekeeping mission involved in actual fighting in the Congo again.

Not all the experts are quite so glum. Some administration planners insist the U.N. will have funds enough to carry on its Congo role until at least the middle of next year. Others argue that the new Congo package contains more than enough persuaders for Mr. Tshombe, even allowing for the British and Belgian dissents. Explaining his country's course, a British diplomat contends: "With any luck there won't be any need for resort to coercion at all."

A U.S. HOPE

U.S. officials emphasize that they, too, hope rougher measures against Katanga can be avoided. "We're not out to destroy Tshombe," says one U.S. official. "We simply are out to destroy his illusion that Katanga can survive for very long as an independent state." U.S. authorities figure that a lot can be accomplished toward this end by a whole series of "pinprick" measures, such as persuading travelers in and out of Katanga to apply for visas from the Léopoldville Government; encouraging international bodies having to do with postal matters or telecommunications to work through the Central Congolese Government, rather than dealing with the Katanga Government; soliciting general statements of support for a united Congo and disapproval for a separate Katanga from any nation willing to sound off on the subject.

But most experts in Washington and at U.N. headquarters remain skeptical that such measures will be effective quickly enough.

"Right now, Tshombe is riding the crest," says one U.S. diplomat. Like most others, he figures the Katanga leader has no real intention at the moment of negotiating a political settlement with the Central Congo Government. According to this view, Mr. Tshombe has been persuaded by key advisers, including white settlers in Katanga, Europeans with interests in the province and such aids as New York-based propagandist Michel Struelens, Belgian-born chief of the Katanga Information Service, that U.S. and Western European support will eventually swing solidly behind him if he simply plays a waiting game.

The Katanga chieftain is so sure of this shift in the view of some authorities that they even worry about the impact on him of this fall's U.S. congressional elections. "If the Republicans pick up some seats, Tshombe will be convinced it was at least partly because of popular discontent in this country with Kennedy's Congo policy," says one U.S. diplomat.

This analysis of Mr. Tshombe's game causes some experts to question whether it's even wise to exert new pressure on him without firm Allied support for such tough, last-resort measures as an economic boycott. "We might set out to demonstrate the strength of outside opposition to Katanga's separate status and wind up demonstrating our own weakness," warns one diplomat.

While some of President Kennedy's closest advisers concede this risk, they intend to push ahead. Mild pressures will first be tried, coupled with promises of generous Western aid to a united Congo. If Mr. Tshombe resists this approach, the United States would seize on this resistance to prod its European allies for a go-ahead on tougher anti-Tshombe action.

TSHOMBE SUPPORT IN BRITAIN

This tactic, however, promises to encounter stiff opposition, particularly in Britain, where pro-Tshombe sentiment is strong within the Conservative Party's ranks. Britons, including some influential Tory figures, hold a big interest in the part-British, part-Belgian Union Miniere du Haut Katanga, the sprawling mining complex whose tax payments on mining of copper and other minerals amounted to over $41 million last year, the bulk of the Katanga Government's revenue.

Belgium, according to U.S. officials, has been somewhat more favorable to stern anti-Tshombe actions than Britain. But neither in Brussels nor in London is there much enthusiasm for economic boycotts against Katanga or even efforts to persuade Union Miniere to pay part of its taxes to Léopoldville, or place them in escrow pending a political settlement, a move the U.S. advocates as part of its progressive anti-Katanga squeeze.

Union Miniere officials have argued that refusal to pay taxes to the Elisabethville government in Katanga would invite reprisals.

Even the U.N.'s U Thant, who has promised to protect Union Miniere against such retaliation, has made it plain his U.N. troops could only protect the major facilities from damage.

U.S. officials argue Mr. Tshombe probably would not relish a closedown of mining operations and loss of needed revenue and so the risk of retaliating against Union Miniere isn't very great.

But putting the squeeze on Tshombe may turn out to be a long-drawn-out affair. And every day it drags on, U.S. officials feel, the danger of a political blowup in Léopoldville will grow. Says one top U.S. diplomat: "Adoula could be toppled almost any day."

Outstanding Public Service to the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the 29th of August will begin the 7th year of television broadcasting by WCKT from channel 7 in Miami, Fla. A few weeks later Biscayne Television Corp., which owns and operates WCKT, will also mark the sixth anniversary of radio station WCKR, on 610 kilocycles, in Miami.

During the past 6 years, both WCKT and WCKR have risen to places of distinction among the Nation's many broadcasting institutions and have been an outstanding source of news, entertainment, and public service to the community.

Television and radio broadcasting in the United States carries a responsibility exceeding that of any other enterprise operating in the public service. It means having clear objectives, taking meaningful action, and looking to growing achievements. WCKT and WCKR operate according to these precepts.

I would like to quote the broadcasting creed of WCKT, which was first announced on July 29, 1956, and applies to the entire activities of the staff and management of the Biscayne Television Corp.:

> We pledge to inform with candor and fairness.
>
> To entertain with dignity and good taste.
>
> To serve with vigor the needs and welfare of the people of south Florida and our country.
>
> And, above all, to conduct ourselves as befits an invited guest in the homes of our viewers.

Racial Disturbances in Albany, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

.HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., is a newspaper noted for its sound and sensible editorial policies and comments. In the August 14, 1962, issue, the distinguished editor of this newspaper, Mr. Wayne W. Freeman, has done an excellent job of analyzing the tense situation in Albany, Ga., and the unnecessarily dangerous intervention into the affairs of this troubled city by the Federal Government on the pretense that to encourage a continuation of racial demonstrations is to help in the preservation of law and order.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION INCITING NEGROES

As it did when it adopted the little used precedent by intervening in the school cases before the U.S. Supreme Court during 1952–54, the Justice Department made a mockery of the legal term "amicus curae" when it intervened before the Federal district judge considering the request of the city of Albany for an injunction to halt the distressing "demonstrations" by Negroes.

The term, translated from the Latin, means "friend of the court." This is a disinterested and unbiased third party which is allowed to come into a court to provide testimony, case histories, legal precedents and other information to assist the judge in arriving at a just decision.

But the Justice Department of John F. Kennedy and his brother Bobby intervened not as a friend of the court, but as a direct advocate of the Negro defendants in the injunction suit. It is aiding and abetting Negro agitators in their courting of disaster for a whole community.

The brief filed in the name of the U.S. Government said in effect that the laws under which the Albany city officials have acted to prevent disorder and frighteningly imminent violence or outright racial warfare are null and void and of no force and effect. But no competent court has declared these laws unconstitutional.

The city contends that the mob scenes called "marches" violate an ordinance prohibiting parades without a permit. Some Negroes have been arrested for disturbing the peace, and what else can one in good conscience call it?

The Justice Department said Albany officials have an obligation under Federal laws and the Constitution to end segregation practices. There are no specific laws enacted by Congress which impose such an obligation and there is no provision in the Constitution for any governing body to force the owners of any business establishment to accept the patronage of persons they do not want to serve.

The Negroes and the Federal Government can rely only on the Warren Supreme Court decision in the school segregation cases, and its legal parentage is suspect, to say the least. It does not apply to the Albany situation.

But that wasn't enough. The Justice Department went on to say that the failure of the city officials to end segregation has brought on the demonstrations. In other words, the men sworn to enforce local and State laws are inviting violence by doing their duty.

If this is not an open invitation to the Negroes to continue their wild and provoking antics and to go even further, then what is it? Instead of trying to help create a climate in which the strife can be stilled (and the city officials have agreed to talk with bona fide leaders of the Negroes of Albany when peace is restored) the administration has added fuel to the flames.

It might as well say to the Negroes of Albany and everywhere else in the United States that if they don't like a local or State law they can ignore it and deliberately violate it. It may not have intended that, but that is the way it will be taken by the Drs. King and Anderson, and the word will spread. Less intelligent Negroes may soon consider themselves immune from laws made by white men.

It amounts to inciting to riot, no matter how the Kennedys may seek to disguise it.

If bloodshed is the result, the administration must bear the primary responsibility. The Albany police have done their duty without discrimination. They have arrested Negroes only when they have gotten completely out of hand and have endured insults and brickbats from the surging black masses.

When the members of the Ku Klux Klan arrived in town, the chief of police went to them and told them to leave, or they would be thrown in jail upon their first move to cause more trouble.

The next time it may not be so easy. Having in effect encouraged the Negroes to take the law into their own hands, the administration need not be surprised if the white citizens of Albany do the same thing. It would not be right, but it may be inevitable.

Human nature has its breaking point; the forbearance of the police officers and the white citizens has been strained; how much more can it take? The administration should have thought of this before it excused the behavior of the Negroes.

One of their self-appointed leaders already has advertised what he and his followers would do. He told the Federal district judge that he felt no compulsion to obey an "unjust law." He and others already had marched after another Federal judge issued a short-lived injunction.

He might as well have said he and his mobs would ignore an injunction if the judge issued it.

Yet, white southerners have been damned and pilloried for not accepting the nebulous 1954 Supreme Court decision as "the law of the land" and as an iron-bound edict, having the effect of an act of Congress or an amendment to the Constitution. When they have overtly protested what they consider an "unjust law" they have been threatened with jail for contempt of court.

Heaven only knows what would happen if they formed mobs and started marching, congregating in public places and chanting their displeasure in jungle rhythms.

But, then, this is election year and the administration is playing the Albany situation for all it is worth to win the Negro vote in the big cities where it counts the most, even if it means a double standard of justice for the two races.

Mexico, a Nation With a Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of an excellent article which contains a keen analysis of the present situation in Mexico, and its importance for United States-Mexican relations. In view of the current situation throughout Latin America, I am sure this article and the views expressed therein will be of great value to my colleagues and to all those interested in Latin American affairs.

The article, entitled, "Mexico, a Nation With a Future," is written by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, of San Antonio, Tex. He is an international lawyer of repute, a man who has spent many years in Mexico and in other Latin American countries, and is an expert on United States-Latin American relations. The article is not only interesting, but thought-provoking and makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Speaker, from the enclosed letter, to me it is clear that Mr. Orleans has spent considerable time in the preparation of this article. I have always been deeply interested in our relations with Latin America and I am, therefore, pleased that this article has come to my attention. I wish to insert it into the RECORD, together with the letter from the author, which are as follows:

MEXICO, A NATION WITH A FUTURE

(By Fred A. Orleans)

Those who wish to weaken United States-Mexican relations have tried many means to do so and most recently have attempted a "hate and fear" campaign against Mexico through reviving, dusting off, and bringing out again the myth that former President Cardenas can take over Mexico at will and that the nation would then be a bastion of communism, offering a far greater threat to the future of the United States than even Castro's Cuba. These peddlers of hate have chosen to ignore the fact that in a recent election in the home State of former President Cardenas, Michoacan, the candidate he supported for Governor was defeated.

It has been stated that Cardenas controls the army through his friendship with the leading generals and because of the deep bond that exists between them and him. While acknowledgedly there are many military leaders, as well as political leaders, who owe their present position in Mexico to their past friendship with Cardenas, and while it is equally true that they would not turn their back on him at home, they most emphatically would not aid and abet his taking over the country to serve the ends of international communism.

Domestic politics is one thing in Mexico, while interference from abroad with the governing of the country is another. The leaders of Mexico, both military and political, would be no means stand idly by and allow their country to be taken over by foreign interests. If patriotism or nationalism are not sufficient reasons for their fighting to protect their country, commonsense would dictate their fighting to preserve what they have and what they most certainly would lose if communism triumphed in Mexico.

For many years the Communists have been striving to build up Lazaro Cardenas as a great leader and rallying point for a Communist movement to spread throughout the hemisphere. Those who write inflammatory and sensational articles in the United States about Mexico and attack Cardenas, build his position out of true proportions, and play directly into the hands of the Communists by giving him the buildup the Communists seek for him.

The people of Mexico are by no means unaware of the threat which international communism poses to the future of their country and it may surprise many in the United States to learn that they are not as apathetic as many citizens in the United States think. The people of Mexico have turned out in substantial numbers to protest Marxism and Marxist attempts to infiltrate their educational system.

"Hate and fear the United States" campaigns have been conducted throughout Latin America for many years by the Communists and have greatly aided their overall cause. The "hate and fear" campaign in Cuba conducted against the United States was very useful to Castro when he originally took over that country, and it has served him well since that time. Another example of this type of program was begun in 1960, close to 2 years ago, and probably was originally instigated and kept alive by the Communists. This campaign, conducted both in the United States and Mexico, has included the following which were intended to disrupt United States-Mexican relations, and unfortunately many in the United States unwittingly have cooperated with this plan to divide and conquer.

The creation of incidents in Mexico were well publicized in the United States so that people would react the way the Communists intended for them to react and cease crossing the border to Mexico. This was an attempt to destroy an important source of income for Mexico which depends heavily on the tourist trade. These incidents also were used to discourage foreign capital investments. It is true that an insignificant number of individuals were responsible for the agitation and incidents which occurred in Mexico, but the resultant publicity tended to give the impression that the will of the majority was being expressed. It was unfortunate that the great percentage of the Mexican people who are pro-American, are not always as articulate as the small percentage of those who are anti-American.

The "hate and fear" bracero labor incidents were created, which resulted in the Mexican people being given the impression that the United States discriminated against braceros and did not want to provide employment for them, while on the other hand, the impression was given in the United States that bracero labor deprived American citizens of rightful employment. The attempts to bar braceros from working in the United States did not take into consideration the fact that perishable crops in many parts of the United States, not adaptable to mechanical harvest, could never be harvested without bracero labor.

Tariff increases on imports from Mexico were proposed for the ostensible purpose of protecting U.S. mining interests, but would have actually resulted in making it difficult for Mexico to continue the large volume of trade it effected with the United States. Mexico's international trade covering total imports and exports is approximately $2 billion a year, most of this trade being with the United States. An increase in U.S. import duties on raw materials from Mexico would have aided the Communists in their attempt to weaken the economic ties between Mexico and the United States and thereby would have enabled the Communist countries to establish greater volumes of trade with Mexico.

The salt water damage incident in Mexico from U.S. rivers actually represented a great amount of agitation about nothing at all. People in Mexico were persuaded to make substantial claims against the United States for damages resulting from salt contents of water originating from the U.S. side of the border. The propaganda on the U.S. side stressed the fact that Mexico was attempting to extort from the United States money to which they were not entitled. This matter developed into a two-headed monster which actually worked against the interests of the people on both sides of the border.

The Zapata movement incident resulted from tremendous publicity given in the United States to an organization with the declared intent to overthrow the Government of Mexico. The leader of this organization, who was originally a Mexican citizen, and subsequently a U.S. citizen, declared himself provisional President of Mexico and indicated that he intended to secure recognition of the United States that he was President of Mexico. Exposure of the background of this individual resulted in the prompt termination of this incident.

Regulation of border points of entry called for the bridges which link the United States and Mexico to be opened only for certain specific hours of the day, thereby limiting the hours of entry and egress. This caused consternation on both sides of the border and emphatic objections from Laredo and other border cities which resulted in this plan being shelved.

The buildup of Cardenas has been previously covered in this article, but at one time this buildup reached such a hysterical pitch that a group of leading Mexicans placed a full page ad in a newspaper in Mexico titled "Cardenas is not Mexico," and a book was written titled "Cardenas—the Man and the Myth."

The racist angle has been very much overworked in recent years and the Communists can find many in the United States to exploit this issue and many in Mexico willing to inflame the people.

The vilification of many of the "heroes" of the Mexican revolution through emphasizing that they were cruel or evil or brutal played into the hands of the Communists.

The stand which Mexico took on the Cuban situation and which caused much ill will among the people of the United States should be explained at this point. Mexico's stand on Cuba was brought about through a combination of the Doctrine of Nonintervention to which Mexico rigidly subscribes; an internal fear that Communist elements would seize upon a break with Cuba to accuse the Government of Mexico of having sold out to the United States and thereby bring about unnecessary agitation and demonstrations by the uninformed in that country; propaganda by the news media of the United States utilized by Mexican newspapers, which actually glorified Castro until very recent date.

Actually what has happened in Mexico is that the people are beginning to understand that Castro is not a great reformer, but merely a tool of international communism; that food and other basic necessities are being rationed in Cuba; and, in brief, that Castro has not kept any of his promises to the Cuban people nor provided the utopia he so loudly offered. The Government of Mexico is very definitely not allowing Communist elements in that country as much freedom of activity as in the past and has quietly taken the steps necessary to restrict Communist and pro-Castro activities in their country.

This is a good time to take a careful look at Mexico. There have been many indications that Mexico, after reaching the fork in the road, is turning more and more to private enterprise, with the realization by many of its leaders that private enterprise will ultimately have to solve the problems of the country, which is in the process of industrialization and development. The following representative examples offer proof of this:

Secretary of Economy Raúl Salinas Lozano, during a recent tour of the United States, stressed the need in Mexico for private capital.

By Presidential decree, the Navy Department of Mexico will turn the naval shipyards at San Juan de Ulúa in Vera Cruz over to a private company composed of mixed capital, 64 percent Mexican and 36 percent foreign.

Mexico will soon have a fleet, independent of the Pemex Petroleum fleet, to transport oil and the majority of the capital will be supplied by private Mexican initiative and U.S. private capital with some government participation.

President Adolfo López-Matéos, in inaugurating the annual meeting of the National Confederation of Industrial Chambers, stated that "when the driving forces of development are on the wane, it becomes imperative that private initiative, responsible to a great degree for Mexico's progress, take action and intensify its efforts of productive investments." The President of Mexico further indicated that in recent years, the correlation between private and public investments has been to the country's benefit, with each stimulating the other to greater efforts. He called for this investment effort being preserved and bettered and indicated that there is ample room for both types of investments without the necessity of establishing contention or competition between them.

The Mexican Government-owned oil company, Petroleos Mexicanos, recently obtained its first loan from private U.S. investor sources. New York banks indicated that Petroleos Mexicanos was operating profitably; that oil reserves would justify loans up to $300 million and that Pemex had a good record for paying U.S. suppliers of machinery.

The President of Mexico has approved a new national program for economic development to be put into effect within 3 years which would accelerate the industrialization of the country. This program has the objectives of creating new work sources; acceleration of the rate of growth in the national economy; eliminate pressures on the balance of payments; and the more efficient utilization of existing industrial capacities through the production of new commodities. The Government of Mexico is offering private initiative, fiscal, and credit incentives, including taxation exemption, tariff protection, control of importation, export stimulation and credit facilities to obtain domestic and foreign financial resources. This new national program coupled with the reawakened interest of Mexican businessmen in investing in their nation's future; the confidence demonstrated by international financing organizations; the strength shown abroad in the Mexican peso, and the general improvement of the international political picture is bringing about a change in the business community's "psychological atmosphere" in Mexico.

In general, Mexico's investment climate is improving and it is beginning to look more attractive than other countries of Latin America. Various Government officials have publicly spoken of the need for foreign capital to accelerate economic growth and there appears to be more willingness now to modify regulations in order to encourage U.S. investors.

Consideration is being given to the need for international agreements to cope with the crises brought about by continuously lower prices for raw materials. The importance of maintaining price stability of basic commodites which Mexico exports cannot be overemphasized. Mexico as well as the countries of Latin America in general have lost more in the past year due to declining raw material prices on the world market than they have gained through loans obtained in the past 4 or 5 years. For the Alliance for Progress to succeed, it is essential that some method be evolved to stabilize the prices of raw materials which constitute the major export item of most Latin American countries.

The time has come to give less stress to negative aspects of United States-Mexican relations and more emphasis to the positive aspects. This will enable Mexico to assume that much sooner its place among the leading nations of the world, and the United States through a prosperous Mexico, will have a strong ally as well as a showcase to demonstrate what can be done in any country which is willing to work to attain an objective.

San Antonio, Tex.,
August 2, 1962.

Hon. Victor Anfuso,
1641 New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Anfuso: For many months I have been working on the enclosed, "Mexico, a Nation With a Future." I am pleased to submit this to you in view of the fact that you have shown over the years such a tremendous interest in United States-Latin American relations, and have devoted so much effort in both attempting to improve same as well as make available to the many who read the Congressional Record the viewpoints of Dr. Ezequiel Padilla of Mexico and myself.

Sincerely yours,
Fred A. Orleans.

U.S. Policy: Let Red China Stew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the Far Eastern horizons, Communist China still poses a major threat to peace.

Fortunately, however, Red policy—though a danger to the free world—is, itself, creating many of its own problems to jeopardize its future.

Economically, for example, the Red Chinese literally stagger under a tremendous burden. With a populace of over 650 million, the gross national product—according to our State Department estimates—amounts to only about $79 billion annually. By comparison, the U.S. gross national product amounts to over $552 billion annually for a populace of 186 million.

Addicted to aggression, however, Chinese Communists still attempt to export conspirators, money and material elsewhere in the world to foment trouble. As a policy this is backfiring by creating ever-larger deficiencies in its domestic program.

Recently, the Wisconsin State Journal published an article by Donald May, entitled "U.S. Policy: Let Red China Stew." Reflecting upon this Communist threat to peace, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. POLICY: LET RED CHINA STEW

(By Donald May)

U.S. policy on Red China at the moment is to keep its own defenses up, to make clear that it would resist any Red Chinese military moves, and to continue to let China stew in its own juice.

This policy is the result of searching questions Western intelligence sources have been asking, such as:

How much more hunger and economic privation can the Red Chinese take before pressure under the lid of tight Communist control reaches a breaking point?

CONTINUING TROUBLES

If unrest does reach a critical point, what forms will a blowup take?

Although they foresee no dramatic developments very soon in China, U.S. analysts look at evidence of continuing Red Chinese troubles on almost every front.

Much thought has been given in the Kennedy administration to ways in which the United States might increase China's difficulties economically. But with trade already completely cut off, no one has come up with any very practical means.

The following summary is based on reports by U.S. officials specializing in Chinese affairs:

Red China has had 3 bad harvest years and it is unlikely that this year's crop, the bulk of which comes in October, will be much improved. The Chinese diet is estimated at from 1,500 to 1,800 calories a day, compared with the Far East average of 2,100.

SINO-SOVIET RIFT

China's political and ideological rift with the Soviet Union, in which Russia has withdrawn most of its aid, appears to be getting worse.

One of the latest incidents involved Chinese protests against Russian offers to provide jet fighters to India, with which China has a border dispute.

In London Tuesday the China Association, which represents British firms trading with Red China, reported that Chinese-Soviet trade is now half what it was in 1959 and is balanced against China.

Soviet exports to China in 1961 were placed at $366.8 million against $551.6 million which China shipped to Russia. Moscow has been pressing Peiping to begin this year repaying $300 million in old trade debts.

Red Chinese foreign exchange used to trade with the free world is believed near the dwindling point.

LEAP FALLS FLAT

China's great leap forward in which peasants were ordered from the farms to the cities several years ago in an attempt to build an industrial state has failed, and millions of peasants are now being ordered back to the farms. Last spring they arrived in the countryside in the season of greatest food shortage. This apparently was one factor which led to the flood of refugees to Hong Kong in May.

Various efforts to revive public spirit have been tried. More private sale of home-produced crafts was permitted. Peasant farmers recently were allowed to grow food in private plots for consumption or sale.

The army has been better fed than the peasants, and more content. But there have been indications army morale has suffered as soldiers receive letters describing how their families are faring.

RED LEADERS BLAMED

The central government appears to have publicly blamed local Communist leaders for national failure, and this has created friction between these officials and the people in some areas.

Although this adds up to a grim picture, U.S. officials do not believe the Peiping regime is in any immediate danger of overthrow. They feel evolution is more likely than revolution—that is, gradual changes in government policies which have brought about the plight.

But when this might begin to appear, no one will guess.

Purple Heart Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present my views on Purple Heart Day, dedicated to gallant American heroes, who, in various wars of our great Nation shed their blood to perpetuate our liberties.

The awarding of the Purple Heart is of greatest significance. It was originated 180 years ago by the Father of our Country, the immortal Gen. George Washington, to honor the brave, devoted men who fought with him in the Revolutionary War for outstanding dedication and supreme sacrifice in battle.

In 1932 this honored award was revived by President Hoover and that great fighting soldier, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and is accorded only to our wounded or dead veterans of the wars. The deep color of the Purple Heart decoration was once described by ancients as being as valuable as gold or jewels, fitting to the lofty stature of fighting men.

The award has been granted to very many of our hallowed war dead, those who died of wounds and those who, though wounded, yet lived in honor and glory. Nearly all of those possessing the Congressional Medal of Honor are holders of the Purple Heart Award, and there are 293 living Americans, 46 of whom served in World War I, who hold these treasured decorations. More than half of the 644 Medal of Honor winners of World War II and the Korean conflict received posthumous awards acknowledging their great sacrifices and their willingness to bleed or die for love and loyalty of country.

Not all heroic veterans of our wars were awarded this prized decoration, because in innumerable cases many gallant heroes fell in mortal combat or made other heroic sacrifices far beyond the call of duty only to live to tell of it. These are the unsung heroes who, while undecorated, live, like the great Washington, in the hearts of our countrymen.

The Purple Heart has been bestowed upon our heroes regardless of their national origin, regardless of their racial derivation, regardless of their religious faith.

It has been a decoration sparingly bestowed upon those who, to the knowledge of their commanding officers and comrades, spilled their blood while fighting for the cause of freedom.

It is most appropriate that a special day has been set aside to honor the gallant and the free who prized liberty so much that they were willing to die or bleed for it.

The sacrifices of these men and all our American heroes who paid the supreme price upon the sacred altar of American patriotism are permanently and deeply inscribed in the glorious annals of our country and in the grateful memory of the American people of every generation.

It is well for us, as representatives of the people, to remember to keep in our minds and in our hearts the noble, unselfish sacrifices of these men. It will be well for us to resolve again and again by voice and by vote in this great body to give practical effect to the national gratitude and our own gratitude to these heroes and their dear ones by making certain that the great programs which Congress has developed for their proper care will ever continue to be guarded, strengthened, and projected to do justice to all those who have served our Nation so loyally.

The cause of their dependents and their dear ones must also be our cause, because this Nation, if it endures through the ages, may the good Lord grant, it could never adequately pay its debt of gratitude to the heroes of the Purple Heart and their families.

Congress will continue for all time to recognize the Purple Heart and fellow comrades of every American war who gave or offered their all to sustain American liberty.

We have a solemn obligation never to forget these men but always to remember their devotion and loyalty in terms of wholehearted generosity and profound humane consideration for those, who by their heroic individual and collective sacrifice, have made security and ordered liberty possible in our day.

Mr. Speaker, in fitting recognition of the great sacrifices made by the heroes of all wars going back to the War of Independence when the first Purple Heart award was made, I recently introduced legislation, now before the Committee on the Judiciary, calling upon the President to proclaim August 7 of each year as Purple Heart Day.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill, House Joint Resolution 836, be printed in the RECORD.

The text follows:

To authorize the President to proclaim the 7th day of August of each year as Purple Heart Day.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7th day of August of each year as Purple Heart Day in commemoration of the deeds of those who have been awarded the Purple Heart, an award first made by George Washington on August 7, 1782, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Kennedy Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today, I had occasion to read an address delivered on August 6 to the Western States Democratic Conference by Mr. Ted Sorenson, Special Assistant to the President. His message to the conference so well enunciates the goals and accomplishments of the Democratic Party and of the Kennedy administration that I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Sorenson's direct and forceful address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNEDY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(Address of Theodore Sorenson, special assistant to the President, delivered to the Western States Democratic Conference Aug. 6, 1962)

We meet in a year of decision. The American people must choose whether this Nation is to "sail or anchor down"—whether we are to blaze new trails for century 21 or return to the well-worn paths of century 19.

The 21st century is but 38 years away. We who are here tonight know that we must educate our children to meet its challenges. We must conserve our resources to meet its needs. We must expand our economy to realize its promise. And we must preserve the human race to enjoy that century in freedom.

But while our eyes are on the century ahead, our opponents are looking back, increasingly united in the blindness of their opposition and in the bitterness of their abuse. They call for cuts in Federal spending but they do not say where. They tell our older citizens to purchase health insurance but they do not say how. They predict unemployment will dissolve without public action but they do not say when.

They do say they are for balancing the budget—not by stating it more accurately, separating capital assets from current expenditures, not by closing tax loopholes or cutting farm surpluses, not by boosting the economy to boost tax revenue, but by blocking all efforts for the education, for conservation, for public works and public health.

They do say they believe in free enterprise, and so do we all, but they mean freedom to pollute our air and our water, freedom to raid our forests and public lands, freedom to pay substandard wages, to make windfall profits on the national stockpile, and to cut people off of public welfare as inveterate frauds or loafers. Oh, to be sure, they are not always hardhearted, all humans weep, but they weep for that 7 percent of the taxpayers who receive 80 percent of dividend income. They weep for those speculators who considered themselves geniuses when the stock market rose after Kennedy's election, and then blamed him when it fell back to the same level this year. They weep, not for the farmer or rancher who is struggling to make ends meet, but for the storage operator who enjoyed a threefold increase in surpluses under Mr. Benson and wants to keep it that way. They weep for the American Medical Association, not those without funds for hospitalization. They weep for the billboard owners, not those who are denied our scenic beauties.

But too often, let us face the fact, their views have prevailed in the Congress. In neither House do we have a solid majority consistently supporting the policies of the Democratic Party and President Kennedy. We have lost important battles, often by a handful of votes, on the floor of both Houses and in most of the major committees. But by and large these are battles which have been lost before, in sessions with even larger Democratic proportions. They are the old familiar battles over education, health insurance, agriculture, and tax loopholes. And in no instance has the loss of any one of these battles meant the end of the war.

For whatever may be said about those Democrats who oppose us, the fact remains that every single seat gained by the Democratic Party in this fall's election will be a gain for the Democratic program. And I learned as a boy from the life and lips of George Norris that those "who sow in tears shall reap in joy," and that today's defeats often pave the way for tomorrow's victories.

There are some who attribute these defeats to the fact that the program is too extreme. And perhaps it is. For we have proposed that human consumers receive the same protection against worthless drugs that has been enjoyed by American hogs, sheep, and cattle since 1913. That is rather extreme.

We have proposed that the special concerns of the 125 million people who live in our urban areas receive the same Cabinet-level representation as those of the 13 million who live on the farm. That is also rather extreme.

We have proposed helping our public schools pay those to whom we entrust the minds of our children an annual income comparable to the income of those to whom we entrust the care of our plumbing.

We have proposed that Federal help should be available to those local systems of mass transportation that now convey us through the streets at speed averaging slightly below the 12 miles per hour averaged by public horsecars of two generations ago.

We have proposed investing in new national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges an amount equal to one-fifth of our annual investment in chewing gum.

We have proposed that the corn farmer and the wheat rancher be treated with at least as much commonsense as our farm laws now accord the peanut grower.

And we have proposed that our workingmen and women contribute throughout their working careers to their own health insurance program under social security instead of being forced—once their jobs and their savings are gone—to seek help from public charity.

Perhaps these goals seem extreme to some but to me they spell out the means of securing "the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Others say: The program is not extreme, but the President's popularity has declined. There is no denying the increasing tempo of abuse but I would refer you to the recent poll of historians evaluating all our previous Chief Executives. Every Democratic President since the Civil War was judged to rank in the "great" or "near great" category. And all of our greatest Presidents in their time were bitterly abused—and hated—and reelected. For no one gets this country moving again without disturbing the status quo, without stirring up the vested interests, and without doing what is necessary instead of what is popular.

To be sure, President Kennedy is concerned—concerned, however, not about his critics but about his country, about the 1 million young Americans who are both out of school and out of work, about the 150,000 unemployed workers who every month exhaust their benefit rights before they can find a job, about the growing shortage of doctors and medical students, when nearly half of those students come from the wealthiest 12 percent of our families. He is concerned about the 8 million adults who are classified as functionally illiterate, about the decency, about those untold numbers of American consumers who have been scarred by untested cosmetics, misled by worthless drugs, or made ill by improper foods. So, criticism or no criticism, John Kennedy intends to "stick to his guns."

But when he looks ahead to the peaks that are yet to be scaled, the President is not unmindful of the distances already climbed. The 87th Congress, breaking a legislative stalemate, has passed a score of key bills that could never be passed before, including bills for area redevelopment, higher minimum wages, better housing and urban renewal, new attacks on crime and delinquency and water pollution.

More was done by this Congress to combat the recession than by any Congress since the thirties. And today this Nation has achieved the highest gross national product and the highest industrial production in its history. Our working men and women are earning $27 billion more a year. Our businessmen are netting $10 billion more a year. And these are not phony inflation dollars that cannot buy more groceries, but sound dollars, backed by our Nation's best postwar record of price stability in any comparable period of recovery, and backed by our best record of balancing our international accounts since they declined in 1958. The national debt is a smaller portion of our gross national product now than it was in 1960 after our predecessors had increased it by $27 billion. And the budget deficits caused by the recession they left us are far smaller now than the $12 billion deficit they ran up in 1959, one of the five deficits they incurred in 8 years of preaching fiscal solvency.

And in those areas where the Congress has not acted, the President has acted, particularly in civil rights. The man who broke down the walls of intolerance to enter the White House has been breaking them down ever since—on behalf of Negro children who want a better education, on behalf of their parents who want to vote and to travel and to work. Those who stand up for their rights are being protected and so are those who sit down.

But events on the domestic scene have confounded those critics who predicted disaster under Democratic rule, events around the world have junked their pessimistic prophecies even more. The foul winds of war have not been loosed; and the fair winds of peace have calmed the troubled land of Laos. Mr. Khrushchev has not taken over West Berlin. Mr. Castro has not taken over Latin America. Mr. Ho Chi Minh has not taken over Vietnam. And Mr. Gizenga has not taken over the Congo.

Those who once scoffed at the Peace Corps as a haven for misguided visionaries have been touched by the moving tributes to American idealism that come from dozens of far-off huts and villages. Those who once assailed the Alliance for Progress—as part of a "no win" policy—this year joined in the applause when the 20 American Republics, in conference at Punta del Este, decreed unanimously to isolate the Castro-Communist offensive as a clear and present danger.

When President and Mrs. Kennedy twice toured Latin America, they were greeted with milling mobs. But this time the mobs were not throwing stones but lifting banners, banners hailing the greatest new era in United States-Latin relations since the days of the good neighbor policy, banners proclaiming the new hemispheric hope of the sixties: Alianza Para Progresso.

And, finally, it is increasingly recognized, at home and abroad, that this Nation, for the first time, has a coherent, consistent effort to launch a peace race instead of an arms race, to foster world law instead of world war.

For the first time we have a full-time full-scale disarmament agency working out ways and means of reaching this goal.

For the first time we are attending a disarmament conference with a specific, step-by-step plan for general and complete disarmament.

For the first time we are on record, along with the United Kingdom, with the actual draft of an effective treaty to ban all nuclear tests—a treaty which may yet be accepted now that the Soviets realize they can no longer prevent the West from testing by pretending to talk while preparing to test themselves.

For the first time we have a long-term foreign aid program, strengthening the basis for peace and freedom in those nations willing to help themselves.

For the first time we have expanded the independent food-for-peace program, providing school lunches and famine relief and daily bread for the hungry and needy of many lands, shipping abroad more food in the last 18 months than Herbert Hoover and his associates shipped in 10 years of World War I relief efforts.

For the first time we have enough authority at the bargaining table to get an agreement on the disarmament of outer space because we are no longer second in outer space.

For the first time we have launched our own initiatives in the United Nations on disarmament, development, and space, and pledged our participation in a U.N. bond issue which will require those nations now trying to starve that organization to death to pay up or get out.

And, for the first time, we have an agency to encourage others to travel to this country and see what we are really like, and an organized effort to secure better housing and better treatment for the diplomats of other countries and other colors, and a new cultural exchange agreement with the Soviet Union and, of lasting importance, a program both to weld and to build the economies of the free world through increased tariff reduction and trade expansion.

This administration also knows that until all arms are abolished, we can preserve the peace, and convince others to parley for peace, only by preparing for war—the war we must deter. And I believe one reason the peace prevails today is the buildup we have undertaken to make certain no aggressor is ever tempted by our weakness. We have strengthened the missile power and the air power and the man power of our Armed Forces. And the President knows, if we are not only to survive but to prevail in the long run, we must strengthen our brainpower and our willpower, with all the measures he has proposed to build a bulwark of healthy minds, healthy bodies, and a healthy American economy.

It is in this spirit, bearing in mind both our achievements and our goals, that the people of western America are called upon to fulfill their proud traditions and to send men of wisdom and vision to Washington this fall. No other group of 13 States will play so key a role in shaping our Nation's future—with 12 Senate races, 10 Governors' races, and 69 House seats at stake. If our opponents are to gain in the House, it is here that we must make those gains. And, moved by the enthusiasm and dedication I have seen here tonight, it is my prediction that when, in November next, the defenders of privilege and opponents of progress are swept from their seats of power, it will be a wind from the West that uproots them.

But our concern is not merely the future of our program, or our party, or even our Nation. Our concern is for the future of mankind. And when the youngest of my sons has grown to the cares of manhood, the world in which he lives will be shaped by what we do today. If men today are moved by greed and pride alone—if we shrink back from the new and the untried and the unknown—then his world may well be a world of sorrow instead of hope. But if we can strive for the good society as well as the good life, if "mercy and truth are met together," not only in the hearts of men but in the seats of power, then surely my son in century 21 will be "neither Red nor dead but alive and free," in a world of peace and abundance.

Foreign Motion Picture Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, my attention was recently called to a pamphlet being sent to many Members of Congress dealing with the problem of production of motion pictures abroad by American companies. Since I have some familiarity with this matter, many of my colleagues asked my views about it.

It will be recalled that our subcommittee on the impact of imports and exports on American employment, in the course of its investigations and hearings, had also studied this particular motion picture situation. This was done at the behest of numerous union groups in California who complained that American workers were suffering from this new type of foreign competition.

Our subcommittee held 2 days of hearings and I personally conferred with both employee and employer leaders in California and Washington before and after the hearings. Subsequently, we issued a report in which we made specific findings and recommendations, chief of which was that the most effective way to meet this so-called runaway motion picture production was for closer cooperation between the producers and the craft unions and guilds in Hollywood. I may add, parenthetically, that we found that the greatest spur to foreign production was not basically the much lower labor costs abroad as it is large government subsidies by certain foreign governments who use their movies as a powerful propaganda and communications medium in a world in which three-fourths of the people still do not have the doubtful privilege of radio and television.

Subsequently, in the 3 months since the issuance of our committee report, I was pleased to learn of several concrete and specific steps that had been taken in an effort to reduce the amount of American production abroad and at the same time actually to increase production of films in the United States.

As an example, one of the most expensive films now scheduled, the biblical story entitled "The Greatest Story Ever Told," is to be shot almost in its entirety in the United States. The unions know that on spectacle type pictures employing thousands of persons substantial savings could be made abroad and therefore they modified certain union contract provisions. Similarly, the producers always have recognized that the efficiency and expertness of Hollywood artisans resulted in lower costs despite higher wage rates.

Thus, a realistic appraisal of facts and a sincere consideration of each other's problems by both employees and employers resulted not only in shifting some pictures back from foreign locale but more importantly gives promise of even greater benefits. It was this type of constructive labor-management discussion and consideration that our committee had recommended, along with a number of other points which the people of Hollywood are now pursuing in a six-point jointly adopted labor-management program.

I was, therefore, surprised and dismayed when I read the pamphlet, entitled "Awake America," currently being circulated through the efforts of the officials of three Hollywood local unions, the photographers, the electricians, and the grips. The pamphlet would have the reader believe that American motion picture producers are involved in some kind of a conspiracy to move their production abroad; that they are monopolists but ironically also perfectly willing to yield this lucrative monopoly to foreign producers; that the Government ought to do something about this; and finally they advocate that all foreign-produced movies ought to be boycotted.

Now, I yield to no man on this floor in fighting for the protection of American labor and American industry against unfair foreign competition. I think my colleagues know something of my efforts along this line. But I just could not understand some of the absurdities in the pamphlet and so I promptly wired Hollywood for the facts. I sent identical telegrams to the head of all Hollywood movie labor unions and to the principal spokesman for the producers, asking them bluntly to tell me the facts.

Here is the text of the telegram to George Flaherty, president of the American Federation of Labor Film Council, and to Charles Boren, executive vice president of the Association of Motion Picture Producers:

> Are you aware that pamphlet entitled "Awake America" purporting to come from three Hollywood unions is being widely distributed here? The pamphlet is completely contrary to reports I have had that a series of joint labor-management conferences have been held with the object of finding ways and means to sharply reduce so-called runaway production. Has there been a change in the situation? In the light of our committee hearings and subsequent report and recomendations I would appreciate a progress report and your frank comments.

The next day I received a telegram signed by both Mr. Flaherty and Mr. Boren. This is what they said:

> In reply to your telegraphic inquiry concerning pamphlet entitled "Awake America" and your request for progress report on our joint labor-management conference to reduce so-called runaway production please be advised as follows:
>
> (1) Such pamphlet, signed by business agents of three local unions which are not affiliated with Hollywood AFL Film Council, was not authorized by and does not reflect the position or attitude of our joint labor-management committee representing 19 local unions of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, with 12,000 members; 7 local unions of the basic crafts, with 6,000 members: The Screen Actors Guild, Screen Extras Guild, Directors Guild of America, Writers Guild of America, West; and the member companies of the Association of Motion Picture Producers and the Alliance of Television Film Producers.
>
> (2) Since February 1, 1962, frequent meetings of our joint labor-management committee representing these responsible elements in the motion picture industry have been held and additional meetings are scheduled to further implement this six-point program (with which you are familiar) adopted on April 17, 1962, to attack the principal causes of foreign runaway production and to encourage increased U.S. film production.
>
> (3) There has been no lessening of our joint determination to do everything possible to solve these pressing economic problems. To the contrary, at the last two committee meetings a far-reaching and effective plan was developed to seek removal of unfair trade barriers and competitive disadvantages which handicap American domestic film production. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of American, Inc., and Ralph Hetzel, executive vice president of the Motion Picture Export Association, personally came to Hollywood to participate in the development of this plan with members of our joint committee.
>
> (4) Our joint committee will continue to seek practical solutions of these difficult and complex problems, and will welcome the constructive assistance of the Congress and appropriate Government agencies along the lines of the six-point program referred to above.
>
> Thank you for your continued interest in this cooperative effort of our joint labor-management committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is pretty obvious.

The answer is that the overwhelming majority of the Hollywood craft unions and guilds are engaged in a serious and constructive program of cooperation with the producers aimed at reducing foreign production and increasing domestic production.

The answer is that the sponsors of the pamphlets are the officials of three unions not members of the Hollywood Film Council and that views expressed therein are the views of the minority—and certainly they have a right, even if they are the expressed views of the full membership of the three unions involved.

The answer is that the participating union officials and the responsible studio executives in Hollywood are equally concerned about the problem, are doing something about it together, and both are resolved that America shall remain, as it has been, the preeminent movie capital of the world.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues should evaluate the pamphlet for what it is, not for what it seems, and not become unduly concerned. For myself, I prefer to await continuing reports of the progress made by those who are doing something about the problem instead of confusing the picture by hurling wild charges about it.

Cloture on Communications Satellite Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Victory for Good Sense," published in the New York Times of today; also an editorial entitled "Busted Filibuster," published in the Washington Post on August 15, 1962, dealing with the imposition of cloture in connection with debate on the communications satellite bill.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 15, 1962]

VICTORY FOR GOOD SENSE

Yesterday's Senate vote of 63 to 27 for cloture of debate on the Kennedy adminstration's communications satellite bill may have been more important as a precedent than is the bill itself. The measure turns over to private corporations the function of developing and launching satellites such as the Telstar, to send words and pictures around the world. The Government can regulate the operation as tightly as it pleases. In any event, the intention of a filibuster is not to determine the merits of a proposal but to prevent a favorable majority from acting on it. This has always been the case with civil rights bills in the Senate, and it was the case with yesterday's very different legislation.

The last of the four previous occasions on which cloture was invoked was in 1927, when it was used to choke off eloquence about a bill involving prohibition. Cloture is obviously not an abused weapon. Southern Senators especially have hesitated to use it for fear it might enable the majority to grind democracy's grist in the field of civil rights. Yesterday some southerners stayed away with the apparent intention to establish no personal precedents. Ninety Senators did show up. Of these only 25 Democrats and 2 Republicans rallied against cloture, whereas 29 Democrats and 34 Republicans voted for it. This gave cloture three more votes than the two-thirds needed.

Majority Leader MANSFIELD called this "a victory for good sense." Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Ohio Democrat, "This entire proceeding has been turned into a circus; the Soviet is orbiting and we are filibustering."

Now any Senator who wants to talk on the bill may have an hour. The communications satellite bill, which has already passed the House, may get through the Senate before the week is over, and thus soon appear on the Presidential desk. That is majority rule. That is democracy.

The next test of cloture will probably come on one of the subjects involved in sectional disputes between North and South. Yesterday's precedent may just possibly make it a little easier to get a vote then on civil rights and unlawful segregation.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 15, 1962]

BUSTED FILIBUSTER

The Senate's approval of the Mansfield-Dirksen cloture motion by the substantial vote of 63 to 27 is a salutary stroke for responsible government. Over a period of 35 years the Senate rejected every proposal for limitation of debate. So consistent had been its toleration of filibusters that some Senators had come to believe that the cloture device was useless. At last the Senate has demonstrated that it can curtail extended talk designed to paralyze its operations and thwart the will of the majority. Incidentally, it is worthy of note that without the improvement in the rule effected in 1959 under the leadership of Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, now Vice President, the cloture motion would have failed.

It is ironical that the Republicans in the Senate gave the administration the strongest support. Behind the cloture motion were 34 Republicans and 29 Democrats. Because of the traditional hostility of most Senators from the South to any limitation of debate, the Democratic ranks were split almost down the center. The hardcore supporters of unlimited debate, such as Senators EASTLAND, ELLENDER and THURMOND, were lined up with the liberals, including Senators MORSE and KEFAUVER, who are eager to abolish the filibuster but who did not hesitate to use that device in their fight for Government ownership of the satellite communications system.

To both these groups the Senate has taught an important lesson. No matter how passionately they may feel about a pending bill, no minority can be allowed indefinitely to thwart the will of the majority on matters of public policy. Now that the Senate has found the courage to limit debate over the opposition of both its most liberal wing and its Southern contingent, there is hope that cloture will be applied whenever necessary to let the will of the majority on an important issue prevail.

Another ironical note is the aid that the orbiting Soviet astronauts gave to the advocates of cloture. "The Soviet is orbiting," cried Senator LAUSCHE, "and we're filibustering." His taunt exposed one of the weakest spots in the armor of the Kefauver-Morse group. They were trying to delay, for reasons of domestic policy, the only aspect of the space race in which the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union. The Soviet's marathon in space left precious little sympathy with any move that might have opened the door to a Russian first in space communications.

Apparently the debate will continue in the Senate for the remainder of the week, but enactment of the administration's bill now seems assured. At the same time the way appears to have been cleared for action on numerous other important measures. The Senate has chosen to move ahead instead of merely floundering in oratory. Certainly this is a heartening decision so far as it goes.

U.S. Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to your attention to the presence of a group of splendid young Americans who are visiting us today. They are cadets of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., an institution whose mission is to train young men "with sound bodies, stout hearts, and alert minds, with a liking for the sea and its lore, and with that high sense of honor, loyalty, and obedience which goes with trained initiative and leadership; well grounded in seamanship, the sciences, and the amenities and strong in the resolve to be worthy of the traditions of commissioned officers in the U.S. Coast Guard in the service of their country and humanity."

These young men are now completing the final phase of their annual summer cruise aboard the famous training bark *Eagle*, and comprise the sophomore and senior classes for the ensuing academic year. They are stopping over briefly in Washington prior to returning to New London where they will begin their summer leave. Two other cutters, the *Absecon* from Norfolk, Va., and the *Castle Rock* from Boston, Mass., accompanied the *Eagle* on the cruise. Of the 260 cadets embarked on this year's cruise, 153 presently serve aboard the *Eagle*. Each has spent two-thirds of the cruise on the *Eagle*, and one-third on one of the accompanying Coast Guard cutters.

These cadets have seen a good part of the world since they departed New London on June 8. They have visited such distant points as Edinburgh, Scotland; Antwerp, Belgium; and Las Palmas in the Canary Islands. During their stay in Edinburgh, His Royal Highness, Prince Philip made an official visit to the *Eagle*.

The purpose of these annual summer cruises is strictly professional. Aboard Coast Guard cutters, cadets of the first and third classes receive practical shipboard instruction in seagoing skills and other matters pertaining to their chosen profession. Combining the features of a sailing ship with a modern diesel engine, the *Eagle* is ideally suited to developing leadership potential and a capacity for teamwork so essential to a successful career as a commissioned officer in the Coast Guard. The *Eagle* also serves as an effective oceangoing classroom for third classmen where they may learn elements of ship maintenance, housekeeping, and shipboard routine.

In addition to its practical training aspects, the cruise is also intended to provide future Coast Guard officers with a broader understanding of foreign countries and customs—an extremely important matter in this shrinking world.

Cut Costs, Then Reduce Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., has printed in its August 13, 1962, edition an excellent editorial which makes much good economic sense. It is entitled "Cut Costs, Then Reduce Taxes." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUT COSTS, THEN REDUCE TAXES

Reduction of Federal taxes for citizens of all wage brackets is desirable, at the appropriate moment and with accompanying fiscal responsibility. Few Carolinians, however, would urge that the Kennedy administration reduce taxes if the Federal Government is to be pushed further in debt.

These wise Carolinians know that they, or their children, are going to have to pay the piper. And many are demanding a cut in nonessential Federal Government expenditures.

But expenses of Washington cannot be reduced without direction from the Nation's Chief Executive. Senator Harry Byrd recognized this recently when he declared that "despite all that some of us can do, it is extremely difficult to hold down expenses without leadership by the Chief Executive."

Instead of summoning Congress to slice costs and persuading Americans to be more self-reliant, Mr. Kennedy has done precisely the contrary. He has incessantly asked Congress to increase Federal spending.

Exemplary is the assertion last May by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges that thousands and millions of tax dollars could be saved by sawing off the deadwood from the Federal tree. A month later, employment figures for his own Department disclosed that he had added 1,600 workers to the taxpayers' expenses. Total civilian employment in Government in that month rose by 34,921 to a total of 2,496,455—the biggest fiscal-year end level since 1952. Senator BYRD contends that the deadwood amounts to about 10 percent.

The frightening reality of increased Government employment is that if the number of Federal employees continues to grow at the rate of the last 30 years, by the year 2,058, all of us in the United States will be working for the Government.

(Republican Congressman ROBERT J. DOLE, of Kansas, observes cogently that "many taxpayers, who in effect work for the Government 1 or 2 days out of 5, probably figure that the time has already arrived.")

Instead of pruning the Federal tree, Mr. Kennedy has consistently proposed adding new and expensive branches. Indifferent to mounting costs and increased debits, the President—for political purposes—has sent 25 recommendations to Congress (Jan. 20 to July 26, 1961), each of which would spend more of the taxpayers' money, adding to the Federal debit.

Take the Senate-passed bill to provide about $900 million extra tax money for "emergency public works projects. The measure is a purely political bill.

Its announced purpose is to reduce unemployment. But only 3 percent of the jobless would get any work out of the $900 million.

The bill could and would be used by the President to coerce Members of Congress to support his programs. Coercion would come through the approval or withholding of funds for projects.

Has the President told the taxpayers about the works projects already underway? He should. Carolinians, and citizens of the other 49 States, right now are paying (and will be paying) for $11.5 billion of projects.

Other projects already authorized but not yet begun will cost another $12.8 billion.

Yet, the President wants Congress to surrender its duty and responsibility for spending, giving him a $900 million Treasury kitty.

Understandably, thus, three out of every four Americans are opposed to a tax cut if such a move means increasing the Federal debt. They would agree with Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, who has said that "it would be irresponsible to propose a tax cut which would drastically and permanently reduce needed revenues, and which would enlarge yearly deficits."

If taxes are to be cut, let's not reduce them without dispensing with nonessential Government spending. The President should honestly tell the people that it's not defense spending that is creating deficits.

Fiscal 1962 was a red figure year for the Kennedys. And 1963 will be another. But nondefense spending for fiscal 1963 is $16 billion more than nondefense spending of fiscal 1955. Comparable defense outlays are up only $12 billion.

We hope the Kennedys catch up with the people in fiscal responsibility and determine to (1) cut nonessential Federal spending and then (2) give the people the tax relief they so desperately need.

Address by Secretary of State Dean Rusk Before National Convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, last night the Honorable Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, made a major foreign policy statement before the 63d National Convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars, meeting in my congressional district in Minneapolis, Minn. Sometimes only announcements of new or changed policies are considered of major importance. But in a world where the hope of so many countries for survival depends so largely upon the strength and steadfastness of U.S. policy, no statement has greater significance to them and is more reassuring to our own people, than a calm and clear appraisal of the world situation we face, an assessment of both the forces against us and those for us, and a fresh declaration of firm commitment to defend, by peaceful solutions wherever possible, America's "basic principles and vital interests." These principles and interests do not change and steady adherence to them is the truly productive course to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include also the fine statement made by the national commander in chief of the VFW—Mr. Robert E. Hansen of St. Paul, Minn., in introducing Secretary Rusk and presenting to him the Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal for Distinguished Service.

The introduction and address follow:

INTRODUCTION OF HON. DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, DISTINGUISHED GUESTS BANQUET, BY COMMANDER IN CHIEF ROBERT E. HANSEN AT THE 63D NATIONAL CONVENTION, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 13, 1962

The Veterans of Foreign Wars historically has taken a deep and continuing interest in the foreign policy of our Nation. All citizens should be interested in what goes on in the world beyond our geographic borders. However, the intense interest of our organization in world affairs stems, I believe, from the common background of each and every member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I refer, of course, to the fact that every member of our organization has served our Nation overseas.

Understandably, the VFW should have, as it does, a more than average interest in and understanding of the vital importance of foreign policy. It is, therefore, particularly fitting that it is our privilege at this distinguished guests banquet to have as our speaker the much-respected Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk.

Our speaker has served as Secretary of State since January 21, 1961, when he was sworn into office as the 54th Secretary of State. Secretary Rusk comes to his present position of vast responsibility from a background of vast experience for such an assignment.

Born in Cherokee County, Ga., he graduated from Davidson College in North Carolina, where he achieved membership in Phi Beta Kappa. He was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford in England, and following that he studied at the University of Berlin. Returning to the United States in 1934, he served as associate professor of government and dean of faculty at Mills College, Oakland, Calif. But this distinguished Scretary of State who works so constantly for the preservation of peace is certainly not unacquainted with the ways of war. In December of 1940 Dean Rusk began active Army duty as a captain. He participated in two campaigns in the Burma theater, rising to the position of deputy chief of staff. At the time of his return to inactive duty, he held the rank of colonel. He holds the Legion of Merit and Oak Leaf Cluster.

With such a background of campaign soldiering, he was well prepared to return to matters pertaining to international affairs. In 1946 he joined the State Department as Assistant Chief of the Division of International Security Affairs. After this he served as Special Assistant to the Secretary of War. Rejoining the Department of State, he served as Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs and as Director of the Office of United Nations Affairs.

In 1949 he became the first Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs. After serving as Deputy Under Secretary of State, he became Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs in March of 1950. I believe that it is a commendable commentary on State Department personnel policy that one who served so extensively in war in the Far East should have become the Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs.

He was in charge of Far Eastern Affairs until March of 1952, when he became president of the Rockefeller Foundation.

As we members of the VFW are well aware, our Nation, together with the cause of freedom, is exposed to constant peril in these times of unrelenting Communist aggression. The international seas are treacherous and turbulent. If our Nation is to survive this era of continuing international storms, it will do so only if the course is well charted and the ship skillfully navigated.

Secretary Rusk's direction of our foreign policy has been impressive. His calm demeanor, his firm determination, and his broad intellect have gained for him respect at home and in other nations. The firm U.S. policy which our Nation has followed in the recurring crisis in Berlin has served notice to Europe that that vital citadel and symbol of freedom would be defended against all Red threats. This, indeed, has contributed to the strength of freedom's cause in the Western community of nations.

In the Far East the continuing support which our Government has given our loyal friend and vigorous anti-Communist leader, President Chiang Kai-shek, has paid vast dividends in national security in the western Pacific.

These are examples of sound policies which have been pursued under the direction of this man who honors us with his presence this evening.

It is in view of his devoted service, his skillful direction of foreign policy, and the personal qualities which have gained for him the profound respect of freedom-loving people, that I now have the privilege of presenting to the Honorable Dean Rusk on behalf of the 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans comprising the Veterans of Foreign Wars the highest award which our organization can bestow—the Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal for Distinguished Service to our Nation.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS CONVENTION, LEAMINGTON HOTEL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1962

(Secretary Rusk's address was carried by the National Broadcasting Co. radio network and highlights broadcast by the Mutual Broadcasting System)

Commander Hansen, distinguished guests, fellow veterans, it is a great pleasure to be here in Minneapolis for this great convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. All of us, of course, are deeply concerned about our country's future; but there is something special about that concern among men and women who have worn the uniform of their country in times of trial. For us, words like war and peace have a special meaning. We know, as veterans, that foreign policy reaches into every home and every community. We know the price when statecraft fails. We know why it is important to seek peaceful solutions wherever possible, consistent with basic principles and vital interests.

I know I don't need to prove to you that we live in a world of turmoil and change. I know I don't need to emphasize to you that we live in a time of danger and that the primary cause of this danger is the existence of powerful forces which are determined to destroy our free way of life.

The global struggle for freedom and against Communist imperialism is our main business in the State Department. My colleagues and I give intensive attention, day by day, to Communist strategy and tactics.

No one has to convince us that when Khrushchev said communism will bury us he was proclaiming, not just an alleged historical inevitability, but an objective toward which Communists work relentlessly by all the means they deem effective. No one has to convince us that "peaceful coexistence" means to them a continuing attempt to spread their system over the earth by all means short of the great war which would be self-defeating. No one has to convince us that the contest between Communist imperialism and freedom is for keeps.

We have a simple but transcendent goal. It is, in President Kennedy's words, "a peaceful world community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future and their own system, so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others."

This goal of ours—and of most of the nations of the world—and the Communist goal are incompatible. This global struggle will continue until freedom prevails. It goes without saying that our purpose is to win.

One hears now and then that we have a "no win" purpose or policies. That is simply not so. Of course we intend to win. And we are going to win. Our objective is a victory for all mankind.

For let us be clear about what we mean when we say: "We are going to win." Who makes up the "we?" Not only 185 million Americans, but most of the rest of the people of the world. And what is the worldwide victory we work for? Not the victory of one nation over another or of one people over another, but a worldwide victory for freedom.

To win this worldwide victory we must achieve:

A world free of aggression—aggression by whatever means.

A world of independent nations, each with the institutions of its own choice, but cooperating with one another to their mutual advantage.

A world which yields continuing progress in economic and social justice for all people.

A world which provides sure and equitable means for the peaceful settlement of disputes and moves progressively toward a rule of law which lays down and enforces standards of conduct in relations between nations.

A world in which, in the great tradition shared by peoples in every continent, governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

A world in which the powers of the state over the individual are limited by law and practice—in which the personal freedoms essential to the dignity of man are secure.

Our hope and purpose is to win without a great war and the damage which the weapons of today would inflict upon the human race. We will defend our vital interests and those of the free world by whatever means may be necessary, but a military climax to this struggle is to be prevented if possible.

The primary purpose of our military forces is to make resort to force by our adversaries unprofitable and dangerous. Our forces have been greatly strengthened in the last 18 months. Our nuclear deterrent has been amplified, and a rising proportion of it is relatively invulnerable to attack. We have the capacity to inflict massive destruction upon any nation that would be so irrational as to attack us or our allies.

Our conventional forces, too, have been strengthened. They are being modernized and made more mobile—not as a substitute for our nuclear capacity but to cope with more limited requirements.

In addition, we have been improving our capacity to deal, and assist our allies in dealing, with guerrilla warfare—a form of aggression which the Communists, in their inverted jargon, call "wars of national liberation." This is the form of the present aggression against South Vietnam. It will not be allowed to succeed.

Thus, as my colleagues in the State Department and I go about our business, we have at our backs a formidable array of military strength under the command of a resolute President. This strength, with that of our many allies, is capable of defending the vital interests of the free world. When President Kennedy says that we and our allies have vital interests in West Berlin—vital interests which all free peoples share with the brave inhabitants of that city—"vital interests" means just that: interests to be protected as a matter of elementary safety for freemen. We are prepared to discuss ways and means for reducing tensions in central Europe and to search for more permanent solutions to those problems, but we will not be forced, harassed, or squeezed out of West Berlin. We are determined to see that West Berlin thrives in freedom. And we have other vital interests in common with the free peoples of Latin America, Europe, Asia, the Far East, and elsewhere, which we are resolved to maintain.

At the same time, despite bitter and far-reaching differences, we seek continually areas of common or overlapping interest—areas of potential concrete agreements. In June 1961, at Vienna, Mr. Khrushchev and President Kennedy agreed that both favored an independent and neutral Laos. Last month at Geneva an agreement was signed by 14 nations, providing for the independence and neutrality of Laos. If the agreement is faithfully executed, all foreign troops will leave Laos and the Laotians will be left alone to control their own affairs—and Laos will cease to be an avenue of supply and reinforcement for the Communist aggression against South Vietnam. I underline the need that the agreement be faithfully executed. We on our side shall do everything possible to see that it is. We believe the Government of Laos will do its best; we expect all others to do the same.

There is another matter in which, objectively examined, all the great powers have a genuine common interest. I refer to the problem of halting the upward spiral of the arms race. Let us be clear about what this means and what it does not mean. We have a security interest in turning the arms race downward; otherwise the path ahead means increasingly vast diversions of resources away from the unfinished business of mankind and increasing dangers for all concerned as weapons systems tax or exceed the capacities of the mind of man. But disarmament measures cannot be unilateral—surely the free world learned that lesson from the demobilization after World War II. Disarmament must be achieved by steps consistent with the security of all concerned and with fully adequate assurance that agreements are faithfully carried out. In today's world, such agreements cannot rest upon blind faith; but arrangements can be worked out under which confidence can rest upon knowledge and not mere trust. In limited fields, such as nuclear testing, improved techniques and instrumentation may permit more efficient and less costly arrangements. But the need for verification remains. We see no way in which the abolition of all nuclear testing can be achieved unless the Soviet Union is ready to abandon its obsession with secrecy. And the rest of the world cannot disarm without knowing what arms are being concealed in those vast and closely policed areas in the very heart of the Eurasian land mass. We hope that self-interest and the yearning of the Soviet peoples for a better life will cause the Soviet Government to reconsider and sit down with the rest of us to work out practical steps which will begin to reduce the burdens and dangers.

PROGRESS TOWARD OUR GOAL

How are we getting along in this great struggle for freedom? A Secretary of State, watching the daily flow of cables from a world in rapid and far-reaching change, cannot afford to be an easy optimist. But I believe that a measured appraisal leads to the conclusion that the historical forces of freedom are writing fresh chapters of achievement and confidence.

1. The vitality and growing strength of the economically advanced countries of the free world: A new industrial revolution has swept over the free countries of Europe in this postwar period. Everywhere there are new factories, new jobs, new buildings, growth and prosperity. Strong new economic and political links have been forged and still others are now taking shape.

The notion that we in America somehow resent or regret this new vitality and confidence in Europe is plain nonsense. This new era has been an objective of our own hopes and policy; it is, among other things, the rich harvest of the massive efforts which the Europeans and we made together through the Marshall plan. We applaud the result thus far and warmly support the prospects for an even stronger and more unified Europe.

Let us not underestimate the importance of these developments to the worldwide struggle for freedom. A vigorous Atlantic partnership will mean closer political consultation to build the strength and unity of the free world as a whole. It will mean an ability to share more broadly the larger economic responsibilities for development beyond the Atlantic Community. Already Europe is approaching the magnitude of effort of the United States in responding to the urgent needs of the developing countries.

And under the strenuous conditions of a still unsettled world, this partnership can provide the military strength, both conventional and nuclear, necessary to defend the peace and to sustain a steadily growing rule of law. In a period of lively discussion within the NATO alliance about next chapters in the organization of our common defense, it is inevitable that there would be speculation which misses the point. NATO is not a limited liability company. For us, and for our allies, the defense of NATO requires whatever means are necessary. We have taken important steps, through the sharing of information, the frank discussion of strategic problems, and consultation on multilateral NATO nuclear forces, to emphasize that we consider that the safety of NATO as a whole is critical to our own security. If there is a ferment of discussion within the alliance, this has nothing to do with the underlying commitments to which we all pledged ourselves when NATO was born. "What is past is prologue." The ferment comes out of the creative discussion of next steps—of which the Common Market negotiations are only the most immediate.

Beyond the Atlantic Community are others joining in similar efforts—nations such as Japan and Australia, whose contributions are large and growing.

The prospect among all these nations is for vigorous economic growth and the steady expansion of trade. Let me point out that according to Marxist-Leninist dogma this could not occur. Acocrding to that fanciful doctrine, the industrialized nations should be ripped by ever-deepening economic crises and by fighting among themselves. Instead, they are working together in ever closer cooperation and are enjoying levels of well-being undreamed of a generation ago.

2. Progress within the underdeveloped world: Equally dramatic changes are taking place in that vast portion of the non-Communist world that is less advanced industrially. Never before in history have so many new, independent states been born in so short a period of time. And all of them, as well as the older but still underdeveloped nations, are determined to modernize their societies and improve the standards of living of their people.

One by one, new nations and their leaders are experiencing the sobering influence of responsibility. They are learning, sometimes painfully, that independence is by itself no panacea for their ills, that it alone does not feed hungry mouths nor turn the wheels of industry, that it alone does not find markets for excess production nor automatically build schoolhouses, homes or communications.

Some have managed the transition from revolutionary struggle to peaceful construction with great skill and statesmanship. Within the last few years a number of underdeveloped countries have made solid economic and social advances. And many others have made promising starts.

Some are still floundering. Some are devoting time and energy and resources to questionable adventures. But, on the whole, there is progress within the underdeveloped areas of the non-Communist world. All the free nations have a vital interest in assisting this progress.

3. Growing understanding of our purposes and the developing partnership between the advanced and underdeveloped nations of the free world: We have rejoiced in the arrival of the peoples of Asia and Africa to the "separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them." This is well understood in the new nations. Most of their leaders are familiar with our history and the great and enduring ideas expressed in our Declaration of Independence.

Nearly all of them also appreciate our readiness to assist them, and understand well that our only purpose is to help them maintain their independence and improve the well-being of their people. And nearly all understand that the United States stands not for a sterile status quo but for vigorous progress.

As President Kennedy said at La Morita, Venezuela, last December: "We do not merely talk of slogans, of democracy and freedom; it is our function here in this hemisphere in 1961 to make it possible not only for all the people to be free, but to have a home and educate their children, and have a job for themselves and in security. And that is what we are determined to do."

President Kennedy spoke of this hemisphere, but the goal he set applies to other regions as well.

New ties are being created almost daily between us and the new states of Asia and Africa. In Latin America, the Alliance for Progress has breathed new life and vigor into an old and valued relationship. We must expect change to create tension; but we and our Latin American partners must insure that change and tension mean movement toward a free society.

We are not interested in maintaining a dole or giveaway program. We are pledged to help most those who do most to help themselves bridge the wide gap between what they have and what they need to provide their people with a decent life.

For the most part, the transformation of the old empires into independent states has proceeded in an orderly manner. In some places, resentments still linger from the old colonial era. These the Communists try to inflame. But on the new and better basis of political and social equality, new partnerships are developing between the industrially advanced free nations and the underdeveloped areas.

4. Competitive coexistence: There are other reasons for quiet confidence, and these come out of the Communist world itself. The sterility of their original doctrine has long been exposed. Marxism first offered a fictitious debate between a communism rejected by its own disciples and a capitalism which has long since disappeared, if it ever existed at all. In recent decades the Communists themselves have, in a curious left-handed way, recognized the overwhelming strength of the great tradition of freedom throughout the world. They have done this by their insistent efforts to capture the great words of that tradition and turn them to their own ends.

They have spoken of "peace" to conceal the use of force; they have spoken of "liberation" to conceal an effort to capture; they speak of "peoples democracy" to avoid the free consultation of the people themselves. Conversely, the people of Germany who want self-determination are "revanchists." Free peoples determined to defend themselves are "militarists." And, oddly enough, those the Communists like to call "imperialists" or "colonialists" are exactly those who have ushered into the United Nations row upon row of independent nations since World War II.

This tactic is increasingly transparent all over the world. So too is the emptiness of such phrases as "classless society," workers paradise," and "great leap forward."

There is no question but that the Soviet Union has achieved some notable successes in certain directions, for example, in space science and technology, in mass education, in public health, and in selected sectors of industry. But it is interesting to note that their successes have come where they have permitted science and technology to move forward without doctrinal blinders and where substantial freedom of action is given to those responsible for the particular enterprise. In other sectors, for example in agriculture, there are serious difficulties throughout the bloc from East Germany to North Vietnam. Nature itself has imposed certain limitations but this cannot be the answer throughout so vast an area. Limitations are imposed by organization, by official stultification of scientific freedom, and by failure to mobilize the most productive element in the history of agriculture, namely, the incentive and individual initiative of the farmer himself. The desperate situation in mainland China cannot advertise successfully the promised paradise of communism.

Other adjustments are having to be made within their bloc because of powerful ideas which long preceded the Communist revolution. A sense of national pride and desire for national independence, yearnings for more freedom for the individual himself, and the desire for higher standards of living and security for family and home have forced changes in the monolithic structure of an authoritarian system. These changes, in turn, have produced sharp differences within the bloc itself—differences of doctrine, organization, tactics, and priorities.

Successful societies do not have to build walls and string barbed wire against their own people. The Berlin wall, erected a year ago today, is a monument to failure—the failure of a "competitive coexistence" that dared not compete.

No quick or easy victory for freedom can be promised. But those who are committed to freedom have less to worry about than those who would reverse the centuries' old history of man. As I have said on another occasion:

"It is not for us to fear the great winds of change that are blowing today. They are the winds we have long known and sailed with, the winds which have carried man on his unending journey, the winds of freedom.

"America at her best is admired and trusted; and America is at her best when she is true to the commitments we made to ourselves and to history in the Declaration of Independence. These are the ideas and ideals which give us allies, spoken or silent, among men and women in every corner of the earth They are part of the unfinished business which is a part of our story. This is the basis of our confidence; this is the scope of our task.

"The revolution of freedom, which we have so proudly nurtured and fought for in the past and to which we pledge today, as in 1776, 'our lives, our fortunes, and our scared honor,' is the true, enduring revolution, because it springs from the deepest, most persistent aspirations of men. History says this revolution will not fail."

First Nuclear-Powered Merchant Ship: The Nuclear Ship "Savannah"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate, I am sure, have followed with deep interest the progress in the development and construction of this Nation's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the nuclear ship *Savannah*.

The *Savannah* is now tied up at its dock in Yorktown, Va., as a result of a labor dispute which is delaying its maiden sea voyage.

With characteristic forthrightness, Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER has expressed his concern over this situation to President Kennedy and urged the President to act immediately.

I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of his letter to the President, dated August 6, together with newspaper articles from the Baltimore Sun, the New York Times, and the New York Herald Tribune regarding it.

There being no objection, the letter and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 6, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, the nuclear ship *Savannah*—researched, developed and constructed at a cost of approximately $80 million of the taxpayers' money—is currently inoperative. Its future is uncertain as a result of the voracious appetite of the union members selected to man this precedent-setting vessel. I need only remind you that the nuclear ship *Savannah* is owned by the people of the United States, and that any reckless display of irresponsibility on the part of its crew members and their union bosses is thus a strike against the Federal Government.

I cannot imagine that you, as Commander in Chief, would tolerate for a moment a strike by the crew members of any vessel of the U.S. Navy, and in like manner, the situation affecting the nuclear ship *Savannah* has already gone beyond any face-saving devices on behalf of the unions and any time-consuming activities by an emergency advisory board. This incredible situation warrants your personal intervention and immediate action.

Your readiness and willingness to initiate corrective measures to curtail impetuous inflationary pressures is already historic. Surely, the potential destructive ramifications in the present nuclear ship *Savannah* impasse cannot be ignored, and failure of the Federal Government to face the issues head on can only undercut your efforts to curb inflation, and to protect the public's investment in this great ship.

The outcome of this situation will, in addition to all other factors, affect the future of the U.S. merchant marine. Should the group that is now striking against the Federal Government be successful in its unjustifiable demands for wage revisions, the upward spiral of wage demands throughout the entire maritime industry, both at sea and ashore, would create a further impediment to the competitive position of the U.S. merchant marine in seeking to assume its rightful place in the trade and commerce of the world.

It is regrettable that the actions of a few dictatorial union bosses can do more to destroy the symbol of freedom, characterized by the nuclear ship *Savannah*, than the entire Communist propaganda machine. Moreover, we who have dedicated our time and energies to a strong U.S. merchant marine have always looked to the nuclear ship *Savannah* as a shining example of government, labor, science, and industry working together to demonstrate how atomic power can be used for peaceful purposes. If these union bosses persist, the world will instead view the nuclear ship *Savannah* as a symbol of labor supremacy in the United States at the expense of the taxpayers and the public treasury. I am sure you do not want that to come to pass.

The Secretary of Commerce and the Maritime Administrator have spoken eloquently and widely about the attributes of the nuclear ship *Savannah*, and have suggested that the knowledge acquired through its construction and operation will be shared with the world. Surely, it would not be your wish to share with our friends and allies an incredible example of union effrontary.

With highest personal regards, I am,
Respectfully,
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
U.S. Senator.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Aug. 8, 1962]

BUTLER ASKS A-SHIP MOVE—SEES "SAVANNAH" AS SYMBOL OF LABOR SUPREMACY

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, August 7.—The strikebound *Savannah* is becoming a "symbol of labor supremacy in the United States at the expense of the taxpayers and the public Treasury," President Kennedy was told today.

In a letter appealing to the President to intervene personally in the situation, Senator BUTLER, Republican of Maryland, said that unless the tieup of the $80 million vessel is halted now, the United States will be sharing "with our friends and allies an incredible example of union effrontery."

SENATOR PUTS COST UP

The $80 million figure used by the Senator is the highest ever cited as the cost of the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship.

An official of States Marine Lines, the company operating the ship for the Government, indicated that the Senator's figure was probably more accurate than the $50 million used since the ship's completion.

No comment on the amount was available from the Maritime Administration late yesterday.

Originally the estimate for the United States floating demonstration of the peaceful application of the atom was $30 million.

THREE UNIONS BALK SINCE JULY 31

The *Savannah* has been idle at her Coast Guard berth in Yorktown, Va., since July 31 when the crew members belonging to the three unions refused to assist in shifting the ship to a Norfolk shipyard where permanent ballast was to be put aboard.

When they refused a second time last Thursday, States Marine Lines attempted to pay the crew off—tantamount to firing them—but they refused to accept the money. They have continued to live aboard, although the company no longer is providing meals on the *Savannah*.

The unions involved in the sitdown are the American Radio Association, the International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots, and the National Maritime Union.

ENGINEERS GOT EXTRA PAY

They are demanding extra pay parallel with that granted to the engineers belonging to the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association who run the reactor of the vessel.

Senator BUTLER calls the future of the *Savannah* uncertain as a result of the voracious appetite of the union members selected to man this precedent-setting vessel.

"I need only remind you that the NS *Savannah* is owned by the people of the United States, and that any reckless display of irresponsibility on the part of its crew members and their union bosses is thus a strike against the Federal Government.

"I cannot imagine that you, as Commander in Chief, would tolerate for a moment a strike by the crew members of any vessel of the U.S. Navy and, in like manner, the situation affecting the NS *Savannah* has already gone beyond any face-saving devices on behalf of the unions and any time-consuming activities by an emergency advisory board.

"This incredible situation warrants your personal intervention and immediate action."

"Another reason the President should participate in the situation," he added, "is the inflationary ramifications, which 'cannot be ignored'." The Senator commented that "failure of the Federal Government to face the issue head on can only undercut any efforts to curb inflation, and to protect the public's investment in this great ship."

The outcome of the *Savannah* situation will affect the future of the U.S. merchant marine, in addition to all other considerations, BUTLER continued.

LIKENED TO NAVY CREW

"Should the group that is now striking against the Federal Government be successful in its unjustifiable demands for wage revision, the upward spiral of wage demands throughout the entire maritime industry, both at sea and at shore, would create a further impediment to the competitive position of the U.S. merchant marine in seeking to assume its rightful place in the trade and commerce of the world."

A FEW UNION BOSSES

"It is regrettable that the actions of a few dictatorial union bosses can do more to destroy the symbol of freedom, characterized by the NS *Savannah*, than the entire Communist propaganda machine.

"Moreover, we who had dedicated our time and energies to a strong U.S. merchant marine have always looked to the NS *Savannah* as a shining example of Government, labor, science and industry working together to demonstrate how atomic power can be used for peaceful purposes.

"If these union bosses persist, the world will instead view the NS *Savannah* as a symbol of labor supremacy in the United States at the expense of the taxpayers and the public treasury. I am sure you do not want that to come to pass."

PHRASES IN SHARING

In his closing paragraph, the Senator referred to the phrases spoke by Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, and Donald W. Alexander, Maritime Administrator, about the *Savannah* and how the knowledge acquired through its construction and operation will be shared with the world.

"Surely, it would not be your wish to share with our friends and allies an incredible example of union effrontery," he concluded.

ADVISORY BOARD TODAY

As the strike aboard the ship entered its second week today, James J. Healey, the chairman of the emergency advisory board named to investigate the dispute, completed preliminary talks in New York and left for Washington, where the three-man body will convene formally at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

Although the board was requested to make a report within 10 days after its appointment last Friday, various arbitration meetings going on in connection with the *Savannah* dispute may make it difficult for the board to complete its work in time.

One of the arbitration sessions is scheduled for 3 p.m. tomorrow between the MMP and States Marine Lines in the presence of their permanent arbitrator, Walter Gelhorn, Columbia University professor and labor arbitrator.

UNION PLEADS NO CONTRACT

However, up to this afternoon, the union was denying that it was under obligation to adhere to its compulsory arbitration clause on the premise that it had no contract on the *Savannah*.

The ARA has taken the same position.

The company said the ARA was due for a meeting Sunday and again today, but failed to appear.

Officials of the NMU, representing the 79 unlicensed seamen aboard, showed up for a compulsory arbitration session last Saturday, but little was accomplished waiting on the progress of the other two unions.

The NMU arbitration is to be resumed Friday with W. Theodore Kheel, permanent arbitrator for that union.

At least 10 of States Marine's regular freighters are still suffering delays and setbacks in various ports as throwbacks by the unions on the *Savannah* matter.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 8, 1962]

STRIKE STILL TIES UP "SAVANNAH": OWNERS AND FACTFINDER CONFER

(By George Horne)

Negotiating efforts in the strike of seamen on the NS *Savannah* remained on dead center yesterday.

James J. Healy, a Harvard University professor, chairman of a special labor panel named by the Maritime Administrator to obtain facts on the dispute conferred during the day with officials of the States Marine Lines, operating agents of the Federally owned ship.

A meeting has been scheduled for this afternoon between the company and striking deck officers. Meanwhile, radio officers ignored yesterday a company offer to arbitrate the dispute.

As the $50 million ship remained at her base in Yorktown, Va., Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER called the White House to act in what he called "an incredible act of union effrontery."

In a letter to President Kennedy, the Maryland Republican said the voracious appetites of the unionmen involved would transform the original concept of the *Savannah* as a shining example of Government, labor, science and industry working together to demonstrate peaceful application of atomic power.

If the union bosses persist, he warned, "the world will instead view the NS *Savannah* as a symbol of labor supremacy in the United States at the expense of the taxpayers and the public treasury."

EQUAL PAY SOUGHT

The unions are the International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots, representing deck officers, and the American Radio Association, and the National Maritime Union, representing unlicensed seamen.

The unions are demanding treatment equal to that accorded the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association. Engineers on the ship, on the premise of special skills and training for this particular ship, are getting as much as 29 percent more in wages than the scale for conventionally powered vessels of this class.

The 13,559-ton *Savannah* is manned by 75 seamen, 16 engineers, 5 mates under Capt. Gaston R. DeGroote, 3 pursers, and 4 radio officers. She had been scheduled to go to Savannah, Ga., soon on the way to the west coast for her first "show ship" cruise.

The striking unions are also demanding improvements in benefits, including a higher manning scale and better accommodations.

Negotiators for the three labor groups have charged that the States Marine Lines has refused to negotiate the demands. On this basis, although the company has called for arbitration under the existing contract grievance procedure, the mates' union has declined to participate in arbitration.

KHEEL SLATES MEETING

Theodore W. Kheel, arbitrator for the NMU contract, will hold an arbitration meeting here on Friday.

A spokesman for the company said yesterday that some of the union's officials considered the refusal by the company to accept union demands equivalent to refusing to negotiate. He said the company had negotiated in good faith.

The *Savannah* received its official classification yesterday from the American Bureau of Shipping, this country's official classification society. The ship was given the society's top rating.

The *Savannah*, planned jointly by the Maritime Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission, is the first such commercial ship in the world, and required special standards under which the American Bureau carried out its tests and examinations.

Senator BUTLER reminded President Kennedy in his letter that the *Savannah* was owned by the people of the United States and that the men were striking against the Government.

"I cannot imagine that you as Commander in Chief would tolerate for a minute a strike by the crew of any vessel of the Navy," he said.

Last week, Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, proposed that the *Savannah* be laid up or transferred to the Navy, because of the intolerable labor situation.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Aug. 8, 1962]

SENATOR BUTLER APPEALS TO KENNEDY: URGES INTERVENTION ON "SAVANNAH"

(By Walter Hamshar)

President Kennedy was urged yesterday to intervene in the dispute that has tied up the nuclear ship *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, for 2 weeks. The *Savannah* has been immobilized at her berth at Yorktown, Va., where she was being prepared for service as a showcase of peaceful uses of atomic power.

The President's intervention was urged by Senator JOHN M. BUTLER, of Maryland, ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Commerce Committee, who supported legislation to build the experimental ship.

Mr. BUTLER called the refusal by members of three maritime union to sail the ship until their demands are met a strike against the Federal Government, which owns the *Savannah*. This is an "incredible situation" that warrants "personal intervention and immediate action," Senator BUTLER declared.

SITTING ABOARD SHIP

Members of the Masters, Mates & Pilots, the American Radio Association and the National Maritime Union are sitting in abroad ship although they were removed from its payroll after refusing last Thursday to move the vessel to a Norfolk shipyard for minor repairs. The unions are demanding parity in wages, manning and quarters with the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, whose members are still employed abroad the ship.

In a letter to the White House, Senator BUTLER said "The action of a few dictorial union bosses can do more to destroy the symbol of freedom characterized by the nuclear ship *Savannah* than the entire Communist machine."

WARNS OF WAGE SPIRAL

Recalling the President's words, BUTLER warned that "should the group that is now striking against the Federal Government be successful in unjustifiable demands for wage revisions, the upward spiral of wage demands throughout the entire maritime industry both at sea and ashore would create a further impediment to the competitive position of the U.S. merchant marine."

The Government has "eloquently and wisely" offered to share with foreign nations the knowledge acquired in constructing and operating the $80 million *Savannah*, Mr. BUTLER reminded the President. "Surely it would not be your wish to share with our friends and allies an incredible example of union effrontery," he said.

Mr. BUTLER's letter was the second written by Congressmen disturbed by the *Savannah* work stoppage. Last week Representative HEBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, suggested in a letter to the Department of Commerce that it might be wise to turn the *Savannah* over to the Navy and remove it from the influence of maritime unions.

ARBITRATION DATE SET

Efforts to arbitrate the dispute advanced slightly yesterday when the Masters, Mates & Pilots and States Marine Lines, which acts as agent for the *Savannah*, agreed to meet at 3 p.m. today to turn the dispute over to Walter Gelhorn, arbiter. The NMU has already agreed to submit its part in the dispute to Theodore W. Kheel, permanent arbiter for the union's agreement. The ARA was considering similar action.

Visit U.S.A.: New Friends and Dollars for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the first year of its existence the U.S. Travel Service has made a noteworthy record and has more than lived up to my expectations when I first suggested the idea of such an Office and then cosponsored the legislation with Senator MAGNUSON which established this Office. It may seem like an easy matter to outline extensive plans and goals for a travel office of this kind, but to convert those plans into action in such a short time is indeed a remarkable achievement. The U.S. Travel Office under the direction of Voit Gilmore for its activities this year is requesting an appropriation of $4.2 million, which is less than the amount authorized in the law. Because of the U.S. Travel Office's noteworthy accomplishments, I deeply believe that there are few activities of greater benefit to our world leadership and international balance of payments that cost so little and produce so much. It is estimated that added tourism to the United States will produce $43 million in the first year of operation as an addition to U.S. income.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the address by Voit Gilmore entitled "Visit U.S.A.: New Friends and Dollars for America," listing the first year achievements of the Travel Office, which was delivered to the North Carolina Press Association Annual Convention, Morehead City, N.C., July 12.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISIT U.S.A.: NEW FRIENDS AND DOLLARS FOR AMERICA

(Address by Voit Gilmore, Director, U.S. Travel Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, delivered to the North Carolina Press Association annual convention at Morehead City, N.C., July 12, 1962)

There is an exciting new way to win friends for the United States—and to earn dollars in the process. Both are high-priority objectives for helping our country, while contributing to world peace and prosperity.

The public—especially the press—has shown its eagerness to cooperate. Because of North Carolina's special interest, I particularly appreciate your invitation to be with you tonight.

The program is called Visit U.S.A. Very simply, it is a worldwide effort to attract visitors to the United States—people who will pay their own way; who want to share with us the beauty and excitement of our land; and who have a good chance of going home as friends of the United States after meeting our people, getting to know our ways, and after learning something of the principles and ideals on which our country is built.

Visit U.S.A. is a team effort of Government and private enterprise. It is a businesslike effort being directed by Americans with business experience who have studied the market, mapped the campaign and launched the product with time-tested merchandising techniques.

The U.S. Travel Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce, was created just a year ago to organize and operate our allout drive for the foreign tourist dollar. Here are some accomplishments of the first year:

USTS offices each staffed by multilingual travel experts, opened in London, Paris, Frankfurt, Rome, São Paulo, Bogotá, Mexico City, Tokyo, and Sydney.

Four and three-tenths million pieces of professionally produced Visit U.S.A. travel literature distributed abroad, most of it in seven major languages.

A half-million-dollar advertising campaign launched overseas, telling of the United State as a travel destination—easy to reach—friendly and hospitable—and less expensive than imagined.

Redtape at the U.S. border has been slashed, the visitors' entry made speedier and far more pleasant.

While dramatizing America's friendly new welcome to people abroad, the Visit U.S.A. program has helped the U.S. public realize that there now are millions who have both time and money to visit us and who need only to be persuaded that we are a desirable travel destination.

How about results? They are better thus far than we had dared to hope. In the first 4 months of 1962, visitors from Europe jumped 21 percent over the same period of 1961. France, up 52 percent. Switzerland, up 25 percent. Brazil, up 21 percent. Australia, up 19 percent.

We are using a combination of newspaper and magazine advertising with dramatic results. A series of unprecedented blockbuster full-page newspaper ads in Britain, France, and Germany shook up Western Europe this spring.

Three hundred people a day poured into our London office seeking more details on thrift trips to the United States. Paris pulled 250 inquiries a day; Frankfurt, 150. Surveys showed these ads achieved remarkably high readership, and the ad copy produced reader recall as high as any in the history of continental newspapers.

These spring inquiries are being converted to summer sales. Just last week our London Embassy reported it is working overtime to keep abreast of visa applicants. Perhaps the greatest tribute to the Visit U.S.A. program comes from Edinburgh, where the canny, thrifty Scots are queued up in unprecedented numbers for visas to pay us a visit.

And the truth is, the Scots are right. The United States is a great vacation bargain. Bob Considine's nationally syndicated column of June 16 told some of the reasons why:

"Private business is cooperating (with USTS). The two leading bus companies, Greyhound and Trailways, offer the foreign visitor 99 days of unlimited bus travel for only $99. U.S. railroads give a 15-percent discount on all coach tickets purchased by foreign visitors. TWA and Pan Am have set up attractive 'Visit U.S.A.' exhibits overseas. Air France, Scandinavian, BOAC and other foreign carriers conduct regular seminars abroad, attempting to quicken interest in visits to the United Staes. American Express has developed a series of low-cost group tours of the land.

"In New York, the rubberneck buses contain multilingual electronic translating devices. Three large hotel chains agreed recently to drop their prices for international visitors. The American Automobile Association recently set up a program designed to help visitors obtain driving licenses."

One of the country's foremost coast-to-coast hotel chains has just announced a $12-a-day for oversea visitors. This means $6 per day for three meals, tips and taxes included, plus $6 for room, based on two people per room.

It was my pleasure to be with the North Carolina Travel Mission in Europe recently when it told about travel bargains in this State. The U.S. Travel Service is pleased to be working with the North Carolina Travel Council and the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development in attracting international visitors. Market surveys show that these visitors want to get beyond our gateways and see the open country. We hope that your newspapers will help spread the word to some of your big-city colleagues who are still editorializing about the "prohibitive cost of travel in the United States."

Two matters should be set straight right here. First, 70 percent of a cross section of Europeans interviewed during a USTS market survey said the place they want most to visit is the United States; but of this group the great majority said they were resigned to never getting here because of the cost. For example, whereas more than half of all U.S. families have incomes in excess of $5,000, only 3 percent of the families in England have incomes of this size. Obviously it is better to make our product available to them at the lowest possible price. They can always spend more if they care to. It is better that middle-income Europeans visit the United States even if they have to economize than that they should not come at all. They bring badly needed foreign exchange and almost all of them go home with a more favorable attitude toward the United States.

The second point to clarify is what our international visitors actually enjoy. Some doleful writers have predicted that there would be disenchantment or even disgust among those who travel the United States on a low budget. But most of these predictions come from those who are accustomed to America, and who often take an expense-account view of things. Just as Europe, for us, has a glamour which Europeans do not see, so our new visitors are not seeing this country through our eyes. Even a prominent North Carolina daily last week revealed regrettable misinformation when it editorialized that "there is no such thing in the United States nowadays as convenient, low-priced transportation," then went on to say that "outside the fleabag hotel range it is getting next to impossible to find a good bed in a large city for under $12 a night."

Fortunately we now have travel experts around the world to offset this sort of excessive self-criticism by providing prospective visitors with facts that are often unknown or ignored here at home—such as the fact that air fares in the United States are lower than in Europe; that gasoline costs less here than in Europe; that deluxe hotels in the United States have a lower average cost than those in Europe, plus such "specials" being offered to our friends from overseas as the $12 rate for a quality hotel room including meals, and the world's greatest travel bargain—99 days of unlimited bus travel for only $99.

To get the actual facts about foreign reactions to the United States, we stood at Idlewild Airport last month and interviewed 300 random visitors returning to four continents after holidays here. We also talked with the 400 middle-income Swiss and the 700 small town French pharmacists and other groups who have come recently on Visit U.S.A. tours. What did this cross section of visitors say?

They loved our country and our people. Rather than being dismayed by our automats and coffee shops, as predicted, they found them unique and delightful. Besides, they hadn't come here expecting any gastronomical orgies. Quite accustomed to bus travel, they loved skimming our turnpikes on swift, air-conditioned express buses. Many of the things they liked are free—Mount Vernon, the New York Stock Exchange and Central Park, the French Quarter in New Orleans, the open road and American homes. The thrill of seeing our cities and our wide-open spaces and the novelty of meeting the amazing American far transcended any hardships involved in economizing.

But listen to Vincent Mulchrone, one of Britain's top feature writers. In May, the London Daily Mail "smuggled" him into the United States to test our travel claims without our knowing he was here. He wrote four enthusiastic full-page stories with more favorable adjectives than we would ever allow our own copy writers to use. In his first dispatch he cabled:

"At the same time as President Kennedy invited me—and all the other millions of Europe—to try the novelty of tourism in the United States, he issued a secret directive to 180 million Americans to be nice to us. How else to explain the embarrasing generosity, the overwhelming kindness, the extreme * * * courtesy at every turn?" * * * He concluded his last dispatch: "I can't wait to get back to the United States and I hope you'll come too."

Of course, travel can be expensive in the United States, just as it can be anywhere. One of this country's greatest features is its range of accommodations—from a chartered airplane to the 10-cent ferry ride at Staten Island—from the presidential suite to a clean national park cabin at the rim of Grand Canyon for $3.50. The point is, along with the hundreds who can travel deluxe, we need to attract the thousands who, to get here, must economize. In the keen competition for the international tourist dollar, we must realize that for just the cost of his round trip economy ticket to the United States, an Englishman can have an all-expense 2-week Mediterranean holiday. Or, for only $10 a day he can enjoy a deluxe vacation holiday in an Iron Curtain country, with jet prop transportation to and from London plus a cruise on the Black Sea thrown in for good measure.

Fortunately USTS was able to help plan the London Women's Press Club trip to North Carolina during its U.S. visit last month. Wonderful stories are now coming back from Britain as a result, with much warmth reflected from the courtesies shown them by the people of Asheville and Charlotte, especially the newspapers of those cities.

More pro-North Carolina feeling will be generated by the tour of European travel agents from Manteo to Murphy next October. USTS is pleased to be working with C. & D. on these arrangements too, just as we will work with North Carolina in the future on any projects to stimulate more Visit U.S.A. travel.

In the new USTS directory of plant tours in the United States, there are listed 4½ solid pages of Tar Heel industries which welcome visitors. Overseas we are telling prospective industrial visitors about these opportunities for closer ties to North Carolina industry. For example, we are currently working with a Scandinavian furniture group which wants to visit this State's furniture manufacturing centers. There are Brazilian businessmen in the Sporting Club of Sao Paulo group here in North Carolina this week.

The economic significance of all this Visit U.S.A. effort was underscored in the recently published exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Mr. David Rockefeller. As the President wrote, "American travelers abroad (last year) spent roughly $1 billion more than foreign visitors to this country. The surplus of our exports over imports, added to the receipts earned by this country on foreign debts and private investment, fell more than half a billion dollars short of covering foreign payments. * * * Our new efforts to attract foreign visitors and foreign capital to these shores will be stepped up."

Last year with more of us going abroad than foreign visitors coming here, travel expenditures exceeded receipts by more than $1 billion. With present U.S. prosperity, augmented by our natural penchant for travel, the tourist dollar gap could continue to widen unless we work hard at attracting more visitors to our shore.

This is why Government and industry will increasingly collaborate to build our tourist income. Even in one short year, this cooperation has been one of the brightest spots in Washington. And the increase in U.S. oversea visitors is a small but important trend in our balance-of-payments picture.

North Carolina fits in the foreground of this picture. More than half of the United States 600,000 annual oversea visitors come from Europe and Latin America. This State is within the primary travel zone of these visitors. The proven zeal of North Carolina's travel industry—coupled with such built-in assets as two national parks, a Federal parkway, a unique seashore, and an internationally famous golf area—gives North Carolina assured tourist appeal.

There are millions of people around the world tonight who want to visit us, meet us, know us; wealthy people who will enjoy our deluxe resorts; people of moderate means who will travel modestly, but treasure their chance to taste the excitement of America; people who will mold opinions in a hundred countries and influence their government's choice between the way of free men and the way of captive men. Our greatest asset, our greatest opportunity, is having these potential friends meet Americans, meet North Carolinians from Bogue Sound to the Great Smokies, and learn that with them we share common aims, problems, and dreams.

In this exciting new program, the U.S. press has a clear opportunity. You can help us say "welcome" to all the world; welcome to rich and poor alike, as has always been America's watchword—come, repay to us all the visits we have so long been paying to you of other lands—see how big America's heart really is, and how it beats for all the world.

The press of America can encourage our people to give these visitors a warm, friendly reception. The Advertising Council thinks enough of the program to have sanctioned a $7-million public service ad campaign which begins this month with appearances by Helen Hayes and Danny Kaye, who tell their countrymen, "Visitors are coming—let's welcome them. Friendly Americans will win America friends."

Yes, Visit U.S.A. is an exciting venture for all of us. It emphasizes the best of our land and it can bring out the best in our people. We earn dollars as we win friends. Join us in telling the people of the United States about this great opportunity within our grasp, and together we can do something of real value for our country and for all the world.

Financing of United Nations and Aid to Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have had called to my attention two radio editorials which were broadcast over radio station WOKE, Charleston, S.C., on August 9 and 10, 1962. These editorials were broadcast by Mr. Harry C. Weaver, owner and general manager of this station. Mr. Weaver is a dedicated patriot and is noted in South Carolina as an outstanding broadcaster. I take great pleasure in commending these two editorials to the Senate by asking unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL BY HARRY C. WEAVER, OWNER AND GENERAL MANAGER, RADIO STATION WOKE, CHARLESTON, S.C., AUGUST 10, 1962

Do you ever ask yourself "Whose side is the United States on?" This is why we ask this question today. A U.S. State Department officer revealed last week that the United States of America has been paying dues to the United Nations for India, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Cuba so that these Communist nations could maintain their voting rights in the U.N. Are we Americans foolish enough to think that India, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Cuba are on our side? Is it in the U.S. interest, of which our youthful and confused President speaks so often, for us to pay dues of Communist nations in that one-world organization—the U.N.—dominated by the Communist-bloc countries and so-called neutral nations?

This amazing misuse of U.S. citizens' tax moneys was revealed last week when the House Foreign Affairs Committee was investigating the $100 million bond bill for the United Nations—the bill which is scheduled to come up for House action soon, in fact, it might have happened since the writing of this editorial. The U.S. House members of the Foreign Affairs Committee were plying the State Department official, Harlan Cleveland, with questions when they drew from Mr. Cleveland this bombshell admission. Although there is a bill in the House, asking for $100 million in U.N. bonds, our beloved United States of America has already given voluntarily to the U.N.—get this amount—$215 million out of our foreign aid contingency fund. We now quote the Washington publication, Human Events, on this shocking admission by a member of the one-world group in our Federal Government who are out to sell out our country and our freedom to our known and sworn enemy, the Communists, if Americans do not put a stop to this action fast: "Then the U.N. proceeded to use part of this sum (the $215 million) to reduce India's assessed share of special U.N. expenses by $812,000, Poland's by $512,000, Yugoslavia's by $243,200, and Cuba's by $140,800. Under the U.N. Charter—those who do not pay dues, lose their voting rights.

"Thus, the U.S. funds given to the U.N. have been used to help Communist countries maintain their voting rights in the U.N."

The truth about the United Nations and our State Department deals with the U.N. is not known to the average American citizen. What the people of our beloved country have not been told is the reason that we are in a state of paralysis today. It is only when a congressional investigation permits a brief peak, into the way our affairs are being handled, that we get an understanding of why we keep on losing. This week's Washington Report concluded with this statement: "Committee members also gasped when the State Department officer, Harlan Cleveland, told them the $100 million bond bill was only a stopgap measure, and that the U.N. would have to continue to tap the U.S. taxpayer for most of its funds." So, reluctantly, this U.S. State Department official dropped this bombshell, during the course of the investigation into the $100 million bond issue by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Are you now asking yourself: "Whose side is our United States on?" There is a bill in Congress, buried in committee, if approved would authorize the Congress to investigate the U.S. State Department, its policies and its personnel. If ever the people of the United States of America are to learn what is the State Department's plan for our Nation's survival, it will only come through public demand for the passage of H.R. 512, the bill now in committee to investigate State Department policy and personnel. Have you written those letters to all six of South Carolina's Members in the House of Representatives? Have you written those letters to your friends and relatives in other States of our United States, asking them to write their Congressmen?

"Whose side is our United States on?" You'll find out fast with the passage of H.R. 512 and the resulting investigation of the U.S. State Department.

EDITORIAL BY HARRY C. WEAVER, OWNER AND GENERAL MANAGER, RADIO STATION WOKE, CHARLESTON, S.C., AUGUST 9, 1962

How can we Americans expect good to prevail, as long as we permit our leaders to reward the evil doers? Internationally, as well as here at home, the forces of evil continue to win. The Director of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in his August "Bulletin to Law Enforcement Officials," refers to the "Massive avalanche of crime sweeping our country." And, we say, "Why not " The U.S. Supreme Court has made the job harder for the law and easier for the criminal in a series of decisions during the past 8 years that have rocked the FBI and the law right back on their heels.

It is no different on the international level. If you can free your mind of the emotional hogwash, that goes for truth these days from the national news mediums, and just look at the record, you could classify a world aggressor as the "bad" man and our United States as the "good" man. But, the truth is, the world criminals are winning. Not only the Communists, but all the international robbers are winning. And, why not? The one-world organization—the United Nations—and the one-world U.S. State Department reward the "bad" men and "penalize" the "good" men. You have to look no further than the current examples for proof of this strange truth: Laos, where the "good" man was forced into a Communist coalition; the Congo, where the "good" man is being forced into a "neutral" coalition; Angola, West New Guinea, and Goa where the aggressor is winning, with the support of the U.N. and our United States. Take a look at Brazil. The third attack this year on U.S. citizens' property now goes almost unnoticed. This occurrence is getting to be commonplace. Just this past Saturday, one of the national news wire services released the statement that "the Brazilian authorities have seized the American-owned power and transportation company. A company spokesman in Brazil, says the state authorities have deposited $8,500 in payment for the property which is valued at between $6 and $8 million. Authorities of other states are seeking permission in the Brazilian courts to seize power and transit companies owned by American and foreign interests." This important news to Americans was shelved by national news mediums in favor of putting their full and complete propaganda stories of the Albany, Ga. racial problems facing our South and created by outside agitators. Never a word of commendation to the majority of the Americans in that Southern city, only the injustices being experienced by the minorities. If there were ever any doubt as to where our one-world President stands it can be removed now from your minds for comic book hero Smilin' Jack Kennedy and his scooter-riding brother, Bobby, are up to their necks in the Albany, Ga. racial strife. So, regardless of whether it is in our United States, in South America, or in the various corners of the world, the "bad" men continue to win and the "good" men continue to lose.

The Brazilians take another $6 to $8 million in the U.S.-owned power and transportation company and offer American stockholders only $8,000 for it. Americans must not forget that we are rewarding them for their thievery. We permit our Congress and the administration leaders to provide over $200 million in foreign aid, in the Alliance for Progress program to Brazil. They are dishing out your tax dollars right now to Brazil.

How can good prevail when the people and the Government of the United States of America are obsessed with the idea that it is the "good" thing to indulge the criminal—both at home and abroad. Where is the penalty in our U.S. policy for the "bad" man? Indulgence erodes honesty and fair play, whether it be in the South, in America, in the Western Hemisphere, or in the world?

Corn Is an American Original—Make Its Tassel Our National Floral Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Miss Margo Cairns, "The Corn Tassel Lady" as an introduction to the remarkable cookbook of American dishes using corn, called "Corn From Soup to Nuts." Miss Cairns has worked tirelessly and selflessly for years to get the Nation and the Congress to choose the corn tassel as its national floral emblem, partly because no country has a plant so uniquely its own, and also to express its gratitude for the maize—meaning mother—which made its survival possible in the beginning and which has played such a vital and undispensable role in its economy and its development into the land we honor and love today.

At a time when the White House and so many in our country are searching for American "originals," surely Indian corn is the first original of them all.

The article follows:

AN AMERICAN ORIGINAL

(By Margo Cairns)

It was maize, Indian corn, that gave to the United States its novel cookery. The Atlantic Ocean was wide. Storms and pirate raids made shipping uncertain and perilous. Wives of the colonists were compelled through necessity to use native foods.

Taught by the Indians, the women acquired the skill of processing and grinding the kernels into meal. They learned that cornmeal porridge and hominy were satisfying and nourishing. From the Indians' ash cake, that primitive bread made of meal and water patted thin and baked on a hot flat rock, the women evolved corn pone, corndodger, cornbread, johnny cake. Indian pudding, sweetened with maple syrup, popcorn, and parched corn were highly prized.

When the harvest moon hung high was the perfect time for corn roasts. Husking corn was both business and pleasure. Done to the music of gay fiddling, there was excited laughter when a red ear was found entitling a man to claim a kiss from his sweetheart.

This was the way of life that was built upon the sturdy roots of the American plant, corn, giving health and strength, joy and prosperity, to the developing Nation.

Late in the 19th century more wealth was wrested from the fruit of our native plant. Corn flakes, crisp and nutritious, changed the breakfast habits of the people. Then it was, too, that corn on the cob, golden and tenderly sweet, was introduced and almost overnight became a national gastronomic joy.

Dedicated scientists, working in laboratories scattered widely through the great corn areas, began unlocking more of the treasures in the golden kernels. Already various forms of feed made from corn had developed vast meat, poultry, and dairy industries. Now more wealth came as scientists extracted syrup, sugar, starch, and oil, putting them in forms that went immediately into the kitchens of the Nation, adding infinite variety to menus.

The United States itself, as well as its distinctive cookery, is a product of the cornstalk. Had the settlements of Jamestown and Plymouth failed, as did the tragic colony on Roanoke Island, this land might never have been peopled by adherents of the Magna Carta and the ideas it embodied of personal and political liberty. Corn and courage conquered adversities.

Maize, Indian corn, is the American original. It was the builder of the United States. Today, in some of many forms, it is present at every meal from soup to nuts.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

Office Address: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Bottum, Joe H., *S. Dak*	
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*	
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hickey, J. J., *Wyo*	4736 W St.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y*	1233 31st St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*	7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr. Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, Maurice J., Jr., *N.H.*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Benjamin A., *Mass*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Kerr (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, and Capehart.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan of North Carolina, Young of Ohio, Hart, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Bush, Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Tower, and Murphy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Butler, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Keating, and Prouty.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, Smith of Massachusetts, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Burdick, Metcalf, Hickey, Kuchel, Allott, Miller, Pearson, Bottum, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan of North Carolina, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Metcalf, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, Murphy, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan of North Carolina, Cannon, Hickey, Pell, Curtis, Dirksen, and Bottum.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.

Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.

Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.

Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd., NW.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire. Puerto Rico. Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Strengthening of Vocational and Educational Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these fast-changing, rapidly advancing times, we as citizens find more and more that completion of normally formal education—important, though it is—really only establishes a foundation for learning.

Upon this foundation, we must build—with almost day-to-day regularity—new knowledge to enable us to keep abreast of, and understanding—and as possible make a contribution to meeting—the challenges of the times.

Across the Nation, vocational and adult educational programs are making a tremendously significant contribution to fulfilling these needs in our national life.

Today, I was privileged to receive from C. L. Greiber, director of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational and Adult Education, a copy of a letter to the House Committee on Agriculture urging a strengthening of the vocational and educational training program.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE BOARD OF
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Madison, Wis., August 8, 1962.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just completed a review of the report issued by the Committee on Economic Development entitled "An Adaptive Program for Agriculture."

Despite the fact that there has been some industrial expansion in our State in recent years, agriculture continues to be an important segment of our economy. In view of the fact that agriculture will continue to play a large part in our future State economy, it is important that we continue to train young persons as competent farmers so that they may contribute to the well-being of the entire State.

Recent studies which have been made by this department indicate the need for replacement in farming in our State numbers of youth equivalent to those who are now being trained for this vocation. These studies also point up the need for an expansion of training opportunities for young and adult farmers so that they may keep abreast of new methods and techniques in their vocation.

We hope, therefore, that the needs of the States for a continuing supply of competent farmers will be taken into consideration when the recommendations made by the Committee on Economic Development are reviewed. Naturally we are taking steps to provide retraining opportunities to individuals who become displaced as farmers. We are also developing training programs which will enable farm youth to train for occupations in areas other than farming.

We hope that your committee will recognize the need for continuing support for this important vocational education training program. A reduction in the amount of Federal funds available for the program which would result in a deemphasis of instruction in vocational agriculture would be a serious blow to the basic economy of our State.

Sincerely yours,
C. L. GREIBER,
State Director, Vocational and Adult Education.

To J.F.K.: Total Victory in the Cold War Is Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a series of five broadcasts which I believe capsulize and define our needed course in wininng total victory over the forces of communism in the cold war.

In these days when too much emphasis is being placed on "accommodation," on compromise, on regressive policies toward segments of communism, it is refreshing and stimulating to note that there are Americans who want to win, without war, our ideological struggle for the future of the world's citizens.

The broadcasts were prepared and delivered by David Wills, international affairs editor of "Three Star Extra." I urge my colleagues to read these brief but penetrating analyses of the urgency and the possibility of winning the cold war.

Text of the broadcasts is as follows:

THE FREE WORLD AND THE SOVIETS
(Broadcast of June 4, 1962)

Our enemy in the cold war is the international Communist conspiracy, irrevocably committed to the overthrow of the free world. The heart of that enemy is Soviet Russia. Even Red China's semi-independent threat would wither away if Soviet Russia's aggressive ambitions were permanently defeated.

While Soviet Russia has great strengths, she has even greater weaknesses. The Communist theories of human behavior, social evolution, and historical forces are false. The Communists continue to fail to meet the material, let alone the spiritual, needs of their own people. To their satellites, Red rule is not a liberating revolution of universal validity, but plain Soviet imperialism. As Khrushchev has admitted by his denunciation of Stalin's tyrannies, communism rules by deceit and force. Its own inherent weaknesses will prove communism's undoing.

The heart of the free world, which is the target of Communist attack, is the North Atlantic Community. If Khrushchev could control Western Europe his resources would decisively outweigh ours. But the combined economic, political, and moral resources of Western Europe and North America are so great that, if applied to the defeat of communism, Khrushchev's boast that he will bury us will be exposed as ludicrous.

It would be entirely consistent with the spirit and purpose of Western civilization that NATO proclaim its aim as total victory over the Communist conspiracy. Total victory involves: First, halting further expansion of the Communist empire; second, liberating the satellites; third, inducing the Russians to install a government whose foreign policies are confined to the legitimate peaceful, patriotic interests of Russia; and fourth, avoiding a third world atomic war which would shatter all civilization.

While it is undoubtedly true that total victory will involve the collapse of the Soviet dictatorship, this is not an essential element of a victory strategy. Unconditional surrender is not a realistic demand. But it is realistic to set total victory as NATO's aim, and conduct our policies so that the Russian rulers are progressively compelled to abandon their program of world conquest, liberate their satellites, and become good neighbors in the world community. If the Western Allies set their target any lower than this, they will not defeat the Communist conspiracy.

THE RUSSIANS AND THE SOVIETS
(Broadcast of June 5, 1962)

The Western Allies must maintain a shield of military superiority if total victory is to be won over the Soviets without world war. Khrushchev knows the damage atomic war would do to Russia and so rejects it as an effective means of advancing communism. But he uses force whenever the risks seem low, and he still works to acquire atomic dominance over the free world. The inescapable moral for us is that we must never permit the Soviets to gain such a military advantage over NATO. Not until the cold war has been won will there be any safe basis for disarmament, a ban on nuclear testing, or a United Nations force to maintain peace.

Nor can the West contemplate war as an effective means of liberating the satellites. This victory aim can be accomplished only by the defeat of communism within Russia itself. The best encouragement we can currently give the captive peoples is to convince them that we are committed to the complete defeat of their tyrants.

The Russian people themselves are the only force capable of securing the pacification of their Government. The conversion of Soviet Russia into a peaceful world neighbor without war is the nub of the whole conflict. Despite Khrushchev's confident boasts of Communist triumphs within Russia, the Russian people are steadily becoming more skeptical of such claims, and increasingly aware of the inability of the Communist system to permit the full development of their qualities. Communism contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction.

How can we best exert our influence to stimulate the Russian people to secure this end? By maintaining formidable obstacles to Communist expansion; by denying to the Communists the successes which they exploit to play upon the patriotic emotions of their people; by making the risks of destruction so great Khrushchev will find further gambles too dangerous; by confronting the Communists with a moral, political, and psychological opposition as unyielding as our military deterrent.

And at the same time, keeping wide open the door for the Russian people to enter into the full peaceful collaboration with the rest of the world that is their right. Khrushchev asserts that Russia will achieve full communism within the lives of Russians now living, and that he will bury us. Our determination must be that in that same period the Russian people, with our help, will liberate themselves, and bury the Communist tyranny.

NEGOTIATION FOR VICTORY

(Broadcast of June 6, 1962)

Diplomatic negotiations have been converted by the Soviets into their principal field of combat against the West. To the Kremlin, "negotiation" is a cold war weapon with which they endeavor to shock us into accepting their demands after they have softened us up by a period of deliberately contrived crises. Any agreements reached are to be broken whenever the Kremlin judges the time is opportune for further Communist advance. However tortuous their path, the pursuit of total victory is the Red leaders undeviating purpose.

If the Western Allies make total victory their aim, then, while they will always be ready to meet the peaceful needs of the Russian people, they will steadfastly block every aggressive move by the Soviet Government. Guided by such a rule, negotiation with the Kremlin will become not an ordeal but an opportunity to carry the free world's campaign against the Red rulers to the Russian people themselves.

President Kennedy has said that while we will not negotiate from fear, we will never fear to negotiate. In the past we have hoped that negotiations would permanently change the Soviet Government's policies. Experience has proved that this is a vain expectation. The Soviet leaders are impervious to conversion. But we can turn negotiation into a weapon for our cause, if we adhere to the principle of no concessions to the Soviet Government, constant friendship toward the Russians.

Berlin is a classical example of Soviet technique. President de Gaulle rejects negotiations on Berlin because he rightly wishes to present an unyielding front to the Communists' dishonest demands. Prime Minister Macmillan favors negotiations because, while constantly opposing Soviet pressures, we should always be ready to meet the legitimate national interest of the Russian people, and maintain open communications with the Kremlin to avert accidental war.

There need be no contradiction between these positions if we treat diplomacy as a method of combat against the Communist conspiracy. The prospects are negligible at present that any agreement regarding Berlin can safely be reached. There is no reason to shrink from this conclusion, nor any reason to search around for a sop to keep the Kremlin quiet. We must always be prepared to go to the brink. After all, if we are to achieve total victory within a generation, Khruschev must soon be made to accustom himself to Communist retreat.

THE CHALLENGE TO NATO

(Broadcast of June 7, 1962)

The duty of the Western Allies to make total victory their aim is strongly emphasized when we consider the role in the cold war of the United Nations, the professing neutralists, and the undeveloped nations.

The United Nations has many passionate advocates, who see in it man's last best hope for peace on earth. This is wishful thinking. The sober reality is that the United Nations is now a doubtful ally of the West. It has been distorted by the Communists into a cockpit of the global struggle. The United Nations is an important theater of this combat, which we would neglect at our peril. But until the West has won the war against communism by actions taken outside its walls, the United Nations will not be able even to begin to play the role intended by its founders.

The neutralists claim to represent the conscience of mankind, but in fact, expediency and personal ambition are their principal guiding emotions, not devotion to the Western principles to which most of them owe their independence. As even Nehru has conceded, the great struggle between freedom and tyranny touches only the fringes of their minds. In these circumstances, the proper role we should assign to the neutralists in influencing our cold war aims and strategy is precisely zero. The Western Allies must follow their own conscience.

Western aid to the undeveloped nations is commonly described as the decisive weapon in the fight against Communist imperialism. But this is a long-range program that would remain with us even if communism had never been invented. It is important, but its significance in the cold war can be so exaggerated that it becomes a bottomless pit of profligate waste. If the Western Allies have a policy for total victory, the surrender of one or another undeveloped country to Communist temptation will not be a critical danger. It cannot be our responsibility to insure all fools against the consequences of their folly. But if we have no policy, we will not find one by rushing around the world trying to buy supporters.

We cannot delegate to the United Nations, the neutralists, or the undeveloped countries our responsibility to win the war against communism. Their contribution will be small; they will frequently indulge in irresponsible criticism of our actions, although their own survival, like ours, depends upon our victory. The Western Allies of the North Atlantic community must wage the fight, on behalf of all mankind, until victory is won.

(Broadcast of June 8, 1962)

If we are to be true to our inheritance, and secure our own future, the Western Allies of the North Atlantic community cannot avoid making total victory over communism its driving purpose. That the alliance is not now completely united on this principle is obvious.

There is a history of nationalist rivalries between some of NATO's members which has not yet been completely replaced by confident habits of collaboration.

There is a tendency among Western peoples to underestimate the diabolic determination of the Communists, and to entertain the easier hope that, in time, the Reds will become civilized citizens, and the Communist threat will pass away.

There is a strong thread of pacifism in the West, which considers it immoral to marshal force, the Communists' chosen weapon, even to defend Western civilization.

Perhaps most serious of all is the difficulty of organizing an alliance in which proud European nations, busily developing unprecedented unity and strength, find their ultimate security dependent upon an American nuclear deterrent over which they have no control. Not all our European allies are happy to leave to Washington the key military and political decisions. This is a pressing problem needing urgent solution.

The NATO world has its troubles and its weaknesses. But these are not innate to our system, as the Communists' weaknesses are to theirs. And since the principles of freedom are the finest contribution of Western civilization to man's evolution, nothing could more stimulate the Western alliance than to make the total victory of those principles the inspiring purpose of NATO.

NATO was conceived as a military defense against Communist aggression. If it is to win the battle without war, it must take the offensive against communism in every other field, while maintaining whatever armed might is necessary to deter Communist military adventures.

The issue is far wider than the survival of the West European and North American members of NATO. For, upon the outcome of the cold war depends the future of the United Nations, and the continued independent existence of the neutralists and the undeveloped nations.

Unless freedom wins total victory, the whole world will lose for centuries the chance it now has to organize its governments and advance its well-being in freedom. At this stage of history fate and our own accomplishments impose upon the western NATO alliance the responsibility of defending all civilized man's past progress against the new Communist barbarian horde. We can only discharge that duty by making total victory our goal.

Far from being atomic warmongering, or a retreat to isolationism, this is the only road to freedom without war. We have no other choice.

Nuclear Test Ban and Disarmament Agreements With the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the August 2, 1962, issue of the Nashville Banner of Nashville, Tenn., contains an editorial on an important subject which has received little attention by the Congress. This subject, which is concerned with the disarming of our defense establishment, has come more into the news lately because of increased efforts on behalf of our State Department negotiators to conclude nuclear test ban and disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union by offering more concessions from our side.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled "Time for Senate Quiz on Three-Phase Surrender" be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Aug. 2, 1962]

WHAT IS STATUS OF 7277? TIME FOR SENATE QUIZ ON THREE-PHASE SURRENDER

Before the 87th Congress adjourns, appropriate committees should ask some pointed questions, and demand specific answers, concerning State Department Publication No. 7277. That is the proposal, finally unveiled last April, for a three-phase disarmament program to dismantle security forces at the national level and replace them with a United Nations peace force.

Top military commanders, knowing the score, entertain no illusions concerning the peril of any suggestion to eventually turn over our nuclear armaments to that U.N. force. They must be equally unreceptive to the idea of supplanting our own Armed Forces with a conglomerate international military machine.

The authorship of this suggested adventure in folly still is obscure. When it was first cited as such by Senator STROM THURMOND, the disclosure that it actually was in the policyworks occasioned tentative denials. Even the Senate liberals closest to the Kennedy team expressed first incredulity and then amazement. But there it was.

As already has been stated, the surrender of arms to the United Nations—divesting ourselves of strength and authority to use it, and simultaneously committing both to an agency in which we and the free world are the minority—was a proposal of such fantastic stupidity as to be, indeed, almost beyond belief. Yet, again, there it was.

It is in order to ask—yea, as the representative public instrument with which all treaties must be cleared, it is mandatory for the Senate to be finding out by more than perfunctory investigation: What about State Department Publication No. 7277? What does the high command think of it? Who is advising the President?

The Banner would find it impossible to believe that such an idea originated with the men in uniform—or that any commanding officer shares, or would countenance it.

Mr. Kennedy's Pentagon shakeup is an occasion to ask some questions. Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who is to become Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is a distinguished combat officer and servant of his country. He will preside over organizational military decisions; simultaneously then as now he will be in an advisory position to the President, under whom the State Department and its several policy agencies function.

General Taylor should have some positive convictions on the suicidal course entertained as an idea in State Department Publication No. 7277. Just as concerned now as it was in April, Congress, including the Senate Armed Forces Committee, should make inquiry.

Speaker McCormack Personally Conveys to General MacArthur Gratitude of the Congress and the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the honoring of General MacArthur today in the House of Representatives on the House side of the Capitol, our distinguished Speaker tendered this great American the thanks of the Congress and the American people for his everlasting devotion to duty, God, and country.

In words which came from the heart, our beloved Speaker paid an incomparable tribute to this magnificent citizen of America and of the world. In reviewing some of the highlights of his unparalleled military life, the Speaker painted innumerable acts of devotion, dedication, and service which General MacArthur has made for his beloved Nation. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith the tribute of Speaker McCORMACK to General MacArthur:

A TRIBUTE TO GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

(By Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, August 16, 1962)

My remarks cannot express our deep feelings on this occasion; for this tribute of the Congress of the United States to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur comes not from me but from a grateful Nation. This great patriot is molded of those beliefs which most deeply penetrate the American historic experience; and as he cherishes those beliefs, so he has fought for them, and helped to preserve them for us all. Duty, honor, country—thus he eloquently expressed the essence of his beliefs in his farewell address to the corps of cadets at West Point this last May. By these principles he lives; by these principles he became an inspired military leader whose name shall always occupy prominent pages in American history.

He has served his country in three great armed conflicts in this country. Douglas MacArthur was chief of staff of the Rainbow Division that fought in the First World War. He it was who commanded the valiant defense of Bataan; he it was who led the final stand at Corregidor until ordered by President Roosevelt to Australia—that brave stand that electrified and rallied a nation shocked and reeling through one of its most tragic hours. For history had a place for Douglas MacArthur that his cleavage to principle and selfless dedication to his Nation's service had prepared him for. And—even as he promised to return to the Philippines to lift the crushing occupation from that land that he had grown to love and respect, so he fulfilled his pledge 3 years later as Supreme Commander of the South Pacific. Douglas MacArthur commanded the American forces which swept the Pacific island chain of the offending enemy and pursued him to his homeland where he was finally brought to bay in August 1945. President Truman appointed General MacArthur as Supreme Allied Commander, and it was fitting that he received the Japanese surrender in Tokyo Harbor on the 14th of August.

The defense of his country's honor to which duty called him was threatened again by the Communist invasion of South Korea, and again he responded. The brilliantly conceived and executed Inchon landings are a classic example of this man's inspired leadership. At the time of his relief in April 1951, General MacArthur was commander of the United Nations Command in the Far East, commander in chief of the Far East Command and supreme commander for the allied forces in Japan.

It is difficult to do justice here to this man's unparalleled military accomplishments, but the names of the places at which he has steadfastly served his country ring out in history: the Marne, Meuse-Argonne, St. Mihiel and Sedan; Bataan, Corregidor, New Guinea, Leyte, Lingayen Gulf, Manila and Borneo; Pusan and Inchon. Let the histories of our age tell of these places and of his deeds there; but his deeds and his name are inscribed far deeper in the hearts of grateful Americans than books have the power to do. These great military events, under his brave leadership, are what make General MacArthur a man of history. There are few men whose place in history is assured during one's lifetime, and General MacArthur is one of that select few. For his whole life has been dedicated to preserving and strengthening our beloved country by retaining a government of law, not only for Americans of this day and age but for generations to come.

No, General MacArthur, to explain your place in the history of this country is not to explain your place in its heart. Your place in the heart of this country must be explained by your incarnation of so many fundamental American ideals. You are the kind of a man to whom a father and mother can proudly point when asked—what does it mean to be an American?

What could words of mine add to the greatest of honors that you already hold? You are part of the living fabric of this country's historic greatness. This is an honor priceless beyond words. But may I quote from your address to the cadets of West Point, words which you meant to describe the American fighting man, but which I feel apply especially to you.

"Yours is the profession of arms, the will to win, the sure knowledge that in war there is no substitute for victory, that if you lose, the Nation will be destroyed, that the very obsession of your public service must be duty, honor, country.

"Others will debate the controversial issues, national and international, which divide men's minds. But serene, calm, aloof, you stand as the Nation's war guardian, as its lifeguard from the raging tides of international conflict, as its gladiator in the arena of battle. For a century and a half you have defended, guarded, and protected its hallowed traditions of liberty and freedom, of right and justice."

And may I close, General MacArthur, in making the concise, but all-embracing observation, that you make all of us proud we are fellow Americans. For your lifetime of dedicated service to our beloved country is a symbol and an inspiration for all others to follow.

New U.S. Test Ban Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a letter addressed to Speaker McCORMACK from the Honorable William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, containing information of importance and of deep interest to Members of the Congress, and to people of the United tSates.

The letter follows:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND
DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: In view of the discussion in the press of the new test ban proposals the United States is submitting to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, I thought you might be interested in hearing more about them.

There have been two key technical developments on which the new proposals are based. The first establishes a better capability for long-distance detection of earth tremors caused by nuclear explosions or earthquakes, and makes it possible to propose a simpler and more economical system of internationally supervised long-range detection stations, manned largely by the country where located.

The second is that an earlier estimate of the number of tremors from earthquakes which might be confused with tremors from nuclear explosions has been shown by actual observation and research to be several times too large. Since there are fewer earthquakes which produce tremors similar to those of an explosion, the number of onsite inspections needed to identify the cause of the tremors is less. However, onsite inspections are still essential.

These developments have shown the way to a control system which would cost less to construct and run, which would be simpler to manage, which could begin operation in a matter of months from ratification of a treaty, and would in no way jeopardize our national security.

The new proposals were developed by this Agency in cooperation with other agencies. They were approved by the President on the unanimous recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, the AEC, the Director of CIA, and the Secretary of State as well as this Agency. The executive branch is strongly of the view that an adequately verified ban on all nuclear weapon tests is in the national interest.

Sincerely,

William C. Foster.

Problems of Legislated Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, most of the people I represent in the Second District of Minnesota, regardless of party affiliation, grow increasingly disturbed at the seemingly endless proliferation of spending and taxing programs on the part of the Federal Government. One of my constituents, Mr. Robert Voosen, of St. James, has brought my attention to excerpts from an address made some years ago by the late Mr. Samuel Gompers, great friend of the American workingman and president of the AFL from 1886 to 1924. Mr. Voosen has asked me to draw Mr. Gompers' statements on legislated security to the attention of my colleagues in Congress, which I am pleased to do. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Congressional Record those portions of Mr. Gompers' speech which appeared in the September 1955 issue of the magazine Ideas on Liberty.

The speech follows:

LEGISLATED SECURITY IS BONDAGE

(By Samuel Gompers)

There has never yet come down from any government any substantial improvement in the conditions of the masses of the people, unless it found its own initiative in the mind, the heart, and the courage of the people. Take from the people of our country the source of initiative and the opportunity to aspire and to struggle in order that that aspiration may become a reality, and though you couch your action in any sympathetic terms, it will fail of its purpose and be the undoing of the vital forces that go to make up a virile people. Look over all the world where you will, and see those governments where the features of compulsory benevolence have been established, and you will find the initiative taken from the hearts of the people.

Social insurance cannot even undertake to remove or prevent poverty. It is not fundamental and does not get at the causes of social injustice.

The first step in establishing compulsory social insurance is to divide people into groups, those eligible for benefits and those considered capable of caring for themselves. The division is based upon earning capacity. This governmental regulation must tend to fix the citizens of the country into classes, and a long-established insurance system would tend to make those classes rigid.

Governmental power grows upon that on which it feeds. Give an agency power, and it at once tries to reach out after more. Its effectiveness depends upon increasing power.

Recently a gentleman of the highest standing stated to me that during the time he was in Germany, and in a position to know, German workmen came to him seeking aid to get out of that country to the United States. They told him that by reason of the taxes which they were compelled to pay into compulsory social insurance schemes, they had no money left except for absolute necessities of life, and were unable to secure sufficient funds to come to the United States even in the steerage. He said to me further that in Germany, where compulsory social insurance has been more extensively worked out than in any other country, the workmen of that country, by reason of their property interests in compulsory social insurance, have been compelled to remain in Germany and work under circumstances, wages, hours, and conditions of employment which forced them to endure conditions below standards of a living wage.

Is it not discernible that the payments required of workmen for this compulsory social insurance interfere very materially with mobility of labor, and constitute a very effectual barrier to the workers determining their whole lives?

Industrial freedom exists only when and where wage earners have complete control over their labor power. To delegate control over their labor power to an outside agency takes away from the economic power of those wage earners and creates another agency for power. Whoever has control of this new agency acquires some degree of control over the worker. There is nothing to guarantee control over that agency to employees. It may also be controlled by employers. In other words, giving the Government control over industrial relations creates a fulcrum which means great power for an unknown user.

The introduction of compulsory social insurance in cases of sickness, or compulsory social insurance in cases of unemployment, means that the workers must be subject to examinations, investigations, regulations, and limitations. Their activities must be regulated in accordance with the standards set by governmental agencies. To that we shall not stand idly by and give our assent.

Men and women, I trust I may not be sounding my warnings upon the empty air. I hope that they may find a lodgment in the minds and the hearts of my countrymen. I bid you have a care in all these attempts to regulate the personal relations and the normal personal activities of the citizenship of our country ere it be too late.

There is in the minds of many an absence of understanding of the fundamental essentials of freedom. They talk freedom, and yet would have bound upon their wrists the gyves that would tie them to everlasting bondage. And no matter how sympathetic or humanitarian is the gloss over the plan and the scheme, I again bid you beware. We know not "when" or "how" this great struggle going on in Europe will terminate, or what it shall mean for the future of those countries; but at least let the people of the United States hold their liberties in their own hands, for it may come to pass that America, the America whose institutions and ideals we so much revere, may be the one nation to hold the beacon light of freedom aloft, and thus aid in relighting the torch, rekindling the heart flame of the world's liberty.

For a mess of pottage, under the pretense of compulsory social insurance, let us not voluntarily surrender the fundamental principles of liberty and freedom, the hope of the Republic of the United States, the leader and teacher to the world of the significance of this great anthem chorus of humanity—liberty.

The Two Grasshoppers: Russia and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a 9-year-old constituent, Jonathan Rolarcheck, who presented an allegory likening the United States and Russia to two grasshoppers who in mutual fear maintained a constant distrusting guard against each other. To the mind of this 9-year-old, readiness to protect or strike back in the event of attack, is a waste. I wonder how many more of the future possible leaders of our country think in a similar vein.

For the interest of my colleagues, I submit the letter sent to me by young Master Rolarcheck and my reply which I hope will teach him the worth of preparedness:

LETTER FROM JONATHAN ROLARCHECK

DEAR SIR: I think that the fear of war is a fear like the fear of the two grasshoppers. The two grasshoppers is a story where two grasshoppers met in a field. They both were afraid of the other one attacking him. So they always kept their claws up ready for an attack and after a while it wore away. Just think of say Russia and the United States as the two grasshoppers and how it will wear away is how every year citizens of our country pay money to do nothing. Nothing is making guns. See how the two grasshoppers just stayed there ready with all the power they had and did nothing. Now get sensible and think of what all this money can do if we use it for something. It's better schools, hospitals, housing projects, and many, many other things that are useful for a change. I hope you take this letter into consideration.

Very truly yours,

Jonathan Rolarcheck.

P.S.—Please excuse the mistakes as I am only 9 years old.

LETTER FROM CONGRESSMAN LEONARD FARBSTEIN

DEAR JONATHAN: Letters such as yours are among the best rewards a Congressman can receive. Indeed, if I were certain that all American youngsters were as bright, alert, and sensitive as you, I would have few fears of the future.

I want you to know that I am deeply concerned with that future. My fondest dream is that there will be a future for fine young people such as yourself to inherit.

Your story of the two grasshoppers was a delightful allegory—and certainly not without its point. But have you considered, Jonathan, what might have happened to one of the grasshoppers if he had not kept up his claws to protect himself? Without doubt, he would have been destroyed.

U.S. relationships with the Soviet Union are much like those of the two grasshoppers. We simply cannot put down our claws. We must continue to show our strength in the fervent hope that such action will serve to discourage war. If the Russian rulers are convinced of our strength, of our ability to strike back and defend ourselves, of the sharpness of our claws, they might have second thoughts about striking out in the first place.

That this is so is a tragic waste. The billions of dollars we have spent on armaments—which we hope and pray will never be used—could most certainly have been better spent on schools, hospitals, and more decent housing, as you suggest. But until the Russian leaders show more clearly evidence that they are genuinely interested in peaceful coexistence with us, we will continue to be faced with this sad alternative.

No one likes or wants an arms race, but until the Russian bear realizes that he has nothing to gain from attacking the American eagle—until he understands that the world is big enough for both of them—we must continue to show our strength.

If I have used some big words in replying to your letter, it is only because I was so carried away by the concepts you presented that I forgot you are only 9 years old. Perhaps mother or dad can explain some of them to you.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

Professor Calls for Stop to Free Delivery of Red Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, among the many letters that have reached me on the matter of free delivery of Communist propaganda is one that speaks clearly of the issues and beliefs of the American people.

This letter is from a history professor at one of the Nation's leading Franciscan schools. He makes the point that—

> Bona fide mail between the two countries is one thing; deliberate flooding of the United States with government propaganda is quite another.

I believe his other points will be of interest to the Members of the House. His letter follows:

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM: You are to be highly commended for the amendment designed to prevent the delivery of Soviet propaganda within the United States at the expense of the United States. Bona fide mail between the two countries is one thing; deliberate flooding of the United States with government propaganda is quite another.

Bills to lower taxes and raise postal rates make no sense, when taken in conjunction and that is the manner in which they should be treated.

It is rather insulting to require the United States to subsidize Red propaganda to this land of ours. At least the administration might request that the deficit in the Post Office Department be made up from out of the foreign aid appropriation, which in this year of grace is almost $5 billion—a truly incredible sum, given out of mounting debt, etc.

I am a professor of American history and speak for myself alone. Yet I have some conception of the sentiments and attitude of our people. An overwhelming majority of them agree with your amendment. Would that a plebiscite might be conducted in regard to it.

How Long Can the U.S. Press Remain Free?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the bastions of liberty—a free press—is under assault by the Kennedy administration. Distinguished Authoress Ayn Rand points out in the following article the dangers that the line of attack being pursued by the New Frontier create for the preservation of our system of government, or freedom of expression.

I urge my colleagues to read this article, to study carefully its implications, and to be alerted to the dangers which an unprincipled administration could generate by arbitrary and capricious interpretation of existing laws, aided and abetted by a rubberstamp Congress.

Text of the article follows:

HOW LONG CAN THE U.S. PRESS REMAIN FREE?

(By Ayn Rand)

"In the FCC and in the Antitrust Division the Government possesses the legal weapons it needs to transform this country into a totalitarian state—and if the conservatives do not know it, the present administration seems to know it."

When I wrote this, in the first number of the Objectivist Newsletter, in January 1961, I pointed out that these were the two crucially dangerous issues, which advocates of freedom had to fight. I could not foresee how swiftly the administration would proceed on that course.

On July 15, the New York Times carried a story announcing: "An antitrust panel of the House Judiciary Committee is preparing a broad inquiry on the press and other news mediums."

NOT ORDINARY LAWS

To understand what this means, one must bear in mind that the antitrust laws are not laws in any normal, civilized sense of the word. They are an accumulation of nonobjective, undefinable, unjudiciable statutes, so contradictory and inconsistent that no two jurists can agree on their meaning, and any business practice can be construed as illegal. Thus the Government has the power to prosecute and to convict any business concern it chooses.

Consider what will happen to the freedom of the press when that sort of noose tightens about its necks and its typewriters.

(Ayn Rand is coeditor of the Objectivist Newsletter, a journal which deals with the application of her philosophy, objectivism, to current issues.)

Representative EMANUEL CELLER is in charge of the coming inquiry. The New York Times quotes him as declaring: "We are very much aware of the first amendment. We are also aware that the courts have said you can distinguish between the business practices and the editorial operations of newspapers."

SUFFICIENT COMPLIANCE

Apparently, Mr. CELLER regarded a declaration of his awareness as sufficient compliance with the Constitution—because he then proceeded to announce that the inquiry will deal with such (noneditorial) issues as the handling of news and the impact of syndicated columns on the gathering and presentation of local news.

Mr. CELLER will also investigate the fact that in some cities one man or company owns both the morning and evening newspapers.

"We shall endeavor to find out," he stated, "whether, in those cities, the news is slanted according to the prejudice or idiosyncrasies of those common owners; whether the editorial policy is consistently politically slanted." (A noneditorial issue?)

Does this mean that the owner of a newspaper has no right to hold consistent political convictions and that a newspaper is not entitled to a consistent editorial policy? If the owner of one newspaper possesses the right of free speech, does he lose it if he acquires two newspapers? Who determines what is slanted and which political views are prejudice or idosyncrasies? The Government?

LOCAL TALENT

The only mergers Mr. CELLER cited as under investigation are recent purchases of newspapers by S. I. Newhouse and by the Hearst Publishing Co. Both these newspaper chains are not exactly liberal in their political views nor overly friendly to the administration.

"Also," declared Mr. CELLER, "we are interested in seeing whether or to what extent the columnists might be drying up local talent in assaying the news of the day."

Well, it is incontestably certain that the talents of the local "High School Bugle" could not possibly compete with nationally syndicated columnists.

Here we see the essence of the antitrust doctrines—in so grotesque a form that no satirist would venture to offer it as a caricature. Yet it is not a caricature, it is the naked, brutal truth.

If it is right to sacrifice ability to incompetence, or success to failure, or achievement to envy—if it is right to break up giant industrial concerns because smaller companies cannot compete with them—then it is right to silence every man who has acquired a national audience and clear the field for those whose audience will never grow beyond the corner drugstore.

If it is right to deprive the small towns of the wider choice and lower prices offered by the big chain stores, and force them to support the little corner grocer—then it is right to deprive them of any intellectual contact with the Nation, or any famous voices, of any TV network programs, and confine them by law to the news of local rummage sales and ice cream socials, to the "assaying" of such news by cracker-barrel pundits, and to the poetry recitals of the "League of Mrs. Worthington's Daughters."

A SERVILE PRESS

Freedom speech? "Why, we don't deprive any man of his freedom of speech," the trustbusters would chorus, "provided he is not heard beyond the boundaries of his township or of his city block."

No, the Government would not establish any censorship; it would not need to. The threat of antitrust prosecutions will be sufficient. We have seen what it did to the steel industry. Rule by hidden, unprovable intimidation relies on the victims' "voluntary" self-enslavement. The result is worse than a censored press; it is a servile press.

Consider the significance of a curious contradiction. On the one hand, the Government hails the launching of Telstar as a means of uniting the whole world in a single network of global communication. On the other hand, the Government proposes to disintegrate national communications into local atoms, forbidding any private individual to acquire the means of addressing the Nation, and forbidding the separate atoms to know what the rest of the Nation is thinking.

TIME TO SPEAK UP

Do you grasp the possibilities?

President Kennedy is to broadcast his news conferences via Telstar. Which one of us will obtain equal time on that global medium? And if we do not, how will we make ourselves heard? It is not by means of the "High School Bugle" that one can protect one's rights or compete with a monopoly of that kind.

Gentlemen of the press, if any, now is the time to speak up.

C. D. Kaier Co. of Mahanoy City, Pa., Receives the American Legion National Employ the Older Worker Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and proud to announce to the House that the C. D. Kaier Co. of my home community of Mahanoy City, Pa., will receive tomorrow the American Legion National Employ the Older Worker Award.

On Monday, April 30 last, Mahanoy City Post 74, American Legion, presented its Employers Community Service Award to the C. D. Kaier Co. on the occasion of the company's 100th birthday. This occasion was fittingly observed and celebrated with a wonderful centennial program and dinner at the Legion Home in Mahanoy City with the presentation being made by the Honorable George F. Bruno, Pennsylvania department commander, the American Legion.

Accepting the award was John B. Lieberman, a grandson of the founder of the company, who tomorrow will also accept, the American Legion national award at headquarters in Washington. Mr. Lieberman is the present energetic and progressive president of the C. D. Kaier Co. and is carrying on and expanding the progressive employment policies instituted by his civic-minded grandfather, the late Charles D. Kaier.

The late Charles D. Kaier established the C. D. Kaier Co. at Mahanoy City in 1862 when it opened a plant for bottling ale and porter. In 1891 he erected a brewery which became known far and wide for its fine products. It was the beginning, the birth, the initial step in the long stairway of employment, economic growth, and community development through Mr. Kaier and his noted successors.

Kaier's has survived a Civil War, a Spanish-American War, two World Wars, and a Korean conflict. It lived, and helped many others live, through a depression and many recessions. With honors, it has passed the test of time. It is 1 year older than its own hometown, yet it is as new, as fresh, and as challenging as the advancing age we live in today.

Proper growth and development leads to a full maturity, and the Kaier brewing firm story is one of real maturity and real success.

The natural business ability of the late Charles D. Kaier was reflected also in the leadership of the brewery down through the years, by such executive personnel as Lloyd W. Fahler, the present board chairman, Margaret C. Kaier, Mrs. Mary Kaier Fahler, Charles A. Domson, and the present president and grandson of the founder, John B. Lieberman.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow's recognition of the C. D. Kaier Co. by the American Legion is another tribute not only to outstanding business principles of the company throughout 100 years of progress, but to the company's civic-minded policies in employing our older citizens.

In recommending the C. D. Kaier Co. for national honors to the National Employment Committee of the American Legion, the Department of Pennsylvania of the American Legion through its employment chairman, Mr. Joseph A. Halka, stated in part:

> This employer, who is currently celebrating its 100th anniversary, was cited for its outstanding voluntary employment policy based upon full consideration of skills and capabilities of older veterans.
>
> Ninety percent of the company's work force are veterans. Seventy-four percent of the work force are veterans in the older worker program classification (past 45 years of age).
>
> This company has consistently throughout the years given support in promoting and advocating acceptance of the Legion's basic employment policies and programs.
>
> C. D. Kaier Co. is a community spirited and centered employer who gives freely of their time and money to all community sponsored projects for welfare and betterment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the American Legion in giving this recognition to the C. D. Kaier Co. of my home community. I know that all the Members of the House join me in extending congratulations and best wishes to the C. D. Kaier Co. upon the occasion of its receiving the American Legion National Employ the Older Worker Award.

Five-Year Tax Writeoffs in Depressed Areas

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my State of Pennsylvania has, I believe, the unfortunate distinction of having more areas of substantial and persistent unemployment than any other in the Nation.

As of June of this year the major areas of substantial unemployment in Pennsylvania included Altoona, in my own district, Erie, Johnstown, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, and Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton. Except for Philadelphia, all these areas were also areas of persistent unemployment, meeting the criteria for assistance with Federal procurement programs and under the Area Redevelopment Act. They would likewise be eligible for assistance under the Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act, now before us.

In addition to these major areas, Pennsylvania has no less than 24 smaller areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, including the Clearfield-Du Bois area, the greater part of which is in my own district.

"Substantial," Mr. Speaker, means that in each area unemployment is well above the average for the Nation. In Altoona the rate in June was 9.4 percent with 5,000 unemployed. This is up from the 4,200, 8.1 percent, reported in May. Clearfield-Du Bois has an even higher rate, around 12 percent, with about 4,000 unemployed. That is what "substantial" means. "Persistent" means it has been like this for a long, long time in the past, and, unless some action is taken, bodes to remain that way for a long, long time in the future.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we passed the Area Redevelopment Act designed to have the Federal Government help us to help ourselves. In the closing hours of the House debate on the Area Redevelopment Act which I actively supported, I warned that it was not intended as an immediate remedy of unemployment but that it was a long-range program that would take time before its effects were felt on our economy.

The truth of my statement is revealed by the fact that during the 1962 fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the Area Redevelopment Administration produced 17,436 direct jobs at a total cost of over $170 million, or approximately $9,800 per job. This year we sought additional Federal help by passing the Manpower Utilization and Training Act. Undoubtedly these Federal programs will help. But something further is needed.

For that reason, I wish to provide for a new sort of help from the Federal Government by letting business spend its own money and be allowed to write it off for tax purposes in only 5 years.

Therefore, I am urging the enactment of my bill, H.R. 274, which I introduced January 3, 1961, or at the beginning of the 87th Congress. For nearly 19 months this bill has been pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means. This bill would help American business to provide jobs by providing businessmen an incentive to step up investment in plants and machinery in areas of persistent labor surplus. My bill would allow businesses to write off their investment in such areas for tax purposes within a period of 5 years, if they so desired.

Despite my warning that the Area Redevelopment Act represents a long-range program, unfortunately many expected to witness an economic miracle once it became effective. In fact, the real barrier to consideration of my bill, H.R. 274, is revealed in a letter I received dated April 20, 1961, from Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon which reads in part:

> A bill which you have introduced, H.R. 274, would provide tax incentives to encourage the development and growth of commercial and industrial enterprise in economically depressed areas. It is the President's view that this problem can be met more effectively by other direct measures outside the tax field, such as the area redevelopment bill.

According to Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, President Kennedy believed, too, the unemployment problem could be met more effectively by other direct measures, such as the area redevelopment bill.

In view of the long-range objectives of the Area Redevelopment Act and the cost figures on the number of jobs during the fiscal year of 1962, I believe that my proposal for a fast tax writeoff in distressed areas is one of great merit.

This accelerated tax amortization program embodied in my bill, H.R. 274, introduced 19 months ago, is not a new or untried proposal. It was originally used in World War I to encourage investment in defense facilities. It was revived and used in World War II, for the same purpose. It may be found in section 124a of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. During World War II certificates of necessity for over $7 billion of investment in productive facilities were issued under this program, of which nearly $6 billion were reported eligible for accelerated amortization.

A program for accelerated tax amortization was renewed after the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950. From the beginning of the program on November 1, 1950, through its termination on December 31, 1959, the estimated cost of defense facilities for which certificates of necessity were granted was over $39 billion. Over $23 billion of this amount was certified as eligible for the accelerated—5-year—depreciation. This shows clearly that rapid tax amortization does induce investment.

From November of 1953 a larger percentage of rapid tax amortization was allowed when the facilities were built in areas of chronic labor surplus. This program to aid such areas was adopted after the tax amortization program had passed its peak, which limited the opportunity it presented for such aid. Nonetheless, it had a definitely beneficial effect. The Office of Defense Mobilization estimated that a total investment of $277 million in defense facilties had provided 15,600 direct jobs in labor surplus areas down to March 1, 1957.

Talk of allowing accelerated depreciation on investments is frequently heard today. In July the revision of Internal Revenue's Bulletin F was released, making public new depreciation schedules and procedures. These guidelines will assist many firms to take a more rapid and realistic depreciation of their machinery and equipment. This much has been accomplished by administrative action alone. Now, indeed, it has been noted by some tax experts that revised Bulletin F does little more than to make public the rules on depreciation which Internal Revenue had already approved in many specific instances.

We hear, too, on all sides talk about a general further revision of depreciation allowances by Congress, as a means of encouraging greater investment and to provide more job opportunities. I am reluctant to see Congress adjourn without enacting my bill, H.R. 274, so that business and industry in distressed areas would through a fast tax writeoff have an incentive to increase investment in plant and machinery and, thereby, help provide jobs for American wage earners.

My bill would allow us to try out such an accelerated investment plan in labor surplus areas. It could be used in any area where the bill before us or the Area Redevelopment Act would apply. Any investment in new plants or any expansion of existing facilities, which would provide jobs in labor surplus areas, could be written off for tax purposes in 5 years. This would help such areas to put their people back to work on new jobs. It could not be used to pirate plants or jobs from other areas.

We may thus test out in such areas how well such an accelerated tax plan works to encourage investment. The knowledge we gain of its effect in providing jobs and investments and its effect on tax revenues will prove valuable should we next year wish to consider a general program of accelerated depreciation allowances.

But in the depressed areas and, unfortunately nearly all of the Members have such areas in their own States, we need to do all we can right now to provide work. My bill would do this. It would provide temporary tax cuts for investors who expand or locate plants in such areas. Past experience shows that it has this effect.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, its adoption.

Defense: The Margin of Superiority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have applied myself as a member of the Armed Services Committee from Philadelphia and have worked strenuously in the last four sessions of the U.S. Congress in favor of legislation which has increased the prestige and security of our country.

The margin of superiority which has been obtained is described by Under Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric in a statement which is included in these remarks:

DEFENSE: THE MARGIN OF SUPERIORITY

(By Roswell Gilpatric, Under Secretary of Defense)

When the Kennedy administration came into office 16 months ago, we found that the United States and its allies in the free world were facing three kinds of threats to our security. It was a curious thing that just a few days before the President was inaugurated, Khrushchev, in a speech which the President regarded as the most significant that has been made out of the Kremlin in the past several years, outlined very clearly for us what the threats were. He told us the kinds of conflicts that are going to exist in the world today.

First, of course, there is the threat of a thermonuclear war, a general world war.

Second was what he calls a "local war," that is a limited war, something less than all-out war.

And third, he talked about a form of conflict of which we have seen a good deal the past year or so and that is what he calls "wars of liberation," or popular uprisings, but which we know better as "counterinsurgency," "guerrilla warfare," "subversion," "insurrection," the sort of thing we see in southeast Asia, so virulent today, and which we may face elsewhere, Latin America, perhaps Africa, and the Middle East in the years ahead.

Therefore, the job of the Defense Department under Secretary McNamara and myself, and the President's leadership, has been to be sure that our Military Establishment, combined with those of our allies, is sufficient to cope with these three kinds of threats.

Now, what has been our program? Well, of course, this country has had for many years a very strong strategic retaliatory force sufficient, we hope, to deter the Soviets from ever attacking us with nuclear weapons. But if they should, we should be able to strike back with such devastating effect that this country would survive along with its allies. Now, that kind of a force, that kind of a strategic force is not a static one. You don't just build it and let it sit there and expect it will serve its purpose year after year.

This business of atomic weapons is a dynamic affair. As we all know the Soviets have built up tremendous strength in this area and since we have denied ourselves under our morality and ethics the privilege of striking first, we have denied ourselves the preemptive, preclusive type of attack. We always have to have a margin—a wide margin—of superiority. Therefore, the President and those of us who are working with him in this area, set out first of all to be sure that our margin of superiority was maintained. What we have today, of course, is the result of what others did before us. What we are doing today is making sure that in 1965–67 we have enough to maintain that margin of superiority.

Now we have done two types of things in the Defense Department to maintain this strategic force. One, we have improved it quantitatively; added Polaris submarines; added Minutemen, which are the principle type of hardened and dispersed land-based ICBM; and then we have increased the number of our bombers on alert, all toward gaining the three kinds of qualitative characteristics that are most important in the type of military equation we have today, vis-a-vis the Soviet. We must have a strategic force that will survive a surprise attack. We know the Soviets have manned bombers that can reach these shores; we know they have submarine-launched missiles, and we know they have land-based missiles that could reach the United States. Therefore, we must have a force which will survive a surprise attack. The Polarises meet that test because they are mobile, they are concealed, they cannot be taken out in a surprise attack. The Russians don't know where they are.

As for as the Minutemen are concerned, when they are operational, they will be deep in silos, hardened and dispersed, and no megaton—high-megaton—weapons of the Russians could knock out a Minuteman; that is not true to the same degree of Atlas and Titans because they don't have the same hardened qualities that Minutemen will have.

We have hundreds and hundreds of B-52's and B-47's on alert today, which means they could be airborne in less than the amount of warning that we would get from our news of any Russian attack.

AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILES

We are also stressing in our qualitative advances, in our strategic forces today, the quality of penetrability. We know that the Russians have strong defenses rimming their country; they have surface-to-air missiles; they have interceptors, and they have all kinds of radar screens, and it would be very difficult for any kind of a manned vehicle to penetrate the Soviet heartland today. Therefore, besides missiles, which of course, can get in, until they have an anti-ICBM system of defense, we are also making sure that our bombers have air-to-ground missiles carried with them so they can stand off outside these defenses and penetrate through them. We have the Hound Dog today which has a range of about 400 miles and a few years from now we will have the Skybolt which would be able to stand off 1,000 miles and lob ballistic missiles through the Russian defense.

So that I feel confident that we will have and maintain this very strong strategic force giving us this margin of superiority we need to counter the first type of threat.

NONNUCLEAR FLEXIBILITY

Now Khrushchev recognizes this. He said himself that thermonuclear wars are too dangerous to fool around with, and he says the same thing about the second kind of conflict, what he calls "local wars." There the risk is that any local war, if we had a Korea-type war today, or if we had a war in Europe over Berlin, in defense of our vital interests in Berlin, the thing could escalate into a nuclear war very readily. Now, the reason that Khrushchev thinks it is dangerous is, because he believes that we would defend Europe, we would defend our vital interests wherever they might be, in Latin America, in southeast Asia—we have got to keep him in that state of mind. If we lower our conventional forces, he will no longer feel that sense of risk in pursuing this kind of a form of conflict.

Now, under the previous administration, we had, as you well know, the doctrine of "massive retaliation." That simply meant this: that if a platoon of East Germans, or Poles or Czechs or Soviets, or any form of bloc military power crossed over into free world territory on an aggressive mission and did not withdraw, we would hit them with nuclear weapons. That was the essence of the "massive retaliation" doctrine. That was the basis of the Eisenhower administration's military policy. Any move the Soviets made directly, or indirectly, would be hit with nuclear weapons. Now, that threat of a nuclear response to any kind of attack, no matter how low a level at the beginning, was all right when we had a much wider margin of superiority than we have today, but that kind of a threat didn't stop the erection of the Berlin wall; it hasn't stopped the Viet Cong from infiltrating into South Vietnam, and it simply is not, in our judgment, the judgment of the President, a sufficiently flexible response to meet the kinds of threats we face today. Therefore, one of the major decisions made by this administration in the past year has been to build up the nonnuclear forces of the United States, our so-called conventional arms to a point where we could do more than just threaten to hit them with nuclear weapons.

COMBAT FORCES UPPED

The past year has seen a very major buildup, first in our Army. A year ago we only had 11 combat-ready divisions. Today, we have 14 and by August, the 2 new divisions that have been added will be combat ready and we will have 16 divisions which is a 50-percent increase over what we had a year ago. That is 100,000 more men in our armies today.

In the Marines, we have also added the beginnings of a fourth division, 15,000 more men, and in the Navy we have stepped up the forces which today represent the most critical element in our naval posture—that is the ability to cope with the Russian submarines. The hardest task we have is to detect, identify, and destroy Soviet submarines if they ever threaten these shores.

We have not made a major type of technical breakthrough in this area since World War II. Therefore, it is very important that we have large naval forces screening the vital areas of concern to the United States, and during this past year we have added about 40 ships, and a large number of aircraft which are doing antisubmarine patrol.

We have also increased the tactical area of the Air Force. You can't have bigger ground forces and not have more air cover, air support for those ground forces, and we have increased the armament of all the forces, because the emphasis as I said before was on nuclear weapons. We didn't have high explosive bombs and other kinds of conventional ordnance to equip this larger force of conventionally armed troops.

The combined effects of these changes which have taken place in the past 12 or 14 months, has been that now we have enough ground forces to meet the types of contingencies that we may be faced with whether it is sending troops into South Vietnam, or Thailand; if we ever had to send troops into Latin America, the Middle East, Africa, we have enough forces now to deploy, to more than one critical area at once. That is one kind of balance. Along with balancing of forces to meet the contingencies, we have the equipment for the forces. There is no use having 2,800,000 men under arms if you don't have enough arms for all those forces.

AIRLIFT INCREASED

Second, we need to bring the airlift, the ability to move these people, these forces wherever they might be needed. We have increased our airlift over 50 percent and today—thanks to jet transport—we can move platoons, brigades, battle teams, and larger units, divisional size units all over the world on very short notice.

Now, obviously we can't move the heavy equipment, the tanks, the personnel carriers, the heavy artillery that quickly. We can air transport a lot of things but the very heavy equipment has to move, and will continue to move by sea, but the way we have gotten around the time element there in order to have the quick reaction forces that we should have is that we have prepositioned the heavy equipment. We have two divisions worth of equipment in Europe today besides the equipment with the six divisions which we maintain there in the 7th Army. So, if the balloon went up, if we were faced with a crisis requiring military action in Europe today, we could fly over in a matter of hours, literally, two divisions of men to match up with the equipment, and we have actually tried this out in exercises in the past year. So we have much more mobility than we have ever had before, thanks to prepositioning of equipment. We also have a division's worth of equipment out in the Far East. We have on Okinawa another set of tanks, carriers and heavy artillery which could be used to equip a third division from the United States.

And then we also brought as I said, the air support, the tactical air elements of the Navy and the Air Force into balance with our ground forces. This is a true kind of balance, a balance among forces.

Now, for this third form of conflict, and the only form of conflict which today is actually going on, fortunately we have at the moment in Berlin as you know, a pause. The Russians are not pressing us there as hard as they did a year ago. Sure we get harassments, they stop our convoys on the autobahn but they are not harassing us in the air corridor and apparently they are not pressing us as hard as they did a year ago before we had the kind of buildup that I attempted to outline for you, with our conventional forces. They know we are stronger, they know that our allies are stronger and they are not pressing as hard there.

SPECIAL FORCES

In the past year we have gone back, retrained and reequipped, all of our forces to meet the kind of guerrilla warfare threat we encounter in southeast Asia. The Army has special forces that are trained down at Fort Bragg. We have hundreds of units of this kind out in southeast Asia today. We have the Marines—it is a basic, integral part of their training to deal with guerrilla situations. As far as the Air Force is concerned we have what they call Jungle Jim units, or commando units, that are not in combat but actually assisting the South Vietnamese in their struggle against the Communist infiltration. And then the Navy has what are called seal teams, sea, air, and land teams, specializing in underwater demolition and amphibious operations, and they too, can deal with this third type of conflict, which starts out with subversion, assassinations, all kinds of violence and they gradually build up to where there is a full-scale revolution.

DEPLOYMENT VARIES

So today, in the one area of the world where clashes of farms are occurring between the free world and the Communist world, American forces are deployed in several ways. In Laos, where we don't think the military solution is the best solution of the situation and the Soviets agree with us, our national policy at the moment is to treat Laos as a buffer.

In South Vietnam, we are training, assisting through transportation, intelligence, communications, and other forms of assistance, the South Vietnamese. The South Vietnamese have the will to resist, they have very large forces, they have 175,000 in their organized armies, air force, and naval units and they have another 125,000 in civil guards, self-defense corps, and in effect, home guard or militia, so that the Vietnamese are fighting for their own lives, for their own country and we are assisting them. But it is an area where the tempo of conflict, of exchange between the Communists and the government regimes are stepping up all the time, and while we feel quite comfortable compared to a year ago, when the scale was tilting against us, we recognize this is a long struggle and as Secretary McNamara said the other night on television, "It might be as long as 3 or 4 years." It is going to take great patience and endurance on the part of the American forces.

Then as you have seen in the past 2 weeks, when the Communist forces in northwest Laos moved down and across the river valley that separates Laos from Thailand on the west, and thereby brought Communist pressure for the first time directly against Thai borders, this country felt that it should respond to the request of its ally, Thailand, under its obligations in the SEATO Treaty. The SEATO Treaty, as the President pointed out, was overwhelmingly approved by Congressional action several years ago when we went into that treaty organization. We have a definite internationally binding commitment there and in support of that we have sent out, as you know some 5,000 combat units, Marine battle landing teams, an Army battle group, and two squadrons of aircraft, Marine and Air Force, in addition to our military forces there.

So we have in southeast Asia today, perhaps 20,000 or 30,000 U.S. forces who are exposed on the periphery of the free world to this kind of a threat. Obviously, they are backed up by many, many tens and hundreds of thousands of forces throughout the Pacific. We have a very strong force stationed in the Pacific. In Okinawa, in the Philippines, in Guam, and in Japan, Korea, throughout that part of the world we could respond very quickly if we have to meet a heightened crisis.

Now, all of this has meant, as I am sure you sense, an increased burden on the American people, on the taxpayers, through a major step-up in the budget. Parts of the problems in raising taxes are compounded by the fact that the defense budget is running about 20 percent higher, $8 billion higher, for 1963—the fiscal year which is about to begin, than it did under the previous administration. The defense budget was running under the previous administration, about $42 billion a year; now it is over $50 billion and we see no prospect in the foreseeable future as long as the pressure remains on the free world from all the quarters that surround us, of which I have illustrated a few, that we can lower the size of the Military Establishment or the cost that it entails. Now, we are very conscious of the burden that this imposes on the American people. We are doing all we can to better manage the resources in the Military Establishment but one of the responsibilities of our administration and of our party, is to keep this added strength. We don't think we would be holding in southeast Asia, if all we had was the naked threat of a nuclear weapon. So that we believe that our policy is right and we hope that the American people and the Congress that represent it will bear with us in carrying out this obligation.

The Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a very fine analysis of the Arab refugee problem which was written by Dr. Karl Baehr, a noted clergyman who is the executive director of the American Christian Palestine Committee and which appeared in the summer 1962 issue of Prevent World War III.

The article follows:

The Refugee Problem

(By Karl Baehr, Congregational clergyman and executive director of the American Christian Palestine Committee)

The most discussed and most emotion-packed refugee problem in the Middle East is that of the Arabs from Palestine. The United Nations does not know how many bona fide refugees from Israel there are—best estimates are that in 1948 from 600,000 to 650,000 left what is present-day Israel—but the U.N. is taking care of over a million.

When the Arab nations rejected the United Nations partition decision of 1947 and took up arms against the infant state of Israel, Jews as well as Arabs were caught in the emotional, nationalist, and military upheaval that followed. Ancient Jewish communities, such as the one in Iraq, where they had lived at least since the days of the Babylonian captivity of 586 B.C., found their situation so intolerable that they abandoned all their possessions and fled to Israel.

We hear little about the million Jewish refugees in Israel because the Hitler era is long past and because the 500,000 from the Arab and Moslem lands are quietly being absorbed in a dynamic and developing Israel without U.N. assistance. The Israelis, fortunately, are not keeping these people in camps as proof of Arab hostility or as propaganda hostages.

In the Arab areas the propaganda mills grind a bitter meal and the bread of hostility is eaten not only by the refugees but also by those who visit the area.

Who is the villain of the story? Blame is not easily assigned. The British, the Nazis, the Communists, the Arabs and Jews, the U.N. are all involved.

It is important to recall that both Arabs and Jews were victimized peoples in the pre-World War I days. The Arabs had been exploited, especially through 400 years (1517–1917) as vassals under the Ottoman Empire. Their once high culture tended to disintegrate under Ottoman oppression. Disease, incredible poverty, and illiteracy took their toll.

World War I saw the collapse of Turkey. The newly created League of Nations, inheriting the vast territories of the Ottoman Empire, faced the task of disposing of these areas, honoring in the process the Woodrow Wilson principle of "self-determination" of populations. Promises of self-determination had been given before and during the war years to both Arabs and Jews.

The Jews, for centuries a persecuted people, faced increasing problems as the 19th century drew to a close. In the Middle East they too suffered under Ottoman oppression. In Europe discrimination and prejudice were rife. Indeed, a series of pogroms left terror and death in Jewish communities, especially in Russia. Thousands fled their homes in search of freedom. One refuge was America, the other was Palestine. Palestine was chosen despite the sands and the swamps because it had the association of a Biblical past and the hope, long deferred, of a Jewish community once again to be reconstructed upon the sacred soil.

Thus, pioneer Jewish communities were established upon the long-forgotten soil of the Holy Land before the 20th century dawned, almost four decades before the Balfour Declaration, issued by Britain in 1917, proclaimed in favor of "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." And these Jews came not as conquerors or exploiters, for they purchased the land they settled—often paying two prices, one to the absentee landowner and another to the peasant (fellah) on the land.

Woodrow Wilson, like David Lloyd George and Lord Balfour and many other Christian leaders, knew the successes of the pioneer Jewish settlements in the Holy Land and believed that the civilized world should grant freedom and self-determination to them as well as to the Arabs. The Bible itself seemed to call to the nations that the hour of fulfillment for the "great return" was at hand.

Fifty-two nations joined in 1922 in setting aside Palestine as a national home for the Jewish people. At the same time, under a system of mandates, these nations granted freedom to the Arab peoples in over a million square miles of the Ottoman Empire, and these are today, members of the U.N.

After World War II, the Jewish community entered upon a period of both passive and violent resistance to British rule. Finally, Britain surrendered her mandate to the newly established United Nations.

The United Nations undertook its responsibility by appointing a special committee to study the situation. As the facts were assembled and feelings assessed, it became apparent that the maximal claims of neither Jews nor Arabs could be accepted without doing violence to the rights of the other group. A compromise created an independent Arab state and an independent Jewish state in Palestine. This partition scheme included also a system of "economic union" whereby the two states were to be linked together in matters of customs, trade, and currency, and Jerusalem was to be set apart as an internationalized area.

The plan was finally accepted by the General Assembly on November 29, 1947, by more than the necessary two-thirds majority. But the Arabs rejected the partition decision and so the stage was set for inevitable conflict.

On May 14, 1948, Israel proclaimed herself a state; the Arab nations sent their armies to Palestine to prevent the birth of the new nation. Now the violence and terrorism of war caused a flood of refugees.

Finally armistice agreements were worked out by Ralph Bunche but peace did not follow.

In the 13 years since Israel's establishment, conflict has continued. Arab leadership has not reconciled itself to Israel's existence, indeed has insisted despite the armistice agreements with Israel, that a "state of war" continues.

Constructive programs for the rehabilitation of Arab refugees have been outlined by various United Nations agencies and by the United States. Perhaps the most hopeful development looking toward the settlement of the Arab refugees on land, unused today but capable of rich development, was the plan, outlined by Eric Johnston, former President Eisenhower's personal ambassador to the Middle East, for joint Arab and Israel utilization of Jordan River waters. An expenditure of $60 million would make possible a Jordan Valley Authority under the U.N. which could provide for the absorption of some 200,000 Arab refugees. Unfortunately, the opposition of Syria frustrated implementation of the Johnston plan.

In addition to both a United Nations and a U.S. program for the Arab refugees, Israel has offered to play her part by paying for lands abandoned by the Arab refugees. Scientists are now convinced that great stretches of the Middle East deserts and wastelands can be reclaimed. Great numbers of peoples—including refugees—can thus be absorbed. The desert is already blooming in Israel—a vivid demonstration as to what can be done with wasting lands and refugee people if there is a will to work, build, and redeem.

It is important to realize that we do not need to choose between refugee people—between Jews and Arabs. We can and must work for mutual understanding and good will. In the process refugees—and also the poverty stricken nonrefugees—will have a new birth of dignity and opportunity.

Kennedy Collisions With Press Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of August 14, 1962:

Kennedy Collisions With Press Told

New York.—The Kennedy administration has administered almost as many lumps to the Washington press corps in 19 months as did the three previous administrations combined, according to an article in Look magazine, issued yesterday.

"Kennedy officialdom is more concerned with its 'image' than any Washington regime in modern times," said the author of the article, Fletcher Knebel, of Look's Washington bureau.

AMAZEMENT

He quotes one veteran newsman as expressing amazement that Mr. Kennedy's official family, and his real family, are not only so hypersensitive but so diligent as readers of the press.

"How can they spot an obscure paragraph in a paper of 3,000 circulation 2,000 miles away?" the correspondent asked. "They must have a thousand little gnomes reading the papers for them."

In support of his thesis, Knebel cites these instances of "collisions":

Mr. Kennedy personally has called down at least six Washington correspondents.

Three Kennedy administration officials have threatened to sue newspapers.

REPORTERS REBUKED

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has reproved at least four newspapermen for stories he disliked. His wife, Ethel, has braced one correspondent for a story about dunkings in the Attorney General's swimming pool.

White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger has rebuked about a dozen reporters for their stories.

The FBI questioned six newspapermen in connection with stories about the administration.

Pentagon security officials quizzed three correspondents.

The White House canceled 22 subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune.

White House Aid Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., called one columnist an "idiot" for asking about payments received for his movie reviews in Show magazine.

Of the 100 Washington magazine and newspaper people questioned by Look for the article on "Kennedy Versus the Press." Knebel says that "about half take a lighthearted view of the Kennedy administration's knuckle rapping of the press. The rest regard it more seriously as an attempt to pressure them."

Texas Highway Engineer DeWitt C. Greer Honored for 35 Years of Distinguished Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on July 24, 1962, the Texas State Highway Commission honored Hon. DeWitt C. Greer, State highway engineer of Texas, by presenting him a pin recognizing his 35 years of honorable service to his State and the Texas Highway Department.

DeWitt Greer is not only a distinguished public official but he is also a fine man of character and integrity. He deserves the tribute which was paid him at this public ceremony.

During the ceremony, tribute was paid to him by Senator John Redditt, who is highly qualified to recognize a man of DeWitt Greer's record. Senator Redditt is a former member of the Texas Senate, a former chairman of the Texas Highway Commission, a member of the Board of Regents, the University of Texas, and one of the outstanding citizens of his State and Nation.

The following is the tribute paid by Senator Redditt to DeWitt Greer:

This week, the Texas Highway Commission, in appropriate ceremonies, will present to DeWitt Greer a pin signifying 35 years of service to the Texas Highway Department. This is a great honor for any citizen of this State to receive. It is of greater importance on this occasion because it is being presented to a man who has served as chief engineer and chief executive officer longer than any other person. It is also a very special honor when given to DeWitt Greer because he has given all of his adult life to the planning, building and maintaining a highway system, second to none.

DeWitt Greer today is the image of an efficient and honest department of government. His own record symbolizes the records of many thousand faithful men and women who have given their very best to this great department.

This event should be of great importance to all of the people of this State who respect good government and who believe that public service is a public trust which should be discharged with loyalty, fidelity and integrity. His long service proves that in public life honesty is just as important as in personal business affairs.

The Texas Highway Department, under the leadership of DeWitt Greer, stands as a permanent monument to all the world, signifying what can be done when you have honest and intelligent direction.

Forty-two years ago some great Texans realized the importance and necessity of a system of State highways. For the past 35 years, DeWitt Greer has been one of the master planners and builders. His love and devotion to the ideals of the Texas Highway Department have been a guiding light to all of its employees. He has furnished unselfish and untarnished leadership because he has lived by the same righteous code of ethics he required of all of his employees.

What has made DeWitt Greer great? First and foremost, he is a God-fearing man who walks humbly before God and his fellowmen both in public and private life. He is a just man and he tempers all decisions with mercy. In his relations with the public, he is congenial, courteous and patient under trying conditions. These are superlative qualities.

As State highway engineer for over 20 years, he has come in contact with more individuals and groups than any other man in State government. Most of these groups are seeking things which would be of benefit to them or their communities. This is to be expected. However, these requests placed upon this man a very great burden. The fact that he has served so long is indicative of the fact that he has done a good job.

What is the secret of his success? In every problem he has to solve he never makes a decision until he has searched for the truth with great tenacity and with the integrity of a saint. In all official matters he does not make statements which are without merit and without being worthy of expression. He does not make official decisions based upon bias or prejudice. When integrity is involved, he must do the right thing and this applies to all persons. When he decides what is right to be done, he has the moral courage to stand by his convictions.

He is a man of great personal charm, has a keen sense of humor and above all posses-ses and utilizes to its fullest extent God's greatest gift, and that is, equanimity.

Conservatives and Anticlericals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under date of August 7, 1962, on page A6053, there was inserted in the Congressional Record a so-called "Reply to the Extreme Right" by Father Albert Nevins.

I am taking this opportunity to insert the following answer which appeared in the Tablet, the foremost Catholic newspaper in the United States, under date of June 9, 1962. I am sure that anyone reading this editorial must come to the conclusion that the facts and the position taken are sound. I commend this as an excellent answer.

The editorial follows:

Conservatives and Anticlericals

We have had occasion before (most recently, May 19) to doubt the calmness and objectivity of those who assert that liberal extremists are as bad as conservative extremists, but spend all their time attacking the latter.

We are not inclined to change our mind now, even though the latest offender is Rev. Albert J. Nevins, M.M., editor of Maryknoll magazine and past president of the Catholic Press Association.

In a speech to the Anti-Defamation League May 31, he said "the liberal left has as many faults as the conservative right." That was the sum total of his criticism of the liberals.

But the conservatives? "Mossbacks * * * negative * * * inconsistent * * * breed hate for fellow humans and contempt for authority * * * reasonable discussion becomes impossible * * * intolerant of the principles of others * * * ready to damn by ridicule anyone who fails to agree with them * * * refuses to admit the social doctrine of the church * * * lies, distortions, suspicions passed off as facts, slanders—this is the character of a great deal of conservative literature."

Shall we call that criticism calm and objective?

Father Nevins then expresses his belief that "charity is the keystone of life."

"Modern conservatism is a series of slogans—some without meaning, most negative," he says: "Let us conserve the little good that is left to us." "Let us return to those principles which made America great. Free enterprise. Climb high, climb far. Carry a big stick. The best governed is the least governed * * *." These are without meaning? These are negative?

He presents negative ideas in his version of the extreme conservative platform, e.g., "Get rid of all the Communists in government." But we assume that he endorses that plank, and therefore he too is negative.

Father Nevins also says "Accuse the Catholic liberal of what you will but I for one can find no instance where a Catholic liberal has contravened eccelesiastical authority. But one can find many instances where Catholic conservatives have defied their bishops, ranging from New Orleans to Lafayette to Pittsburgh."

Of course, we endorse no contravention of authority or defiance of bishops. And we certainly don't accept the segregationist crackpots as responsible conservatives. But if there are anticlericals, who are they?

1. In a recent commencement address, Msgr. John Tracy Ellis discussed "symptoms that suggest an anticlerical sentiment." He emphasized that "I have in mind situations quite apart from the indefensible conduct of an insignificant minority of lay Catholics in New Orleans." He referred rather to certain educated laymen.

2. In a recent editorial disagreeing with the American hierarchy on Federal aid to education, Commonweal said the situation "demands * * * risking the displeasure and anger of one's bishop." Dale Francis in Our Sunday Visitor commented "Commonweal has been almost condescending in its criticism of the stand of the hierarchy. Never in their discussions have the editors of Commonweal given any suggestion that they might be wrong and the bishops right, never have they shown any awareness of the possibility the bishops might know better, or even as well, what is best for the church and the Nation."

3. A year ago this month, the apostolic delegate found it necessary to express his public concern "with the uneasiness and preoccupation of some Catholic intellectuals" who feel that "an excessive attachment to traditional positions appears to prevent the church from freely facing modern problems with adequate answers and assuring direction." (We commented editorially "it is obviously not the conservatives who digress from traditional positions.")

When a group of nine liberal Catholic intellectuals publicly criticized him, Archbishop Vagnozzi told them: "The layman has not been constituted as teacher of the magisterium nor as admonitor of the hierarchy * * *. We have not had in this country either a tradition of disregard for ecclesiastical authority or a spirit of anticlericalism. Let them not be fostered now."

Father Nevins "can find no instance where a Catholic liberal has contravened ecclesiastical authority." The Tablet can find no instance where a Catholic conservative has earned such an admonition from the apostolic delegate.

A New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the New Leader of August 6 by Prof. Robert Lekachman which I believe all of us should read. Professor Lekachman's article is vitally important at this time when the President, the Congress, and the country are searching for ways to improve our economy. Of particular interest is the professor's analysis of our budgeting methods and of the budgeting practices of Western European countries.

I commend to all my colleagues the following article:

[From the New Leader, Aug. 6, 1962]

Cutting Taxes and Balancing Budgets

(By Robert Lekachman)

For the professional student of the American economy, this is an unusual period. It is a time of growing public consensus about both the present condition and the general prospects of the Nation's business. Even more striking is the spectacle of labor and management spokesmen—the United Auto Workers' Walter Reuther and the Chamber of Commerce's Ladd Plumley—in broad agreement on the appropriate economic responses to the United States unsatisfactory rate of recovery from the 1960 recession.

Take economic diagnosis first. With only a few exceptions, leaders in business, labor, liberal opinion, and even Government have expressed public concern about the economy's failure to gather momentum. It is an unusual analyst indeed who is prepared to say the economy is acting satisfactorily. The statistical indicators of future trouble are far too numerous to encourage optimism. For some time now, the National Bureau of Economic Research's leading indicators of impending business cycle turns—among them new business orders, business failures, and stock market prices—have been flashing red.

Unemployment sticks stubbornly at about 5.5 percent. Worse still, the failure of the labor force to expand according to reasonable demographic expectations strongly implies that many young people, housewives, and elderly men and women have retired in despair from a job market which offers so little prospect of employment. When seasonal influences are eliminated, total employment in June gained only 43,000, which represents the smallest month-to-month increase of the year. Moreover, for the second consecutive month, average factory hours-per-week declined from 40.6 in May to 40.4 in June. And reduction in average factory hours worked is frequently seen as a prelude to layoffs and furloughs.

As for steel, output is little more than half of capacity. United States Steel, in an ironic footnote to the quarrel between Roger Blough and President Kennedy, has announced a reduction in the price of linepipe in the wake of its June decrease in the price of secondary sheet steel. Meanwhile, retail sales have slipped, and business investment has persistently failed to increase according to the projections of the President's advisers and other analysts.

About the only sensible question to ask right now is whether recession has already begun (as the stock market appears to have concluded) or whether it is fated to commence early in 1963. In either case, a new recession will be starting from the highest level of unemployment and the least convincing recovery of the postwar era.

Respectable economic theory—that is, Keynesian analysis—offers an alert government two alternative methods of handling an economy which is plagued by a persistent deficiency in aggregate demand. Political leaders can either increase Government expenditures on desirable social projects such as education, health, urban renewal, scientific research, and recreational amenities, or they can reduce taxes.

Both devices have the effect of placing larger sums of money in the hands of individuals and, if the tax cut extends to corporate income taxes, business. The happy recipients of these benefits will spend the bulk of their windfalls. Thus, the ultimate impact of the tax reduction or the expansion of Government spending will be some multiple of the budget deficit which is deliberately incurred.

There is no question that a great many liberals, not to mention all admirers of John Kenneth Galbraith, strongly prefer the first means of supporting aggregate demand. They do so on the familiar ground that the contemporary allocation of resources between public and private uses severely discriminates against Government functions. Walkers in large cities and readers of educational and social statistics are likely to concur in this preference. But while Government spending may be more desirable than tax reductions, there is little or no reason to believe that Congress will agree with this value judgment. On grounds of practical policy and political reality, even the AFL-CIO favors a tax cut.

What makes the possibility of a tax reduction infinitely more promising is the conversion of the chamber of commerce to a policy of deficit financing. Chamber President Plumley, in a letter to Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, pointed out a good conservative's reasons for supporting immediate tax cuts. If, said he, something were not done quickly to stimulate the economy, then conditions would worsen and the Federal Government would be fatally tempted to undertake huge new spending programs. Tax cuts at least increased the degree of private discretion in the spending of income and recognized the advisability of reducing imposts which are "so burdensome to private initiative and accomplishment." Plumley's route to tax reduction was unusual, but at journey's end he was securely in the camp of the Keynesians.

Administration conservatives like Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon and Under Secretary Robert V. Roosa have used our balance-of-payments difficulties as an argument against larger deficits. These deficits, they maintain, promote inflation and frighten the foreign holders of American dollars and convertible assets. But even this not entirely convincing argument has now vanished. The May report of the Economic Policy Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development underlined the dangers of continued inadequate U.S. growth to European as well as American prosperity. The experts who unanimously endorsed the report agreed that larger deficits were now appropriate, and left wide open the door to their achievement by either tax cuts or increased public expenditures. These astute Europeans clearly prefer a strong U.S. economy to a balanced U.S. budget.

Naturally, the public consensus tends to break down in this country once one raises the practical question, whose taxes shall be reduced? On June 16 Business Week, usually a trifle to the left of its business constituency, came out formally for a $10 billion tax slash: $2.5 billion in the shape of a reduction of corporate income taxes from 52 to 47 percent, and the remainder in the form of reductions in personal income taxes now applied to all tax brackets. Liberal economists have tended to prefer an increase in tax exemptions—possibly from the present $600 to $1,000 per person—which has two advantages: People with low incomes, whose need is greatest, will get the bulk of the reduction. They will aso spend a larger proportion of any increase in their incomes than their more fortunate fellow Americans.

But even upon this treacherous issue a measure of agreement appears probable. There is general recognition among realistic liberals that the only tax reduction which stands a chance of congressional approval will be one which offers benefits to corporations and wealthy individuals as well as other segments of the population. For once liberals and conservatives, unions and business groups concur on the desirability of a sensible economic response to possible recession. The price that liberals must pay for business acceptance of elementary fiscal policy is a tax cut which more closely resembles the distribution of political and economic power than it does an optimum technical response to an economic contingency.

Although President Kennedy is still inexplicably watching the economic indicators and speaking wistfully of postponing action until next year, in this instance Congress may be more eager to move than the President appears to be. And now that the legislative logjam shows signs of breaking, a realistic look at our budget conventions is in order. These conventions have played a role in the creation of unrealistic public responses to fiscal policies. As we shall see, our way of keeping national accounts has the unfortunate effect of exaggerating public deficits and minimizing occasional surpluses.

There are three major varieties of national budget, the most familiar of which is the administrative or conventional budget. This is the set of numbers—bulking about as large as the Manhattan telephone directory—which the President presents each January to Congress. Despite its appearance of detailed precision, it actually cannot amount to more than the Bureau of the Budget's educated guesses about the size of the Treasury's cash receipts during the coming fiscal year, and the volume of its cash disbursements from congressional appropriations and other sources in the same period. What this budget omits, however, has become increasingly important: the income and the outgo of the gigantic trust funds through which we administer our social security program and huge highway construction program.

The second of these budget variants, the consolidated cash budget, is less misleading about the size of Government operations. In fact, it is deliberately designed to identify the entire flow of money between the Federal Government and the public at large, is free of the legal distinctions which impair the usefulness of the administrative budget, and does include the receipts and outlays of the social security and highway trust funds. The cash budget also covers the operations of such Government-sponsored institutions as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal land banks, the home loan banks and the intermediate credit banks. The inclusion of the trust funds enlarges the size of Federal Government accounts by something like $25 billion each year. Thus the cash budget is considerably more realistic as an economic measure of Government impact than the administrative budget.

But most economists prefer still a third variant, the national income accounts budget, to measure Federal impact upon the economy. Operating within the national income framework, this budget measures the direct influence of Federal taxing and spending on the flow of income and output. Trust funds are included. But since this budget includes only receipts and outlays which directly influence current income and output, Government transactions in loans and mortgages are excluded.

Perhaps this budget's principal advantage is one of timing. Though fairly technical, the point is extremely important. Conventional and cash budgets both record tax receipts as they are collected by the Treasury. But actual collection need not coincide with maximum impact upon the taxpayer. The national income accounts budget records business taxes as Treasury income when they are accrued as liabilities, and personal income taxes when they are withheld from wage and salary checks. Consequently, it gives a more accurate reflection of the financial effect of taxes upon those who pay them.

A businessman guides his actions by the current balance sheet on which tax accruals affect the figures. And since 6 months on the average elapse between the time a tax liability is incurred and when it is discharged, alterations in tax liabilities will not show up in the cash budget until some months after the onset of a recession. But they will be very speedily noted in the national income accounts budget. Obviously, the national income accounts budget is by far the best guide to the timing of fiscal policy.

Reliance on the administrative budget as the single measuring rod not only damages economic policy it also exaggerates the size of deficits. The point is readily made by a comparison of the 1961 deficit according to each of the budget concepts. (See chart.) The administrative budget, quite typically, portrays the deficit as being approximately 70 percent larger than it appears to be in the national income accounts budget.

Indeed, the national income accounts budget possesses at least three shining virtues: It more properly reflects the state of financial relations between the Federal Government and the remainder of the Nation; it is a far superior guide to the control of both inflation and recession; and it tends to diminish the fear of deficits which many people still retain. There is little doubt that President Eisenhower and his administration so reinforced the mythology of the budget that many earnest Americans have come to believe an unbalanced budget is a sign of national weakness and a certain invitation to inflation. An understanding of the three budget methods and an increasing use of the national income variant should contribute to public enlightenment and the recognition that budgets are only technical devices, subject to varying formulations and differing interpretations.

The point is worthy of emphasis. In a valuable study of European postwar fiscal experience, Andrew H. Gantt II, of Harvard University, carefully adjusted French, English, and German budget data for the period 1950–60 to make the information correspond to American administrative budget measures. What he discovered was illuminating.

Gantt first asked how often, according to American definitions, these three European nations and the United States incurred deficits. The United Kingdom ran a deficit 9 out of 11 years; France had a deficit for 10 consecutive years; Germany incurred a deficit 4 out of the 6 most recent years of the period. As for the United States, it had a deficit 6 of the 11 years, a smaller percentage of the time than any other country. Nor were our deficits particularly large. Consistently, American deficits were a much smaller percentage of American gross national product than were French deficits.

Now such evidence does not logically demonstrate that large budget deficits inevitably generate vigorous economic growth. Too many other elements have entered into the economic success of France and Germany. But, according to the data, at the least large deficits and rapid economic growth are mutually consistent. From the narrow standpoint of fiscal orthodoxy, the United States has been closer to the path of rectitude than France or Germany. Perhaps our financial managers will reap their reward in heaven. In this world, however, the French and the Germans have enjoyed impressive economic success and worried very little about balancing their budgets.

Currently, every economic justification favors an immediate tax cut of some $10 billion. There is at last hope that neither a misreading of European success, a confusion of thought on the meaning of national budgets, nor the opposition of fiscal primitives will obstruct reasonable technical reactions to economic stagnation.

Budget comparisons, 1961

[In millions]

	Total receipts	Total expenditures	Surplus or deficit
National income accounts budget	$94,800	$97,000	−$2,200
Consolidated cash budget	97,242	99,528	−2,286
Administrative budget	77,659	81,515	−3,856

Diamond Jubilee of Roaring Spring, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this week the residents of Roaring Spring, Pa., are observing the 75th anniversary of the founding of their borough. On August 13, it was my privilege to attend the Founder's Day program and to deliver the following address:

FOUNDER'S DAY ADDRESS, BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, DELIVERED ON THE OCCASION OF THE DIAMOND JUBILEE OF ROARING SPRING, PA., AS A BOROUGH, AUGUST 13, 1962

It is a pleasure to participate in your diamond jubilee program and to accept the invitation to address you on Founder's Day.

Here in Roaring Spring, local tradition has a way of reflecting the traditions of Pennsylvania itself. Founder's Day, and the diamond jubilee celebration currently in progress, make this visit all the more rewarding. Your pride in local achievement is wholly understandable—and your respect for tradition highly commendable.

It is all too seldom nowadays that the people of a community feel sufficiently in tune with the past to honor their forebears without the necessity of a national holiday.

It would seem that to many people the term "progress" is misinterpreted to mean that they should never look back as if, in looking back, they may somehow lose pace with the march of destiny, as if progress requires that they set their sights on the future—regardless of the past.

This, of course, is not the case. For the future is nothing but a repetition of the past, with the good parts retained, if possible, and the bad parts removed. Only through the study of the past can we clearly discern our future goals and needs.

Without progress, it is certainly true that tradition is wholly meaningless. On the other hand—it is equally true that without tradition—so-called progress becomes less than meaningless—indeed, it becomes a sham, a fraud, and a trip to nowhere in particular.

It is clear, however, that tradition is a vital force in this community. Even the town name, Roaring Spring, reflects a past condition rather than a present one.

The word "roaring" reminds us that at one time the fall of water at the spring could actually be heard a mile away from town.

Later, as a result of efforts to change the course of the spring, several large stones were removed from beneath the falls and the roaring stopped. The dramatic name remains, however, in tribute to a dramatic past.

Situated here, at the southern end of Morrison's Cove, Roaring Spring was from the start a coveted land site in the minds of all who knew of its existence. Indians populated the area before the white man arrived in the late 1770's and from the fight they put up against the arrival of the newcomers, we can only conclude that they, too, recognized the magnificence of the place.

The first white settlers in the cove fully understood the great agricultural and industrial possibilities offered here.

Among the earliest settlers was Edward Sanders, who bought the mill seat property in 1776. This tract of land is now covered by the Borough of Roaring Spring.

Mr. Sanders in turn, sold small tracts to various individuals—particularly to one Daniel Ullery—who bought most of it in the year 1780. No permanent settlement developed in this period. however, and for the time being none but the most intrepid and independent pioneers could be induced to partake of the natural splendors in this area.

Indians were still numerous in the area at that point and there were few white settlers willing or ready to advance into Indian country alone.

There is a record however of the use of water power facilities here by one Jacob Neff who operated a grist mill in this district as early as 1777. Mr. Neff had plenty of trouble with the Indians who resented his presence and finally succeeded in driving him out. When the first two Indians appeared, Mr. Neff killed both of them with his musket and hurried off to the nearest fort in search of aid.

When he returned with reinforcements there was evidence that a whole tribe of red men had visited the mill in his absence for the buildings were burned to the ground. So ended the first commercial enterprise in this area. It had served however, as a harbinger of future commercial undertakings which appeared in great profusion when the community began to develop, full force, during the administration of President James Monroe.

The first real settlement on the site of Roaring Spring started with the coming of George B. Spang in 1821. Mr. Spang operated a grist mill in this locality and his son-in-law, Mr. Farquar, opened the first store in the settlement.

Finally, in 1854, the Government opened a post office in Mr. Farquar's store and gave the town the name of Spang's Mill.

During the Civil War period the Upper Maria Forges—Rodman and McKee—below Spang's Mill were put in operation. This aided the growth of Spang's Mill, for teamsters who hauled ore to the forges from the pits at ore hill stopped in the community and traded at the general store.

The true beginnings of Roaring Spring did not take place, however, until 1863. In that year Daniel Bare and his son, Daniel Mathias Bare, purchased a large part of the old Mill Seat tract. The exact purchase consisted of 90 acres of land, two small log houses, a frame house, and store building, and an old gristmill and sawmill.

In 1864 the Bare family moved to the community to engage in the milling and mercantile business. The history of the town, from that time on, is bound up with the history of its industries and the business activities of the Bare family. The new proprietors of the little village set about immediately to make many changes. The first of these affected the industrial life of the community, for in 1865 the Bare family built the first plant of the papermill.

This new industry was to attract many settlers and for many years the industrial life of the village centered around the production of paper. When the mill burned down in 1866, it was promptly rebuilt and production was soon at an alltime high. Production increased so rapidly in fact, that new additions were made to the plant in 1878 and again in 1912.

The Bare brothers, builders of the Roaring Spring papermill, were leaders in this industry throughout all of Blair County, for in 1880 they built the papermill at Tyrone.

Meanwhile other changes were taking place in the little community of Spang's Mill. Some of the inhabitants of the community had suggested that its name be changed to Baretown in honor of the family which played so vital a role in its industrial life. The honor was declined, however, by Daniel M. Bare, and in 1868, when he became postmaster, Mr. Bare petitioned that the name of the town be changed to Roaring Spring. The request was granted.

Although the papermill continued to prosper, Mr. Bare and his associates recognized the great need for a railroad connecting Roaring Spring with the metropolis of Altoona. Business activities were hindered because the nearest shipping point for the papermill was first at Hollidaysburg and then, a little later, at Newry.

Mr. Bare was interested in building a sister industry to the papermill—the composition or blankbook industry—but he refused to do so prior to the improvement of local transportation facilities.

Finally, in 1871, the Morrison's Cove branch railroad was extended to Roaring Spring after which Mr. Bare began construction of the blankbook factory, which was completed in 1886.

In keeping with the local history of industrial disaster, going back to the destruction of Mr. Neff's gristmill in 1777, the blankbook factory was twice destroyed by flames, in 1887 and 1888. Also in keeping with local tradition, the factory was twice rebuilt and new additions were made.

Since 1900, the growth of the blankbook factory has been rapid, to the point where today it services not only the educational facilities of this country, but also those of Canada, Puerto Rico, Brazil, and England.

While industry has prospered from the start in Roaring Spring, to such an extent as to dominate the history of local development, it cannot be said that the religious, educational, and cultural needs of the population have been forgotten or suffered from neglect. During the course of the town's expansion, from an isolated millsite to the thriving community it is today, religion has been served in a manner befitting the devout nature of the townspeople. The first settlers in the community; namely, Daniel Ullery and the Neff family, were of the Brethren faith.

Many Lutherans moved in with the first large-scale wave of local immigration and by 1857 a Lutheran church was standing, the first such structure in existence in these parts.

The Brethren, Methodist, Church of God, Reformed, and Mennonite faiths soon followed, in force, building churches of their own.

The educational system of the community has grown from the one-room schoolhouse of Spang's Mill, with an enrollment of 75 pupils, to the present large and flourishing grade and high school system of which the borough is so justly proud. We may note as landmarks in the educational progress of the community the beginning of a 2-year high school course in 1892, the change to a 3-year high school course in 1908, and the adoption of the present 4-year course in 1919.

Other advancements included the introduction of a business and commercial course in 1917, the construction of a gymnasium in 1932, the building of the present high school and the introduction of a vocational agriculture department, and a vocational homemaking department in 1937.

As a consequence of its beautiful scenic surroundings, Roaring Spring began attracting visitors as far back as 1865—when the first local hotel was put into operation. The first hotel originally was known as the Grant Hotel, later as the Barley Hotel.

This, in turn, was followed by construction of the Eldon Inn which has served for years as one of central Pennsylvania's finest hotels.

As of September 1887, the growing community of Roaring Spring, which then comprised about 800 people, was a part of Taylor Township. On October 3, 1887, the community petitioned the local courts for a charter and for the right to organize as an independent borough. Both charter and independence were granted and Roaring Spring emerged as a borough in its own right.

From that time forward the record of progress in this area has equaled that of many communities earlier organized and originally more wealthy. It is, therefore, only fitting that as residents of Roaring Spring you should, on this occasion, hail the history of this community as an example of positive achievement.

The founders of Roaring Spring arrived here originally with little in the way of wealth. But they brought with them some other properties: Hope, diligence, and courage, all of which have seemed to rub off on one generation after another to the great benefit of the borough as it stands today.

It is, therefore, a distinct pleasure to participate with you in your Founder's Day celebration and join in your diamond jubilee.

Kennedy Versus the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Fletcher Knebel from the August 28, issue of Look. Mr. Knebel points out that Kennedy officialdom is more concerned with its "image" than any Washington regime in modern times. Twenty-two correspondents have been chastised by Kennedy and his aids because the writings of these able journalists were not to the liking of the administration. What has happened to the freedom of the press?

The article follows:

[From Look, Aug. 28, 1962]

KENNEDY VERSUS THE PRESS

(By Fletcher Knebel)

("Never before have so few bawled out so many so often for so little," as the Kennedys battle reporters.)

It will appear that John F. Kennedy's honeymoon with the press, probably the most affectionate in the long history of Presidential politics, is on the pebbles, if not the rocks. Contusions and abrasions are reported on all sides as reporters pat their wounds after an unusual number of collisions with the President himself, his aids or his family. The list is now a long one:

Kennedy personally has called down at least six Washington correspondents either for their writings or for their publications.

Three Kennedy administration officials have threatened to sue newspapers.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has reproved at least four newspapermen for stories he disliked.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation questioned six newspapermen in connection with stories concerning policies of the Kennedy administration.

Pentagon security officials quizzed three corespondents.

The White House canceled 22 subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune.

Administration officials, reporters charge, put "the freeze" on some reporters who had offended them.

White House Special Counsel Theodore C. Sorensen has reprimanded some newspapermen.

White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger has rebuked about a dozen reporters for their stories.

White House Aid Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a Pultizer Prize historian, called one columnist "an idiot."

Even the Kennedy women have gotten into the act. Ethel Kennedy, wife of the Attorney General, and Mrs. Jean Smith, sister of the President, braced one correspondent for his story about dunkings in the Bob Kennedy swimming pool.

But there is another side to the story. While the President and those around him have been far more critical of the press than were Dwight D. Eisenhower and his official family, the Kennedys have also been quick to offer plaudits and "well dones" rarely heard by startled reporters since the days of the late Henry Fountain Ashurst, the first Senator from Arizona, who loved them all. A phone call from the office of bubbly Pierre Salinger, the rotund maestro of the press orchestration, is typical of many: "The President thought your piece on SEATO was superb, remarkably well put together. He just wanted you to know how he felt."

Personal phone calls of congratulations from a pleased President are no longer unusual in Washington news offices. President Kennedy occasionally dashes off a note of thanks to a writer. Holmes Alexander, the most conservative and anti-New Frontier of all Washington columnists, was amazed one morning to open his mail and find a note of praise from J.F.K. Alexander had written glowingly of the President's address at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Thomas G. Walker, White House reporter for the New York Times, suddenly confronted by J.F.K. in a pouring rain in Columbus, Ohio, was congratulated for "that splendid piece this morning." Wicker had come full circle; for only several weeks before, a White House aid had given him the woodshed treatment.

This praise-and-blame technique from an administration that pays closer attention to the press than any in modern times drums on the heads of the Washington press corps like a tatto; the downbeat alternates with the upbeat. The writer chastised for his choice of words in the morning may find himself embraced by sunset.

It is the downbeat, of course, that nettles the correspondents, although they would be the first to concede that Presidential displeasure with the press is nothing new. Within the close confines of the White House, the Government-press relationship is at its most intimate and vexing. The press is there to report the news, good or bad. A President, being human, prefers to accentuate the positive and eliminate the negative. Result: taut nerves.

Every President since George Washington has had cause to splutter over the headlines. Franklin D. Roosevelt awarded dunce caps and once even an Iron Cross at his press conferences. Harry S. Truman thundered "S.O.B." at Columnist Drew Pearson. In the Eisenhower administration, Columnist Joseph Alsop and his brother Stewart, now a magazine writer, were "disinvited" to a dinner by Central Intelligence Agency hosts because of Ike's ire over a column.

What amazes many in the huge Washington newspaper fraternity in the Kennedy era is not the fact of White House disenchantment, but the volume, extent and dexterity of its expression. Never before have so few bawled out so many so often for so little. Says Merriman Smith of United Press International, the senior White House correspondent, "Every administration develops Potomac sunburn sooner or later. The main difference with the Kennedy people is that their hypersensitivity developed so early. One reason is the close attention they pay to everything written about them. How they can spot an obscure paragraph in a paper of 3,000 circulation 2.000 miles away is beyond me. They must have a thousand little gnomes reading the papers for them."

Some of the trouble no doubt arises from President Kennedy's sharing of the universal desire to be liked. At a preelection party at the home of Senator CLAIR ENGLE (Democrat, of California) Kennedy asked the wife of George Dixon, humor columnist, "Why doesn't your husband like me?" Dixon was perplexed by the query, since he had never weighed his feelings about the then Senator from Massachusetts.

Ironically, Kennedy was, and is, liked by a goodly share of those who cover his activities. Indeed, it was his 1960 rival, Richard M. Nixon, who complained after the election that pro-Kennedy reporting made the difference in his narrow defeat.

Another cause may be Kennedy's own genius for public relations. Immediately after his election, he became the most accessible President since Teddy Roosevelt. He threw open his office to exclusive interviews by a parade of writers. Photographers penetrated inner rooms of the White House. Magazines flowered with Kennedy family pictures and chitchat. Mrs. Kennedy conducted an hour-long TV tour of the mansion, subjecting that structure to subsequent inundation by ceaseless waves of tourists. Having thrown the door wide, the President does not take kindly to those who cross the threshold armed with a harpoon instead of a bouquet.

Still another reason may be Kennedy's rapid (1,200 words a minute) reading talent. A President who devours newspapers, foreign and domestic, and who navigates through thousands of words about himself in books, magazines, and scholarly journals naturally sees more to complain about than a President like Eisenhower. Ike found newspapers a chore and rarely got around to the thick Sunday editions before twilight. Indeed, according to White House staffers, Ike once advised Kennedy not to read so many newspapers.

Some correspondents believe President Kennedy and his official family misunderstand the role of the press. "They want us as a cheering squad, as an arm of the executive branch of Government," says one White House reporter. Salinger disputes this, but says that, when the press "has been given unusual access to information, it has an added responsibility to get the facts straight."

Whatever the precise explanation, the Washington press corps has taken almost as many lumps in 19 months of Kennedy rule as during the three previous administrations put together.

Asked how he felt about the press at his May 9 press conference, Kennedy replied, "Well, I am reading more and enjoying it less and so on, but I have not complained, nor do I plan to make any general complaints. I read and talk to myself about it, but I don't plan to issue any general statement of the press. They are doing their task, as a critical branch, the fourth estate, and I am attempting to do mine, and we are going to live together for a period and then go our separate ways."

Before going his separate way, the President has had some sulfurous remarks to make to a number of writers. Hugh S. Sidey, White House correspondent for Time and Life magazines, has been scorched twice by J.F.K. After Time printed a story last summer on the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as military representative of the President in the aftermath of the Cuban invasion fiasco, Kennedy called Sidey on the phone and complained bitterly about the story. In the opinion of Sidey, a White House "freeze" against Time went into effect for about 2 weeks. His administration news sources found excuses not to talk to him. Salinger dismisses such "freezes" as fantasy and challenges newspapermen to "point to a single instance where there has been retaliation against a reporter.

Sidey received a second Presidential dressing down in February. Time reprinted a picture of Kennedy adorning the cover of Gentlemen's Quarterly, a male fashion publication. Sidey was summoned to the President's office to find J.F.K. ringed by 9 or 10 of his staff. Kennedy slammed the open magazine down on his desk and demanded to know what Time was trying to do to him.

Marianne Means, the fetching White House reporter for Hearst Headline Service, was astounded one evening to receive a call from the President reading her the riot act for a Hearst story on Kennedy family diets, a story written by another reporter.

Garnett D. Horner of the Washington Evening Star received his presidential rebuke in Salinger's office. He was summoned there to find J.F.K. in a wrathful mood over a story in the Star about the planting of leafy rhododendrons around the White House fence. At issue was whether the plants were intended to screen little Caroline from tourists' eyes or merely to improve the mansion's landscaping.

Art Buchwald, humor columnist of the New York Herald Tribune syndicate, called on the President, only to be greeted by a blistering remark about the Herald Tribune. John Sutherland of U.S. News & World Report may have been the first reporter to get the Presidential treatment aloft. He was summoned to the cabin of the President-elect's plane before the inauguration and criticized for a story he had done on the Kennedy team. J.F.K.'s language was somewhat more earthbound than the plane at that moment.

Even a good friend of the President, Benjamin C. Bradlee, Washington bureau chief of Newsweek, felt the Presidential fire. Kennedy phoned him to take him to task for a Newsweek story about an old Massachusetts aid of Kennedy's being considered for a Federal judgeship. Also ticked off later by Attorney General Kennedy for another story, Bradlee takes the rebukes philosophically and not too seriously.

"It's almost impossible," he says, "to write a story they like. Even if a story is quite favorable to their side, they'll find one paragraph to quibble with."

At least once in the columnist field, the President stalked his own big game. Last summer Walter Lippmann, the dean of Washington columnists, wrote a column critical of the administration's handling of the Berlin wall crisis. Later, at a state dinner, Lippmann was told the President wished to speak to him. While the two men sipped coffee, Kennedy went into considerable detail on the administration's position. Many columnists have obtained interviews with President Kennedy, but Lippmann holds the unique record of having the Nation's top news source self-delivered to his waiting ears.

Bob Kennedy lectured Earl Mazo, New York Herald Tribune writer, at great length for his Billie Sol Estes stories. He telephoned Columnist Robert S. Allen three times to complain about columns Allen had done on the Teddy Kennedy-Edward McCormack battle for the Democratic senatorial nomination in Massachusetts. He called Columnist Roscoe Drummond (as did Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman) to protest a Drummond column on the Billie Sol Estes case.

Attorney General Kennedy says that it is only "blatant inaccuracies and dishonest reporting that cause irritation," and not columns of opinion. While his brother has called several editorial writers, he says, it was because "the editorials were based on inaccurate data."

"Perhaps we could just let inaccurate statements go by," he said. Then, he added, with a grin, "My father told us once that we shouldn't complain because so many of the inaccurate stories were the ones that praised us."

Of deeper significance is an incident on which the principals differ radically as to what happened. One leading Washington news bureau chief tells this story: Last winter his White House man was told by a White House official that if his newspaper persisted in an antiadministration editorial policy, relations with its White House man might grow "sour." The bureau chief called the official and declared that if such threats were to be made, he would feel justified in raising the issue at a Presidential press conference. He added that the Polish Government once took such a retaliatory stand against an American reporter, but no U.S. administration ever had.

The White House official concedes that he complained to the reporter about his paper's editorial stand, but denies he made any threats to choke off news. Fearing a "misinterpretation" of his remarks, he says, he called the bureau chief to set things straight. Since the two versions differ radically, the names of the two men are omitted. At any rate, the newspaper suffered no discrimination in its news coverage of the White House.

Threats of suits against newspapermen have been made several times. Thomas R. Hughes, executive assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, threatened to sue one correspondent for Texas newspapers. Kennedy spokesmen threatened suit last summer should any newspaper print one spectacular story about a high official. (This particular story, painstakingly checked by many newspapers, proved to be false and was never printed.)

Salinger once told Paul Martin, chief of the Washington bureau of the Gannett Newspapers, that, if Kennedy were not President, he would sue Martin for "invasion of privacy." This involved a story written January 31, 1961, by Martin, in which he described the treatment given Kennedy for an insufficiency of the adrenal glands. Martin had made a lengthy check of medical records and doctors before writing the story. In their subsequent phone conversation, Salinger took the position that this story was legally actionable because it invaded Kennedy's privacy. Martin took the position that the people had a right to know everything about a President's health. The issue remains deadlocked.

Reporters have been rebuked by such diverse administration functionaries as White House Aid Schlesinger; P. Kenneth O'Donnell, the President's appointments secretary; Pamela Turnure, Mrs. Kennedy's press secretary; and Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester, but the chief disciplinarian is Salinger, who used to be a newspaperman himself. About a dozen writers, including David Wise, New York Herald Tribune, Dorothy B. McCardle, North American Newspaper Alliance, Jay G. Hayden, Detroit News, Merriman Smith, UPI, and Louis Heren, London Times, have been taken to the Salinger "woodshed." Salinger views the "woodshed" as a "great myth." "Every press secretary blows up once in a while," he said. "If he didn't, he'd go out of his mind. I'm not defensive about it. I have called in reporters and pointed out factual errors in their stories. Why is there any obligation on me to be perfectly speechless? The fact of the matter is that the press is getting too sensitive—and the press is the most sensitive group in the world anyway."

In addition to Lee Linder, Associated Press, John Lawrence, Wall Street Journal, and Jim Parks, Wilmington, Del., Journal, who were questioned in early morning hours by the FBI in connection with the steel price-rise controversy last spring, three Washington newspapermen have been quizzed by the FBI about stories emanating from the Pentagon. They are Richard Fryklund and Earl H. Voss of the Washington Evening Star, and Lloyd H. Norman of Newsweek. Fryklund and Norman also were targets of exhaustive investigations at the Pentagon by security officers. Objective: To try to pinpoint the sources that had provided them with information for news stories.

Of approximately 100 Washington magazine and newspaper people questioned by Look, about half take a lighthearted view of the Kennedy administration's knuckle rapping of the press. The rest regard it more seriously as an attempt to pressure them. In the former group is longtime Washington Reporter William H. Lawrence, now with the American Broadcasting Co., and formerly with the New York Times. One day, after Lawrence asked a question at a Presidential press conference that put Kennedy on something of a spot, O'Donnell called in Lawrence and handed him a dagger. "After that question," said O'Donnell, "the President wanted you to have this." Lawrence took it as a joke and continues to ply his trade as usual.

Among those who take the situation seriously are some who think the administration bends every effort to influence the news its way. "They remind me of the ballplayer who yells at the umpire after the strike call," says one veteran. "The batter has no hope of changing the ump's decision, but he hopes to soften him up on the next pitch." Says another, "They mean it when they take you to the woodshed. They're not Victorian in their choice of language when they get mad."

One thing is sure. Kennedy officialdom is more concerned with its "image" than any Washington regime in modern times. Furthermore, President Kennedy is adept, knowledgeable, and resourceful in the field of public relations. After all, like his press secretary, he used to be a newspaperman himself, however briefly. And that, when all is said and done, may be the rub.

Trade: Our Problem Is One of Increasing Growth, Domestic and Import

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important bills to come out of the Ways and Means Committee in a good many years is the Trade Expansion Act.

I have supported and worked for the Trade Expansion Act because of its great value to our country and to our city.

Philadelphia had the good fortune to exceed New York in tonnage last year even though it is the second largest port in the Nation.

The employment of persons involved in our export and import activities amounts to 212,000. The bill passed the House by a vote of 298 to 125.

I include herewith the statement made by Under Secretary of Commerce Edward Gudeman, expanding on the trade bill and developing the arguments in favor of increasing growth, both domestic and export:

TRADE: OUR PROBLEM IS ONE OF INCREASING GROWTH, BOTH DOMESTIC AND EXPORT

(By Edward Gudeman, Under Secretary of Commerce)

I would like to talk to you about the trade problems that face our country, both domestic and international, with particular emphasis on the international and the trade bill. Now, the rise in our gross national product during the past year has been excellent, a rise from around $500 billion to $548 billion. This, however, has been insufficient to bring the unemployment rate down below 5½ percent, and unless we can get a greater growth than the 3 percent that we have been getting, we will never be able to bring the unemployment rate down to 4 percent, which is the target; or to absorb the over 1 million new people coming into the labor market each year and the 200,000 and more put out of work by automation.

So our problem is one of increasing growth, both domestic and export. At the same time, profits of corporations have not kept pace with the growth of sales. You might be interested to know that in the decade of 1950 to 1960, profits after taxes was just about even. No increase whatsoever. Sales increase during that time was approximately 70 percent. Now we know the present administration, as you know, believes in good corporate profits. Our defense budget requires profits because profits bring taxes. Secretary Fowler's problem would be greatly mitigated if our growth rate could be increased.

Now how do we accomplish greater growth? Well, new depreciation rates which Secretary Fowler talked about this morning through the revision of Bulletin F will give additional funds along with the investment credit to industry so that that can be placed back into new equipment and new plant to lower our costs and make us more competitive.

DEPRECIATION RATES

You might be interested to know that the first-year depreciation rate in Canada, Japan, and the seven leading Western European nations is 29 percent; ours at present is 13.3 percent. Now if new depreciation rates similar to those given the textile industry are put into effect through a revision of Bulletin F and if the 7 or 8 percent investment credit that Secretary Fowler talked about this morning is passed by the Congress, our first-year depreciation rate will be 29.3 percent as against the 29 percent for the countries that I mentioned. We must continue our efforts to lower our costs, the costs of production, the costs of distribution, in order to increase economic growth. And we must have continued stability in wages and prices, and wage increases must be held within the limits of productivity. Here I don't know whether Mr. Heller pointed out to you yesterday that when we talk about "wages" within the limits of productivity, we do not mean that all the gain in productivity can and should go to wages. Each element in business will have its share of the increase in productivity, so that profits will have their share, overhead its share, prices their share, and in many cases, because of the application of increased productivity to prices, prices can be decreased at the same time that wages are increased if there is an increase in productivity.

We must continue our efforts for research and development in our country to produce greater economic growth, and I would like to point out to you that in the past 5 years, it is really questionable whether research and development, as great as it has been, has brought us the growth that we want. Think of the new things in consumer goods on the market, during the past year, and you will see what I am trying to say. There has been very little new in a refrigerator, a washing machine, a stove, a radio, a television, or an automobile, other than the compact car which is not a development coming from research. So our research and development must be put to better use than it has been to help our economic growth.

We must increase our exports. We must increase our exports to help our economic growth and also to help our balance-of-payments problem. Let me touch on that for a moment.

IMPROVED RATIO

From 1958 to 1960, the deficit of this country was more than $11 billion. That is, dollar earnings were $11 billion short of expenditures overseas. In 1961, the outflow of dollars was $29.9 billion. The inflow was $27.4 billion. Thus, there was a deficit of $2½ billion. This was a great improvement over the previous year of 1960, when the deficit was $3.9 billion. But still a huge deficit.

Now, where does this come from? In 1961, the United States had a net inflow of dollars from three categories of transactions. Trade produced $3 billion; investment income, $2.8 billion; and repayment of foreign debts on U.S. Government loans, $1.3 billion. The income to the United States from services such as transactions, royalties, insurance premiums, but excluding travel, was approximately equal to the payments that we made abroad for those same classifications. The above net receipts added up to $7.1 billion but against this, we had a dollar outflow of $9.6 billion making the $2½ billion deficit I mentioned before. The outflow came from expenditures for military abroad, of close to $3 billion. Foreign aid loans and grants, not spent in the United States, accounted for $1.3 billion; travel, $800 million; private investment, including short-term capital movements, $3.4 billion, and pensions, remittances, and so forth, $1.5 billion.

Now, the possibilities of reducing some of these expenditures is there. Secretary McNamara has said he believes that of the close to $3 billion spent abroad for military, about a billion can be taken out of that; and of the $1.3 billion spent for aid, perhaps a half a billion can be taken out of that. But the only way that we are going to improve our balance-of-payments problem is if we increase our exports, and at the same time, if we can increase our exports, we help our domestic growth.

POTENTIAL MARKET

So, we must do this, we must increase exports, and of course, as Secretary Ball has said, Western Europe is the big market for our goods. Here let me give you just a few figures. The six Common Market countries import from the United States $3.5 billion a year, and we import from those six countries, $2.2 billion. So we have a favorable balance here. Now, if we assume that the United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, and Greece and Ireland go into the Common Market, and as Secretary Ball said this is very probable, then our exports to that expanded Common Market will be $4.9 billion against imports of $3.9 billion. And if we include, eventually, all of the OECD countries—Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Turkey—then our exports are $6 billion, $6 billion out of $20 billion, 30 percent, and our imports are $3.8 billion.

The Common Market has been lowering its tariffs within itself. This is a federation of six states just as we are a federation of 50 States, with free exchange of goods between all our 50 States. As yet, between the six Common Market countries there is not a free exchange of goods, but the tariffs between these countries are being lowered, very rapidly.

Let me give you an example. Before the Common Market was organized, American-French-Italian auto duty on shipments into Germany was 21 percent. Now the French and Italians can ship their cars into Germany at a rate of 12.5 percent, but the American car going into Germany carries a duty rate of 22 percent. Let me give you another example. Before the Common Market was organized, American and Italian manufacturers of TV and radio sets shipping into Germany paid a duty, depending upon the category of goods, of between 12 and 15 percent. The Italian now shipping into Germany pays a duty of 7 to 9 percent. The U.S. duty is now 12.8 to 17.6 percent.

LEGISLATION NEEDED

I don't think one can pinpoint the relationship between duty and amount of business exactly, but Germany's imports from the United States used to be 39 percent in this radio and television category, and at that time, 4 percent of German imports came from Italy. Now the U.S. percentage has dropped from 39 percent to 20 percent, and the Italian shipments have soared from the 4 percent to 25 percent. Thus, we must have new legislation in the Trade Expansion Act, in order to work out lower tariffs and tariffs that are comparable on American good into the Common Market that they are developing for shipments among the Common Market countries. This is very important, as you can see, from the quantity of goods we ship.

This is why the Trade Expansion Act has the complete backing of the President, and under that act, as you know, duties can be reduced to Common Market countries to zero on those classes of goods where the Common Market and the United States together are the dominant supplier to the world and duties to other countries and on other good can be reduced by 50 percent. The new bill also carries in it, a trade adjustment and adjustment assistance section so that those workers and those firms injured by increased imports, due to lowered duties coming into this country on merchandise from other countries, will be able to apply to the Government through the Tariff Commission for assistance. We believe that it is most essential for this trade legislation to be passed as now written and as you know it has gone through the Ways and Means Committee and will come up before the House shortly for a vote.

Let me tell you what we in the Commerce Department are doing to help both domestic and international growth but particularly on the international side. Obviously, greater growth must come from private industry. There is little that Government can do directly, but we can help and here is what we are doing. We have opened up a trade center which is like a merchandise mart, in London. It has been opened about 10 months. So far, 315 U.S. firms have displayed goods in various shows in that trade center. And of those, more than 30 percent of those firms, more than 30 percent have made marketing arrangements to sell their goods in the United Kingdom, and those firms never had such marketing arrangements before. We recently completed a toy show, where over a million dollars of initial orders were taken for American toys.

Next, we are going to open centers, and have opened one in Bangkok just a week ago, and will later this year in Tokyo, and in Frankfurt, Germany. Our 101st trade mission is going to leave in a few days for the State of Israel. A trade mission is a group of six men who visit a country for about a month, and talk to businessmen, government people, bankers, lawyers, and others developing trade for the United States. Each mission goes to a country and is integrated to those things which that country needs from the United States. For Israel, it is general consumer goods. A trade mission to Germany would have more people on it knowledgeable in the field of machinery and equipment. We will have about 18 trade fairs this year in various countries where we believe there are possibilities to increase our exports.

MORE TRADE EFFORT

We have changed, along with the State Department, the time that our commercial attachés give to developing business, and we are taking away from them much of the detail work they have had in the past so that they can concentrate through their embassy on developing trade for the United States.

Through all these efforts, through the passage of the trade bill, we believe that our balance of payments can be greatly improved, that our exports can be increased, and our target is a 10-percent increase or about $2 billion.

Cheer Red Anthem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. William D. Graff, publisher of the American Standard at Buena Park, Calif. The article points up how easy it is for cultural exchange and athletic exchange from the Soviet Union to brainwash the American people into believing that Russia is "mellowing."

The article follows:

CHEER RED ANTHEM

(By William D. Graff)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Last month, after the guise of "cultural exchange," Stanford University played host to the U.S.S.R. track team. Publisher Bill Graff went to Palo Alto to "see for himself" what effect this program had on the American people's will-to-resist the international onslaught.)

PALO ALTO, CALIF.—The Soviet agent in the traditional sweat suit of the track and field athlete stepped forward and held aloft the dreaded hammer and sickle of the fatherland of communism, the Soviet Union.

Throughout the vast Stanford University stadium, some 80,000 Americans stood motionless, almost as though enraptured by the dream of world "peace," and then applauded the banner which represented the enslavement of one-third of the world's peoples, and the murder of countless millions more.

Not one voice, out of the 80,000 assembled there, asked the question which should have been on the minds of every Stanford student, alumni, and fan. "Will you now, in the spirit of peace which you claim to want, release our fellow Stanford student, Robert Mann, from your prison in East Germany?"

Perhaps the reason this was never asked, except by young Mann's sister afterward, was because the U.S. Government itself, never officially asked for the boy's release. It seems we now "officially" accept the Communist lie that helping another human being escape from slavery is a crime.

LACK UNDERSTANDING

I looked about me, sickened at the faces of those thousands of innocents, sublimely suckered into believing that perhaps the United States and the Soviet butchers have simply lacked understanding of what truly nice people the other guys really are.

I also looked down at the playing field where American amateurs were about to engage state-subsidized, state-trained, professional athletes who were in the United States for one reason—to assist in carrying out a phase of the phony "cultural exchange" program which would eventually place Uncle Sam at the losing end of the whole shebang.

Oh, the Soviet performers looked pleasant enough. There were no beards, bombs, or bullets. In fact, there was little to distinguish them in physical appearance from the American boys and girls with whom they were about to compete.

RECALLS WARNINGS

I thought of the warnings by Mr. Hoover of the FBI, and others familiar with Soviet planning, the warnings that Soviet agents visit the United States under many guises. They come in as scientists, diplomats, athletes, dancers, singers, farmers, doctors, professors, you name it, but underneath the Trojan horse exterior, it's a bunch of dedicated, mentally straitjacketed agents of the Communist global conquest.

Perhaps it wasn't quite hospitable for our men's team to trounce the Russian team the way it did that day. We're sure the appeasement corps in the State Department didn't like it a bit.

But we have a sneaking suspicion the Russians weren't too disappointed. For after all, they had won their real victory. It came when 80,000 Americans rose and paid homage to the hammer and sickle in the traditional display of respect for an honorable nation's flag.

WILL TO RESIST

American will to resist creeping, unrelenting, approaching slavery under communism had again moved downward.

When Nikita Khrushchev recently boasted in Bucharest that the hammer and sickle would fly over the United States, raised by the American people, perhaps he was talking about something that is not so far away.

For shame, America, that you cannot feel the hot breath upon your neck, nor smell the slavering monster as he waits for you without the stadium with his velvet glove that conceals the bloody hook.

Law and Order in Albany and the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, there is great danger of real trouble in Albany, Ga. Dr. Martin Luther King and his followers have precipitated numerous mob gatherings which could have easily erupted into racial riots.

The officials of Albany have done a remarkable job of preventing serious disorder and violence. These local law enforcement agencies are to be commended for their courage and sound judgment under the most trying circumstances.

It is most regrettable that some officials of the Federal Government have thought it wise to lend encouragement and support to Dr. King, or anyone else, who seeks publicity, financial enrichment, and martyrdom as a result of imprisonment for the violation of local and State laws.

A thorough analysis of this tragedy in Albany is revealed in a recent editorial in the Greenville, S.C., News. I am sure this editorial will be of interest to many Members of Congress, and I include it in the Appendix with my remarks:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Aug. 2, 1962]

LAW AND ORDER IN ALBANY AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Seen in the wrong light and taken in the wrong spirit, this editorial could be considered inflammatory. It is written close to the edge of anger and even closer to the edge of sadness.

But it has to be written because it deals with frightening facts pertaining to law enforcement in two cities.

One is the once peaceful city of Albany, Ga., where hundreds and even thousands of Negro demonstrators are almost daily threatening peace and good order in the name of rights and freedom. They have attracted national attention and sympathy. Cabinet officers, northern Governors, and thousands of do-gooders encourage them.

They have defied a Federal court injunction to continue their marches. Their mob assemblies have been applauded while the TV cameras rolled to record their antics.

The administration has either overlooked the danger or intimated that it may intervene in their behalf.

The other city is Washington, D.C., the Capital of the United States and one of the most heavily policed areas of its size in the world.

But it has become unsafe for a white woman to venture out of doors within a stone's throw of the Capitol building (or even on the Capitol steps) even in broad daylight and even with an escort.

Physical assaults and the ultimate in heinous crimes, rape, are becoming more and more commonplace, along with muggings and purse snatching. And the combined forces of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police and the Capitol guards haven't been able to stop it.

Most of the assailants and violators of the lesser laws on crime against the person are Negroes. But the suspects or persons arrested and charged are seldom if ever identified by race except by newsmen representing southern newspapers.

It seems to be bad taste or a violation of some sort of civil right to call a Negro criminal a Negro in print in Washington or in the big northern cities.

The situation has been getting worse for years as the percentage of Negroes among the population has risen. Members of Congress have protested before. They are crying out now in anger and in fear for the safety of their staff members, their families, and visitors. They have attracted little attention.

Not all of the perpetrators of these crimes are Negroes, of course. But Washington has become the largest of the Nation's cities where Negroes outnumber whites, and Negroes account for a percentage of the criminal offenses higher even than their proportionate number among the total population.

Capitol Hill has replaced New York's Central Park as the most dangerous place in any metropolis for anyone to move about at night without an armed guard.

The administration seems to be looking the other way—toward Albany perhaps.

Let's go back a little further into the facts and merits of the problems in the two cities.

First Albany: The city has been turned into a racial battleground by Negro citizens who have been aroused by professional race-baiters from other States. Chief among them is Martin Luther King, the darling of the liberal integrationists and a pet of the administration.

It started with the familiar sit-ins and freedom-ride activities. It has developed into something much bigger and more sinister. Mobs of Negroes gather in rallies, sing hymns, pray, listen to promised-land speeches by leaders who know just how to work them up.

They march through the streets, they congregate in public places. They call their methods Christian and nonviolent and speak of peaceful aims. They say, or are told by their leaders, that the object is to win their rights and their freedom.

But the threat of violence looms over every such gathering. There have been reports of jeering at police officers and the throwing of brickbats.

The rights and freedom these people talk about boils down to one thing only. It is not the right to equal treatment by the law (if the demonstrators were white, they would be treated the same way) nor to own property. It is not freedom of movement to go where they will nor to meet in peaceful assembly and to petition for the redress of wrongs.

Their primary and sole purpose is to try to force an end to segregation, to be integrated with whites in any and every place of their own choosing.

But are they proving themselves prepared for racially mixed society?

The remarkable thing is that serious injury and wholesale riots have been prevented. That it has is due to local law enforcement and not to Federal policy or action; quite the contrary.

Now Washington: Rampant Negro hoodlums have created a reign of terror around the Capitol so intense that the Congressional Secretaries Club has called for drastic action. These women work on Capitol Hill and many of them live nearby. Women caught in the vicinity have been the victims of rape, murderous assault, and violent robbery.

The recent meeting of the secretaries was called after a white woman, a congressional secretary, was attacked in a church adjacent to the Capitol Grounds while kneeling in prayer and stabbed nine times. The initial reports said only that the assailant was a man. Southern newsmen have learned and reported that he was a Negro. He has not been caught.

Soon after this incident, a visiting Ohio housewife was beaten by two Negro girls in an unprovoked daylight assault on the Capitol steps. When the woman's husband tried to run down the two girls, a Negro boy tripped him up. By the time a few of the scores of policemen who patrol the place arrived, the three were gone. They have not been caught.

In the last 3 weeks or so, there have been five or more rapes committed within a few blocks of the Capitol; each victim described the attacker as a Negro. A Negro man has been arrested and charged.

The situation became so bad that police officers issued a broadside urging secretaries who had to go home after dark to call for a police escort to their homes.

The thugs then started making attacks in daylight.

In a speech before the House last week, Representative MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, said that Washington has become "the jungle of the civilized world." He noted that Attorney General Bobby Kennedy had been quoted as saying that such incidents would continue unless "wider opportunities are offered to permit young people to live differently than they do now."

This RIVERS took to mean a demand for passage of administration legislation on juvenile delinquency and others of its propsals. However, said RIVERS, the Attorney General "moans about the criminal and not the victim" and "has said nothing about better police protection and sterner punishment."

Despite all the provocation, violence thus far has been prevented in Albany. State, country, and city officers have seen to that.

Hoodlums seem to roam and attack at will in Washington. The Federal Government is responsible for governing the District of Columbia and enforcing the law.

Essay of Miss Dianne Sanders, Hawaii Girls State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, during the week of July 29–August 4, 1962, representatives from 50 States gathered at the American University campus in Washington, D.C., to participate in a convention of Girls Nation to study discuss, and learn about our Federal Government. Representing Hawaii's Girls State as "U.S. Senators" were Miss Dianne Sanders, a student at Kailua High School and Miss Margaret Christian, a student at the Kamehameha School for Girls. I was privileged to meet both Dianne and Margaret in Washington, and was very much impressed by them. Both were charming and intelligent—excellent representatives of the State of Hawaii.

The Girls State is sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary, both in Hawaii and the Nation, in conjunction with its program of promoting citizenship and Americanism. In selecting the "Senators" from Hawaii, the candidates were required to submit an essay on the subject, "The Power of Education in a Republic." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include Miss Dianne Sanders' winning essay, as follows:

THE POWER OF EDUCATION IN A REPUBLIC

(By Diane Sanders)

It has been said by every generation that the future of the United States rests in the hands of youth. This is self-evident and it can be seen that these youths have grown up and become leaders in every field to carry on the work of their forefathers. They have fought two great wars and won them only through the sacrifice of their lives and their ambitions. They have created new inventions to further industry in every stage of development. They have become scientists, doctors, lawyers, and stalwart leaders of this country's peoples. Aside from this they are happy and prosperous citizens. They have respect and loyalty for their country and its leaders, and they are able to appreciate what this country and these leaders have to offer them.

But let us stop and think for a moment. What has made all these advances possible? What gift do these persons have that has enabled them to be what they are?

There may be many contributing factors, but the most important of these is the right to an education. This education is one that they are able to choose for themselves. It is not dictated to them, nor is it denied them. There are the citizens of a republic and this is one of the most precious privileges that a person can have.

Their education, being gained in a republic, has a very great power. Not only does it allow them to become a member of the profession of their choice for the purpose fo advancing this profession, but it gives them a knowledge of their Government, a sense of duty to this Government, and a will to defend it against all enemies.

This education can save lives. It can make most lives safer, happier, and, above all, more meaningful. With the feelings and attitudes gained from an education free of restrictions, all citizens of a republic become much more useful in promoting the good things in life. There is no other privilege that has a greater effect or a greater power than education in a republic. May God keep it safe.

Israel Foreign Ministry Statement on the Soblen Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement which was issued by the Israel Foreign Ministry with reference to the case of Dr. Robert Soblen.

A perusal of this statement, which was made on August 12, will show that the Israel Government has acted in a completely proper manner in this affair.

The statement follows:

1. On June 26, 1962, Dr. Robert Soblen arrived in Israel under an assumed name with false papers. When his true identity was discovered, he was immediately detained and an order for his expulsion from Israel was issued by the Minister of Interior in accordance with section 13 of the "Entry Into Israel Law."

2. On July 1, 1962, the order was carried out and Dr. Soblen was expelled from Israel.

3. The Government of Israel never intended that a person who was a fugitive from justice, who had been properly tried by the courts of the United States and found guilty of criminal acts, should enjoy the benefit of the "law of return," and therefore, Soblen was refused permission to stay in Israel. The Prime Minister of Israel expressed these views in the Knesset on July 11, 1962, when he said: "The law of return, and the concept on which it is based, do not only mean that we passed a law for ourselves. We are deeply interested first and foremost in the opinion of the Jewish people throughout the world, and in the opinion of the whole world. We are thinking of a refuge for Jews who do not wish, or are unable, to remain where they are, but not of an asylum for criminals."

This position of the Government of Israel was endorsed by a majority in the Knesset.

For the same reason Soblen's subsequent application submitted in London, to be admitted into Israel under the "law of return," was rejected.

4. Dr. Soblen has now been 6 weeks in the United Kingdom owing to circumstances over which the Government of Israel had no control and for which it has no responsibility.

5. Upon his expulsion from Israel, Israel's part in this case was terminated. Dr. Soblen is no longer under Israel's jurisdiction, and therefore there was no basis for involving Israel or El Al in any further steps regarding Dr. Soblen. Any participation by the Government of Israel, or an Israel aircraft, or an Israel vessel in the removal or deportation of Dr. Soblen from the United Kingdom to the United States is contrary to Israel law, and, therefore, the Government of Israel cannot take any such action.

6. From the outset, this position has been made clear on various occasions to the Government of the United States and to the Government of the United Kingdom. The Government of Israel was entitled to assume that the Governments concerned would take this position into account in their dealings with the Soblen case.

7. The Government of Israel notes that at no stage was it asked by the United States to take action which would not be in conformity with the laws of Israel. In this connection, the Government of Israel recalls the statement made by the official spokesman of the U.S. Department of State on June 28, 1962: "We are not asking them (Israel) to break their own laws, of course." He added: "The situation is that we and Israel do not have an extradition treaty. In January of this year, we negotiated such a treaty with Israel. But it has not been submitted to the Senate for ratification. One cautionary note: Even if we had such a treaty and it were in force, it would not cover extradition for espionage."

8. In the light of this situation, the Government of Israel, while fully sharing the concerns of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States, could not see its way to authorize El Al to comply with the direction issued by the British Government, since the laws of Israel do not permit it to do so.

9. The Government of Israel expresses its hope that it will now be possible for a solution to be reached. The procedure now initiated by the Government of the United Kingdom indicates the correctness of the assumption of the Israel Government, that a satisfactory solution can be found without any of the parties being required to act against its own laws.

Suicidal Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Raymond Moley is one of the able and respected columnists of our time. He is a real student of political science, he writes well, makes a keen analysis and some very cogent observations from time to time. Recently he has written an article under the title of "Suicidal Extremists." Here again he has made a very worthwhile contribution to the political thinking of our time. With the hope that my colleagues and others will have greater opportunity to read this very lucid and erudite dissertation on the subject, I take this opportunity to place this in the RECORD:

SUICIDAL EXTREMISTS

(By Raymond Moley)

A little group, in which Senator WAYNE MORSE is the most wordy, is creating great embarrassment for its party and its President by opposition to the communications satellite bill. But whether they win or lose, we may be sure that in the campaign to come these Senators will be out there shouting mealymouthed hosannas for their "great President" and the liberal Democratic Party. When the chips are down, they will support their party. They have nowhere else to go if they expect to stay in official life.

That sort of conformity is not found in certain individuals who are organizing to defeat Nixon in California and Rockefeller and Javits in New York.

In California, Nixon emerged successfully from a primary fight. But his opponents in that primary have now pledged themselves to support their party and its candidates.

However, a group in Sacramento which is a branch of a so-called party called Conservatives of America, with headquarters in New Orleans, have decided to attempt to destroy Nixon by supporting and voting for Governor Brown.

In New York a Conservative Party has selected candidates to help defeat Rockefeller and JAVITS and elect certain Democratic candidates who have not yet been chosen.

In California these alleged Conservatives do not like Brown or agree with what he stands for. Their purpose is to weaken the Republican Party and destroy its chosen leader, Richard Nixon.

In New York they ignore the fact that Rockefeller has been a competent and prudent Governor and a professed Republican. JAVITS' voting record is more liberal than that of the majority of his party, but a study of 115 rollcalls shows that his record is more conservative than that of 49 Democratic Senators.

It has been a habit of those who write for the public prints to call these dissidents and destroyers in California and New York "conservative extremists." I don't mind their being called extremists. But I resent their being called conservative.

During the last 3 years, during which we have heard so much about these extremists, I have carefully reviewed the history and policies of conservatism from Burke to the present—its mood, convictions, and methods. And I have formulated the following definition of a conservative:

The conservative puts his faith in freemen, unfettered, so far as is practicable, by state authority. He recognizes the human fallibility of man, but he believes he must learn through his errors. On the other hand, the liberal has no faith at all in the individual, but believes he must be subjected to the tyranny of an official elite. The conservative abhors violence and extremism. He believes neither in sudden salvation nor in instant damnation. His objective is progress by remedies for present problems achieved within the guidelines of successfully proved constitutional traditions. In achieving progress when confronted by a governing majority dedicated to liberalism, he believes in keeping things from getting worse.

Finally, he recognizes that to win a majority capable of reschaping National and State policies, he must work through the two-party system—an institution created in Anglo-American life by the great constitutionalists of the past. It is an institution which has been preserved in Britain and the United States, while other nations in the Western World have been destroyed by their multiple-party misgovernment. Their experience has shown that many parties end with one party, and a one-party system ends in a one-man system.

These alleged Conservatives in California and New York do not conform to the foregoing definition. Their reactionary suicidal methods would, if successful, lead us down to the tragedy of the multiple-party nations of continental Europe. They would destroy the very essence of conservative, moderate progress and deny freemen the power to grow and to achieve the general welfare through orderly change.

Forty-second Anniversary of Polish Soldier's Day Observed at Eddington, Pa., August 12, 1962, by Post No. 12 of the Polish Army Veterans Association of Philadelphia and Their Ladies Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for insertion in the Appendix an address I had the honor to make on August 12 at Eddington, Pa. The occasion was the 42d anniversary of the establishment of Polish Soldier's Day and the event was under the sponsorship of Post No. 12 of the Polish Army Veterans Association of Philadelphia and their Ladies Auxiliary.

In addition, I am including a copy of the program and the text of a resolution unanimously adopted by the members of the association on this occasion honoring the memory of their departed comrades.

The address, program, and resolution follow:

A TRIBUTE TO THE POLISH SOLDIER ON THE 42D ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH SOLDIER'S DAY

(Address by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the Polish Soldier's Day celebration, 42d anniversary, at Eddington, Pa., Aug. 12, 1962)

It is a pleasure to participate in this program observing the 42d anniversary of Polish Soldier's Day under the sponsorship of Post No. 12 of the Polish Army Veterans and its Ladies Auxiliary.

Having been invited to deliver the principal address on this occasion, not only do I want to congratulate the members of Post No. 12 and its auxiliary for sponsorship of this anniversary program, but I wish to stress the great contribution the Polish soldiers have made to their native land.

It is common knowledge that the fate and the destiny of all nations, from the most ancient times to our own day, are formed and fashioned by its soldiers.

Throughout the long and rather uneven course of human history soldiers of all nations, and especially those dauntless Polish soldiers serving in Poland's world-famed cavalry units, together with those gallant Polish soldiers of freedom fighting in our Revolutionary War, all have had an important share and have played a decisive role in the making of nations and in the shaping of their destiny and their fate.

The soldier's main task is his role in safeguarding and maintaining the independence and sovereign integrity of city, State, and Nation.

Thus the all-important task of soldiers is the making of nations—the shaping of their destiny and then serving as guardians of the fate of nations.

These broad generalizations may seem too sweeping—and perhaps as a combat veteran of two world wars I may be regarded as magnifying the role and importance of soldiers in national histories.

I find it hard to overemphasize or praise too highly the supreme importance of soldiers in the difficult task of nation making and nation guarding.

Down through the ages good soldiers have always deserved to be, both in time of war as well as in peacetime, the admired and honored citizens of a nation. This is particularly true in the case of the soldier of Poland.

The long, eventful, dramatic, and tragic history of the Polish people in their struggle for independence is universally known.

During the days of the grandeur and glory of the Polish nation, as well as in its decline and destruction by its foes, the Polish soldier has shared its glory and has suffered its misfortunes.

In glory and in misfortune he has steadfastly remained true to his calling, to serve to the best of his ability and to the limits of his physical power the righteous cause of the Polish people by fighting and dying for it.

During the infancy of their nation Polish soldiers learned this supremely important lesson 10 centuries ago in the days of their first national king, Mieszko I, the founder of the Polish kingdom.

This founding father of Poland, with the aid of a band of Polish soldiers, extended his reign northward to the Baltic shore and southward to the foothills of the western Carpathians.

On his death in 992 he was succeeded by his worthy son, the famous Boleslav the Brave, who as a courageous soldier and resourceful statesman is known in Poland's history as Boleslav the Great.

For more than 30 years this gallant knight, the first soldier and first servant of Poland, served Poland's cause by strengthening the Polish state and thus making it one of the best organized and most important countries in Eastern Europe.

Through his soldierly gallantry and astute statesmanship this warrior-king raised Poland to the rank of a leading European country.

In his almost miraculous success his ability as a soldier proved far more important than his statesmanship, for those were the days of warrior-kings of uncommon valor and extraordinary courage. And Poland was fortunate in having a good supply of such leaders, men of noble character and indomitable will.

And, as the whole world knows, these great sons of Poland, besides serving Poland's sacred cause, have also served the European causes, the American cause, and the cause of humanity.

But long before the fame of Polish soldiers was known in other parts of Europe, and many centuries before the discovery of America, they were guarding Europe against its non-European invaders.

For several centuries when Eastern Europe was under attack by Mongols and Tartars from Asia the fighting men of Poland often found themselves between Christian Europe and its non-Christian foes, the powerful

Asiatic hordes in their massive westward movement.

In this defense of Europe's Christian civilization these devoutly Christian Polish soldiers fought with doubled courage and with intense fervor because they knew that they were defending supreme causes, the sacred cause of the church and the righteous cause of Poland.

Centuries later—late in the 17th century—when the same Europe's sacred cause was under the attack of the Ottoman Turks—it was saved by the singularly swift mobilization of the Polish soldiers under their warrior-king, Sobieski the Great.

Yes, in the year 1683 the invincible forces of victorious Ottoman Sultan had besieged Vienna and this last citadel of central Europe was about to fall to its un-Christian foes, and it was saved by the gallantry of Poland's greatest king in modern times, Sobieski the Great; it was saved by his organizing genius, his supremely successful leadership in the field of battle and his unmatched mastery of the art of fighting a decisive and successful battle against a superior enemy.

So in the year 1683, on that fateful September 11 when King Sobieski's combined Polish and Austrian forces defeated the far superior Turkish forces at the gates of Vienna, the victorious armies not only saved Europe from the ravages of the Ottoman Turks, but by that decisive victory they brought an end to Turkish expansion in Europe.

Here again it is proverbial to talk and expand on the bravery and courage of Polish soldiers and also of their heroic king, Sobieski the Great.

We on this side of the Atlantic look upon this miraculous feat of Polish soliders as one of the finest services that these gallant fighters rendered to the cause of Christian civilization and to humanity.

About a century after the glorious fight of Polish soldiers against the Turks under the walls of Vienna, another great war was being fought in the British colonies on this side of the Atlantic.

Our Revolutionary War had attracted many gallant soldiers from many lands in the cause of freedom. But among all those who found means to secure passage to the New World where they hoped to have a chance to fight for a noble cause, none had any purer and unmixed motive than those Poles who rallied to our cause.

They enrolled in our fighting forces and then distinguished themselves as leaders and organizers of fighting units.

There were many Poles who thus fought and gave their lives for our freedom, thereby leaving us eternally in their debt.

Among these great and devoted Polish soldiers of freedom, two stand out:

Gen. Casimir Pulaski's name has long become a household word in all American homes as the military genius who organized our cavalry forces during the Revolutionary War. His fame is well established as the father of American cavalry.

Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko is equally well known as another great son of Poland who served with equal distinction in our Revolutionary War, and also subsequently in his native land in fighting for Poland's freedom.

When Poland's brave Polish soliders were fighting for freedom in other lands, Poland was having her most agonizing period in her long history.

Late in the 18th century her powerful and implacable foes—Austrians, Prussians, and Russians—partitioned her among themselves, put an end to independent Poland, and enslaved the Polish people.

Fortunately, however, these autocracies were unable to put an end to the living spirit of Poland. Patriotic and fighting Poles lived on it and they bred a caste of fighters who vowed to fight and die for Poland's freedom.

Poland's conqueror could not suppress Poland's fighting, soldierly spirit.

For more than 100 years these daring Poles carried on their underground fight against all three of their oppressors.

During the First World War, when Poland's historic foes were defeated and their regimes shattered, Poland regained her freedom. Poland's sons had fought in that war on the side of the allied and associated powers. And, just as Polish-Americans fought in our forces with gallantry and distinction, so Polish soldiers fighting in the armies of our allies gave a splendid account of themselves.

Their services were universally recognized. And as a reward for their contributions and for the immense sacrifices they had made for their freedom, they were assisted in regaining their independence at the end of that war.

During the next two decades the Poles rebuilt their war-ravaged country, established their own national institutions, organized a powerful army under the indomitable Marshal Pilsudski, and were quite content with their lot in their homeland.

But the course of politics in neighboring Russia and Germany, particularly in the late 1930's, ushered in tragedy to independent Poland, to free Europe, and to Western civilization.

Neither Poland's strong army by itself nor those of her allies in the west were able to prevent the outbreak of the last war.

Poland was the first victim of that war and the soldiers of Poland were the first to resist the far superior and brutal forces of Hitler's Germany.

It is to the credit of Poland's gallant and brave soldiers that under the most adverse and heartbreaking conditions they carried on their fight against their ruthless and immensely superior foes for more than 5 years.

Throughout these agonizing years the patriotic Pole's ingenuity and his readiness to give his life for his country's cause earned the free world's admiration and affection. Most glorious was their stand against the Nazis in the abortive but heroic mass rising in Warsaw in the summer of 1944.

In that epic fighting between the Polish underground and their Nazi oppressors, the Polish soldier's valor and bravery assured him a distinct place among the heroes of the last war.

Eighteen years have gone by since that epic struggle in Warsaw and the glory which the Polish soldiers earned by their gallantry and bravery there looms larger and grander today, even though they were treacherously abandoned and then betrayed by the Soviet Government.

In the face of the multitude of heroic services which Polish soldiers have rendered to their country and its people, to Europe and its civilization, and, of course, to the cause of freedom during our Revolutionary War, I find it difficult to praise too highly the fine and noble deeds of Polish soldiers.

I know I can hardly do justice in my comments to the descendants of Boleslav the Brave and Sobieski the Great or to the spiritual followers of Kosciuszko and Pulaski. Nor can I do justice in my remarks to the true disciples of Marshal Pilsudski and to all those who served under Generals Sikorski, Sosnkowski, and Komorowski.

Many great sons of Poland, yes, many of her gallant soldiers of freedom, find themselves far away from their native Poland today. Thousands of them are welcomed in this great Republic and many of them are among America's outstanding naturalized citizens.

These soldiers may rest assured that we in this country are fully aware and duly appreciative of their superb services to the cause of freedom.

As I conclude, let me again pay tribute to the members of Post No. 12 Polish Army Veterans and its auxiliary for their sponsorship of this annual Polish Soldiers Day.

Through such an observance you keep alive in the minds of the Polish people, as well as all Americans, the determination on the part of Poland as a nation to shake off the yoke of atheistic communism.

You give a ray of hope to the Polish people that Poland, as a nation protected by the courageous Polish soldier, may once more enjoy the liberty and freedom yearned for in the hearts of the Polish people.

PROGRAM

10:30 A.M.

Holy Mass at St. Adalbert's Church.

2 P.M.

Presentation and review of color guards.

Introduction, Lt. Alexander Machowski, commander, Polish Army Veterans Post No. 12.

Toastmaster, Hon. Julian Zbytniewski, first national senior vice commander of Polish Army Veterans Association.

Invocation, Rev. Francis Palecki, pastor, St. Adalbert's Church.

American and Polish national anthems, Polish American Musicians Association Band.

Address, Hon. Theodore S. Gutowicz, insurance commissioner, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Musical selections, Polish American Musicians Association Band under the direction of Mr. Joseph Pudlinski.

Principal address, Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member, U.S. House of Representatives.

Polish folk dances, St. Adalbert's Polish Language School.

Resolution, Lucian F. Pazulski, Esq., director, Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board.

Introduction of honored guests.

Taps in honor of deceased Polish soldiers, Rudy Meinhart, Horn-Ross-Weiss Post 861 VFW, officer of the day.

Benediction, Rev. John A. Naja, pastor, St. Ladislaus Church.

Finale, "Boze Cos Polske."

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the exercises commemorating the annual and 42d anniversary of the Polish Soldiers Day celebration, sponsored under the auspices of the Polish Army Veterans Association, Post No. 12, and its Ladies Auxiliary, in Philadelphia, Pa.

Assembled under the auspices of the Polish Army Veterans Association, Post No. 12, in Philadelphia, Pa., we veterans having paid tribute to the valiant Poles who fell on the battlefields of glory for their country, for Christianity, for freedom, and democracy, do hereby resolve as follows:

The Polish Soldiers Day, as decreed by the constitutional Polish Parliament in Warsaw, Poland, some 42 years ago, was chiefly designed as an observance of the heroic Polish defense in 1920 which resulted in the routing of the Bolshevist hordes that invaded the newly reborn country. Observance of the Polish Soldiers Day, August 15, in present-day Communist-ruled Poland is forbidden, as is Poland's Independence Day, November 11. It behooves us then to give all aid and comfort to those who are bent on observing Polish Soldiers Day in commemoration of the glorious deeds of all who made the supreme sacrifice in defense of Poland, including those of them who, like Kociuszko and Pulaski, also fought for our American independence.

Since most everybody of the natives in Poland truly became a soldier with the advent of Nazi and Soviet occupation of the country after Hitler and Stalin invaded Poland and divided it between themselves, Polish Soldiers Day became the occasion for the observance of a universal sacrifice of the Polish people, the first to fight in defense against totalitarianism in World War II and, as one of our Presidents said, the inspiration for all the peoples of the earth. We, therefore, salute today not only the Polish soldiers here gathered, but also the one who fought so bravely side by side with our U.S. forces and our Western Allies on land, on the seas, and in the air, distinguishing himself in the battle of London; at Narvik, Norway; in Tobruk, Africa; on Monte Cassino, Italy; at La Falaise, France; at Arnhem, Holland, and on the high seas of the Atlantic.

We also resolve that this observance today is a fit occasion to renew the June 16, 1962, entreaties of the Supreme Council of the Polish American Congress at its sixth national meeting in Washington, D.C., directed to the White House and the Congress of the United States, that aid to the people of Poland be extended and not discontinued by our Government. We likewise renew our national body's representations to the effect that in a larger view of history, Poland, due to its geographic position, its national temper, and its thousand-year-old ties with Western culture and Christianity, is in fact, an invincible barrier in the path of pernicious Soviet designs for world conquest. Consequently, at this time, we also renew our hopes that our national administration, at an early date, will see fit to recognize Poland's western borders along the Odra-Nysa line, thereby removing the fears of the Polish people in their homeland, convincing them that German eastward aggression is definitely checked by the West. At this time we also repeat the stand taken by our national body in its statement of policy that we will accept no determination of Poland's boundaries which does not assure that nation not only her present Western boundary, but also the return to her of her territory on the east annexed by Soviet Russia.

And we finally resolve that the hereinabove described statements be forwarded in their entirety to the White House, to our Department of State, and our representatives in both Houses of the U.S. Congress.

ALEXANDER MACHOWSKI,
Commander, Polish Army Veterans Post No. 12 and Chairman of the Polish Soldiers Day Celebration.

LUCIAN F. PAZULSKI, Esq.,
Chairman of the Resolutions Committee.

West Virginia's Wonderful Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia, organizations within the State, and just plain ordinary citizens, have embarked upon a tremendous program of self-help.

This effort has been spurred by the climate of the Kennedy administration in Washington, where every cooperation has been afforded.

One of our self-help programs is an annual travel clinic. This year's clinic, conducted recently at Blackwater Falls State Park, was under the joint sponsorship of the upper Monongahela Valley Association and the Tucker County Development Association.

Three things became apparent as the clinic panelists unfolded their stories. They were:

First. West Virginia has a wonderful potential as the vacationland of the east-central United States.

Second. Private enterprise and public agencies are working together to provide more and better facilities for the tourist and to tell the story of West Virginia's vacationland features to an increasing number of prospects; and

Third. A wholesome attitude of State pride and confidence in the future grows as the date for the State's 100th birthday celebration comes nearer.

Many suggestions were made at the clinic. Some were outstanding. What is more to the point, those who attended the clinic are putting them into action.

Here is a list of the more outstanding suggestions:

First. Create some regional event—or attraction—that will hold the traveler in your area. Honey in the Rock and Civil War Showcase are two examples.

Second. Promote your festivals and fairs, not only in the area, but in the neighboring States and regions.

Third. Privately developed facilities can be successful. The need for good restaurants and for good lodgings will increase during the centennial year and in the years following.

Fourth. Search out the crafts people in your area. Well-designed items of ceramics, weaving, jewelry, woodworking, quilting, and other items are sought after by travelers. Help your handicraft people merchandise their products.

Fifth. Educate your own people, particularly those who have direct contact with the traveler. Special hospitality workshops can be arranged with the State department of vocational education.

Sixth. Push the cleanup campaign for 1962—the impression that West Virginia makes during 1963 will have a lasting effect on the State's future travel business.

Seventh. The tourist information center at Bluefield has proven worth while and the building of similar centers at other entry points in the State was urged.

Eighth. Good facilities and recreation areas not only attract tourists, but make the area an attractive one for industry. Industrial prospects consider recreational facilities as necessary.

Ninth. Local plants should be encouraged to arrange tours of their facilities for the tourist.

Tenth. Tour West Virginia yourself. Becoming familiar with the attractions that West Virginia has to offer will give you the enthusiasm to become a one-man chamber of commerce for the State.

Hon. Victor E. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great shock that I heard yesterday of the untimely passing of former Gov. Victor Anderson, of Nebraska. He died at the age of 60 apparently from a heart attack. He had been in poor health for the past few weeks.

Vic Anderson was a friend of mine, as, indeed, he was a friend of most Nebraskans. He was a fine man, an outstanding civic leader, and an outstanding and scrupulously ethical businessman in Lincoln, Nebr.

Vic had a long and distinguished career as a political figure in Nebraska. This career dates back to 1937 when he first served as a trustee for a sanitary district in Lancaster County. In 1948 he served one term as a member of the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature and made an outstanding record as a legislator.

After his term ended Vic wanted to go back into private life and to devote himself to his business activities which were widely varied. But his fellow citizens would not permit Vic to retire from public life. Less than a year later he was called upon to become mayor of Lincoln and again he performed an outstanding service to his community and his fellow citizens.

The job of mayor at that time demanded nearly full-time service by Vic, and paid $20 a month. But Vic was more than glad to serve because it was ingrained in his nature and being to perform such service.

In 1956 Vic was elected Governor of Nebraska and once again he did an outstanding job during his two terms in office. He helped the State through the trying times of growing pains that new industrial development and a sagging farm economy forced upon the Midwest. His service was unselfish in this and other areas.

Since 1958 Vic has more or less retired from public life although he has been an active civic leader in Lincoln and Lancaster County.

The State of Nebraska will miss Vic Anderson. I know that I speak for all of his friend when I say that I will miss him a great deal. Mrs. Weaver joins me in extending our sympathy to his wife, Betty, and son, Roger.

Multiple Use as a Concept of Land Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Second Congressional District which I am proud to represent in the Congress contains approximately 12½ million acres of national forest lands. This constitutes about half of the national forests in all of California. Mr. Charles A. Connaughton is the regional forester who is responsible for the vast national forest areas of California. Mr. Connaughton is highly respected as an outstanding administrator of our national forest resources.

The Forest Farmer, a national magazine devoted to forestry in practice and published by the Forest Farmers Association, has published an excellent article written by Mr. Connaughton entitled "Multiple Use as a Concept of Land Management."

I would like at this time to insert Mr. Conaughton's fine statement on the importance of multiple use to our national forests:

One of the earliest descriptions of multiple use as applied to American land management is attributed to Theodore Roosevelt. He said:

"All these various uses of our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated, and should be treated as a part of one coherent plan and not in haphazard and piecemeal fashion."

Multiple use is simply a concept of land use. It is not a system or method. As a concept, it is not subject to definitive description but when used it does indicate broad policy in terms of management direction. Within the concept of multiple use any one method or system of land use may be well and wisely employed.

The concept of multiple use involves the utilization of all the products and services of the land in such a way that realization of their combined value is obtained in a manner consistent with managerial objectives. This presupposes that the uses and services will be combined in a manner so that they are complementary insofar as attainable with concessions in the minor uses to the major ones where such action is necessary.

Multiple use is not intended to apply acre by acre. Instead, it applies to entire properties or at least to large units or blocks of individual properties. Nor does multiple use necessarily mean full use. Actually, the dominant or major value or use must be the primary guide to management, with subordinate uses developed to the maximum consistent with utilization of the main one. There often will be concessions on the part of all uses in order to work out the best combination of uses.

When conflicts arise, adjustments must take place in favor of the dominant use, at the same time securing maximum possible benefits from lesser uses. For example, in a forest primarily dedicated to timber production the yield of wildlife may need to be adjusted to something less than full potential to avoid adverse influence on timber. In turn, timber production may be adjusted somewhat in a downward direction to benefit some wildlife aspects. Multiple use, therefore, may be full use but also may be something considerably less.

This brief and oversimplified description of multiple use is presented to insure a common understanding of the concept. I regard this as basic to the development of the idea that the multiple-use concept demands strong consideration in applied forest management.

At this point, I want to say that good land management doesn't necessarily require application of this concept. In many situations, management objectives are such that multiple use isn't applicable. This can be a perfectly normal and desirable situation. For example, grazing of domestic livestock is incompatible with hardwood production in many situations.

However, when multiple use is consistent with management objectives, it is wise to practice it planwise. Where it is applicable it should be encouraged not only from the standpoint of being profitable to the landowner but also because it creates the best possible relations with the public.

With the foregoing explanation of multiple use at hand, I want to expand on why this concept should be applied. Particularly, I want to develop the relation of multiple use to public opinion and needed support for forestry measnres.

The public at large doesn't feel that we are suitable stewards for the Nation's forest land. This applies to publicly and privately owned lands alike, and is manifest by the strong and growing desire to place land under dedications for special services.

To illustrate, a considerable acreage of land in the country, including hardwood areas, is in hunting reservations. There is nothing wrong with this use of land and in most areas reasonable timber production can be achieved along with the game production. This combined use isn't always adopted by landowners, as verified by data available from the Northeast.

The Federal Land Bank of Boston recently released the results of a study of the management of forest land held by groups for various recreational purposes, including hunting. These group ownerships are very significant in that area. This study showed that only 41 percent of the organization camps and 34 percent of the sportsmen groups permit any logging on their lands. I am sure data pointing in a similar direction could be collected in other areas of the Nation. These are sufficient, however, to point up the job at hand, namely, that of convincing landowners, along with the general public, that timber production can be carried out in manner consistent with production of wildlife and recreation.

We simply must demonstrate in the management of forest lands that wood production, wildlife production, and recreation can be made compatible. Regrettably, the public has seen too many examples in the past where the coordination of these uses was not achieved. As a result, they are determined to secure commitments of dedications of land which will insure the fulfillment of their desires, such as for recreation to the exclusion of all else, particularly to the exclusion of all uses involving timber cutting.

In short, I want to emphasize that even though multiple use management may not always be essential or even desirable, it is still wise to apply this concept if at all possible.

Multiple use may or may not yield the maximum in direct financial return. However, even if it actually reduces direct returns it may in the long run far offset the cost by indirect benefit. By this statement, I mean that if multiple use will assist in obtaining good will and public support, it may be wise to practice it. The desirability of practicing multiple use under conditions which engender public interest and support is apparent even if such a decision actually adds to direct costs.

The advantages of public support in carrying out land management objectives are perfectly clear. Yet we constantly encounter situations where land management practices neglect or overlook public reaction and response. These situations are common on public and privately owned land alike. Any one circumstance isn't too important but their effects are cumulative and many small points of view can generate into one big one. From a land-management standpoint, it is imperative that this "big one" be oriented to favor the purposes of the enlightened land manager. One way to direct this properly is to employ the multiple use concept to the maximum consistent with the basic management objective of the ownership involved.

I'd like to call attention to institutional advertising of Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. as an illustration of enlightened self-interest. At frequent intervals multicolor, full-page advertising in support of this company appears in the national magazines. Study this advertising carefully. You'll find it does little to feature a specific product. Instead, much of the advertising is designed to create an image in the public mind that this company is a suitable steward for forest land. Incidentally, this is certainly a correct image.

This advertising features multiple use in developing this image. You'll usually find as backdrop to the advertisement a lovely forest scene from which forest products have been harvested. In this forest setting recreational and wildlife values will be featured. The net result is a picture of forest land being used in such a way that the interests of many people other than the stockholders are being served. This leading American company has decided that the public image must be created and shaped and that multiple use should be featured in the process. I regard this forward-looking action as one of the most impressive on the American forestry scene.

I selected Weyerhaeuser advertising to describe because it is good and effective, not because it is unique. There are other good examples reflecting the same approach. For instance, International Paper Co. recently issued a recreation guide to one of its tree farms. This is a fine job which shows that the company realizes that the public image needs to be shaped and one way to do this is by emphasizing the multiple use opportunities of forest land.

In applying multiple use, the management systems employed must result in high levels of achievement on the land. There is no point in adopting any management concept unless the evidence of its use doesn't react favorably on the land.

In this respect, I've no detailed, specific suggestions to make because of tremendous variations which are encountered on the land. As a generalization, however, I feel very strongly that regardless of what our standards of land management are today, they aren't high enough to meet the needs of tomorrow. Those of us responsible for land management results have the obligation, therefore, to raise our standards of land use and, preferably, in the multiple use pattern. This increase in standards can be expected to yield a proportionate increase in returns either direct or indirect.

Actually, raising standards isn't as difficult as it might seem. Our level of knowledge is constantly being raised. Slowly, but consistently, through the processes of research and experience, we are improving techniques of land management. An alertness to this new fund of knowledge makes adjustment of standards feasible and possible.

Thus, far, I've made the point that nationwide we are in a rather critical period in relation to shaping the public image of forest land use. I've indicated that one important way to do this is to apply the multiple use concept in forest land management. I've emphasized that in applying the multiple use concept that direct costs might exceed direct returns but that indirect returns can be expected to outweigh greatly any expenditures.

Incidentally, some secondary returns for forest land management can be quite subtantial. I recently saw a quote from August issue of the Sport Fishing Institute Bulletin which stated that the sport fishing rights for salmon and trout from one bank of a stream in England sold for $59,552 for 1¼ miles.

There is no panacea, however, to meeting the problem of shaping the public image of forest management. Multiple use is just one approach. Where it will work it should be used and, furthermore, it should be featured. Where it is not applicable there is no point in trying to force it. The main point here is that there is a big job to do right away in shaping and directing public opinion either with or without multiple use.

Probably at no time in American history has the need for emphasis on this matter been greater. This is due to the fact that our population is increasing rapidly while our land base is static. This automatically places increasing public pressure on the land. Also, this increased population has more time than ever to become interested in the forest land whether or not they use it for recreational purposes. Actually, we've reached a point where the fit of the population to the land has become tight.

The decade of the 1960's therefore, will be a decade of decision for much forest land and many dedications of forest land will be requested and some will be made. We, as land managers, will be consulted when the decisions on these dedications are made only insofar as there is confidence in our ability as land managers to handle the forest so both its productivity and appearance is maintained.

No Runs for Your Money: Runproof Nylon Stockings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I should like to draw the attention of the Senate today to run-proof nylon stockings. I am not an expert in this field. Indeed, it is a new experience for me to take an interest—in my official capacity—in women's stockings.

Several months ago, two Denver women wrote to me about stockings. They said that the very sheer stockings which women wear nowadays do not wear well. Runs and snags occur almost as soon as the stockings are put on.

I checked with my wife and with the women in my office and found that such complaints were general.

I took the matter up with the Federal Trade Commission. Its Chairman advised that action is possible only if the stockings had been advertised fraudulently. I made telephone calls. I talked with an expert at the National Bureau of Standards who had helped to develop the original machine which measures the strength of stockings by denier and gage. This gentleman told me that stockings were measured accurately and that the increase in the frequency of runs was due to the increased demand for lighter, sheerer stockings.

I am most pleased, therefore, to note that the Swiss have developed a process for making runproof nylon stockings. There have recently been two most interesting articles on the subject, one by Phyllis Nibling published in Empire, the magazine section of the Sunday Denver Post, and the other by Rosalind Massow, which was published in Parade magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Sunday Denver (Colo.) Post, July 8, 1962]

A Running Battle Won?—New Runproof Hosiery Gets Dissenters' Nod

(By Phyllis Nibling)

Two Denver women who carried their runing battle with the nylon hosiery industry to the U.S. Senate are about ready to call a truce.

The industry has capitulated—or, at least, it has come out with a new process for making sheer mesh runproof stockings in 20 deniers which may mend matters with Mrs. Ruth Engstrom and Mrs. Vernie C. O'Grady—and the 64,607,000 other American women who wear stockings.

Mrs. Engstrom and Mrs. O'Grady, employees of the Denver U.S. National Bank, became spokesmen for runner-weary womanhood last winter when both wrote indignant letters to U.S. Senator John A. Carroll.

It must have been refreshing to Senator Carroll to find letters that had nothing to do with the national debt, medicare, or atomic bomb testing.

Their subject was much closer to a woman's purse and good temper.

"What," demanded Mrs. O'Grady, "can we, as consumers do about this worldwide 'fraud' in ladies hosiery?"

Mrs. Engstrom's complaint was more poetic but no less emphatic. She wrote:

I'm mighty tired of working
And spending what I got
Just to keep my legs in
Some no-good-wearing socks * * *
Every night upon the shower rod
There hangs a lonely sock.
To see two hanging there
Would be a dreadful shock.

Senator Carroll, "a man with three generations of girls in his immediate family," was sympathetic. His answer:

"Your poem is clear
And so my dear,
  I'll send it to Rand Dixon
And ask that he
Alert for me
  The Federal Trade Commission."

Mr. Dixon is FTC Chairman, and being used to scanning the rhymes of TV and radio commercials, was not taken aback by the meter in his mail. But, alas, he could only report that, so far as the FTC was concerned, the hosiery manufacturers were not consciously practicing "fraud" on the women of the United States.

"We feel that this Commission may not properly under existing legislation establish quality standards for ladies' hosiery or require hosiery manufacturers to label their products as conforming to any existing quality standards," he wrote.

"As a result of our experience with this industry it is our understanding that the wearability of hosiery is to a large extent determined by the denier and gage."

Senator Carroll, meanwhile, talked to a National Bureau of Standards engineer who had helped develop a machine to measure the strength of stockings by denier and gage.

"He told me the industry was still giving fair measurements, but he said the women demand very light, flimsy stockings," the Senator reported. "That's what the man said."

And, although he felt the question was "legitimate and serious, affecting millions of working women and housewives," the Senator could go no further. The problem seemed to be that 70 percent of American women wanted sheer seamless stockings, and there was simply no way of making them runproof.

Well, the matter ended there. Mrs. Engstrom and Mrs. O'Grady each went back to washing out a single stocking at night—the other had usually been tossed into the wastebasket—and muttering about the fashion that dictated that they had to wear sheer nylons in this most impractical of worlds.

And then, miracle of miracles, the nylon hosiery industry came out with its new process.

Last week, Mrs. Engstrom and Mrs. O'Grady were both wearing the first of the new nonrun stockings to arrive in Denver, courtesy of the May-D. & F.

They were almost ecstatic. For the first time in many a moon, the ladies reported each had worn one pair of stockings for 3 days running, or rather, without running.

"You can't make them run," Mrs. O'Grady said. And, in a drastic demonstration for a Denver Post photographer, she took a sharpened wooden pencil and rammed it through one of her stockings.

Then she tugged at the hole in all directions: No runners appeared.

Naturally, though, there was that hole.

That the hosiery manufacturers warn, is the one problem with the new nylons. They won't run, but they certainly will snag, and if the snag, is rough enough, they'll get holes.

(The New York Times, sad to tell, reports that Macy's bureau of standards has made the runless hosiery run. However, they seem to have put it through much more stringent tests than the average woman ever will—unless she makes a habit of wading through bramble patches.)

Secret of the new hosiery is a micromesh technique developed by a German inventor 9 years ago. His patents had been tied up until last June when a Hanes official managed to get hold of them.

Other companies jumped on the bandwagon when word of the new stocking process got around and developed their own knitting machines. The result is that seamless mesh hosiery is now going on sale for the first time—or will be as soon as local stores get their stocks in.

The news of a runless stocking seems to have caused the biggest "run," pardon the word, on hosiery since nylons came back on the open market after World War II.

A survey of six Denver department stores last week showed that all had the new nylons on order if not in stock. Some had incoming stocks already accounted for in held orders.

"The quantities available in the new runless stockings are limited for the present time due to the manufacturers having to change over their machines," Bill Carsen, hosiery buyer for May-D. & F., said. "What sizes and colors we don't have will be available in 2 to 3 weeks, so we invite the customer to leave her order for later delivery."

Apparently many costumers are leaving orders, and most stores reported a "great many" inquiries.

"I think there's been a lot of publicity on them that people are interpreting wrong," Mrs. Inez Bolding of Fontius said. "They won't run, but they will snag. But even so, they should give very good wear."

Mrs. Bolding, incidentally, claims to have gotten up to 3 months' wear out of a single pair of ordinary 15-denier hose, wearing them daily and washing them out at night, which sounds like getting 100 miles to the gallon on an air-conditioned limousine. But she says it's not unusual for her.

"It's all in the way you take them off and put them on," Mrs. Bolding said. "Taking them off is when most people snag their stockings. And girdles that put a taut strain on stockings make them run more easily."

Most of the major hosiery companies are coming out with no-run, runproof, runless, or nonrun stockings, and at least four brands will be available in Denver within a month.

They will be available only in medium lengths in some brands and in a limited color selection. Prices range from $1.65 to $1.95 a pair.

In appearance, they're hard to tell from regular sheers, although on close inspection the tiny mesh pattern does show up. But from an ordinary point of view, few people should be able to tell whether they're 15-denier sheers or 26-denier mesh.

Senator Carroll, the man who got involved in this feminine furor, says he cheers the new stockings—but still has lingering doubts.

"All stockings wear out eventually," he cautioned. "But I certainly hope the ladies will like them. It will make life easier for a lot of people and save them money they can ill afford to waste."

[From Parade magazine]

Something New in Stockings

(By Rosalind Massow)

Ladies, there's a new stocking in your future. It's runless, seamless and, what's more, it's here now.

Every woman who has ever known the frustration of a last minute rush to get dressed, only to find she's hooked a run in her last pair of nylons, will greet with a sigh of relief the announcement that the era of the runless stocking is about to begin.

So throw away the clear nail polish, girls, that snag is no longer always fatal.

Not since nylons emerged from the test tube in 1939 has anything so important been done for female legs and pocketbooks as these stockings. Conservative hosiery manufacturers predict that they'll outlast present hose four to one.

WHAT THEY LOOK LIKE

On the leg, runless hose looks like any other mesh stocking; in the hand, you can tell the weave is different. Because of a locked-stitch construction, the stocking has a thicker texture than regular seamless mesh and is a little heavier. In some respects it is similar to service-weight hose, but hosiery makers hope to produce a sheerer stocking.

While the new hose is being sold in some cities now, it won't be readily available until fall.

So anxious are women to try the new stocking that one store in San Francisco reports it ran out of 1,200 pairs of runless in 4 hours. Is all the hoopla justified? Just how good are these stockings?

Recognizing the possible significance of the new development but still preserving a natural skepticism, Parade recently sat in on several demonstrations given by competitive hosiery companies.

We saw stockings put through a testing hell, and we concluded that if you're the kind of person who likes to climb barbed wire fences, walk through fields of thorned wild roses, hang your hose up to dry on fish hooks or scratch your stockinged leg with a cheese grater—then these are definitely the stockings for you. They snag, but they don't ordinarily run.

Or if your daily routine calls for burning a hole in your hose with a cigarette, running a nail file through your nylons or maybe hooking them with big safety pins, you'll wind up with holes but no runs.

If, on the other hand, your routine is sort of normal, you'll get better wear from these stockings. They won't run, for example, on a dance floor when a clumsy oaf steps on your ankle, or when inadvertently you brush up against a rough chair or maybe even hook your hose on a charm bracelet.

The truth is that these no-runs don't carry a lifelong guarantee or anything like it. You can get holes in your hose and you can snag them, but they are more durable than regular seamless stockings and for that reason deserve a hearing. A Parade test showed that they will run if you make a hole in the leg part and then stretch them with all your might, as in a tug of war.

The average woman buys 12.4 pairs of stockings a year, and many women don't wear hose all the time because they can't afford to take the chance of tearing them. The runless will be more expensive, up to $1.95 a pair, but they'll last longer.

If these runless stockings do result in revolutionizing the manufacture of ladies' hose it won't be the first time. There have been many milestones in the long and interesting history of female leg gear.

Silk stockings caught the fancy of Queen Elizabeth in 1560, but it wasn't until the 18th century that they made their way over to this country. However, only wealthy women could afford them. Nylons kayoed the silk hose just before World War II and have been the champ ever since. It's still possible to buy silk stockings in the United States. One company says it sold 25,000 pairs of silk last year, compared to the industry's total sale of 804 million pairs of nylon.

FROM STOCKINGS TO PARACHUTES

The first nylons right before World War II were just as strong as the current runless hose. They weren't as sheer as silk. but they lasted. When the war came and nylons went to battle as parachutes and gunpowder bags, women couldn't buy them anymore. Nylon stockings were so coveted they became a medium of exchange for rare and expensive items. The story is told that Gen. Mark Clark took nylons with him to north Africa as a means of persuading an admiral there to help in the allied invasion.

When the war ended and nylons went back to ladies' legs, women accused manufacturers of producing inferior hose. One lady was so incensed by the fragility of her nylons that she wrote a letter to the editor of a New York newspaper suggesting that when the Army-McCarthy hearings were over the committee remain in session to investigate why nylon stockings ran so easily. Truth was, of course, that the stronger prewar stockings were much heavier and less flattering than the thin sheers now in vogue.

Probably that lady letterwriter, like millions of other women, is still worrying about the problem—and eager to get her first look at the new stockings. If so, there's sure to be a run on runless this fall.

Carded Yarn Association Tells Its Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received more information on still another U.S. industry that feels the serious injury being inflicted because of our trade policies.

I have tried repeatedly to warn of the dangers involved in the passage of any Trade Expansion Act that ignores the economic facts of life.

The Carded Yarn Association has a story to tell that ought to interest every Member:

The Carded Yarn Association, Inc.,
Charlotte, N.C., August 13, 1962.

Hon. J. H. Dent,
Representative from Pennsylvania,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Dent: On Wednesday, August 8, 1962, the executive committee and the import task committee of the Carded Yarn Association met in a joint meeting at Charlotte, N.C. The purpose was to discuss the problems arising from the tremendous volume of carded yard being imported into the United States from foreign sources.

At this meeting Mr. W. R. Austin read the inclosed editorial written by Mr. J. Craig Smith, for the Avondale Sun and published as a guest editorial in the Birmingham, Ala., paper. The figures showing the import of yarn by individual countries, was also discussed in detail.

It was the unanimous opinion of the mill owners gathered at this meeting that each Member of Congress would appreciate the information presented and I was directed to forward this information to you. The members of both committees thought you would be interested in seeing how foreign countries are exporting textiles, whose greatest value lies in the raw material contained therein, to the United States to receive the advantage of the cotton differential.

If this association can be of assistance in keeping you informed of any yarn statistics please feel free to call upon us.

Yours very truly,

J. H. Campbell,
Executive Vice President.

"GOOD FAITH IS AT STAKE

"(By J. Craig Smith)

"Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, Assistant to the President Myer Feldman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Hickman Price, Jr., and other representatives of the Kennedy administration have repeatedly told our industry that under the long-term Geneva arrangement cotton textile imports would be held for 3 years to what came in during the Government's fiscal year which ended June 30, 1961, and that for the remaining 2 years of the arrangement there would be an increase of 5 percent per year. A rereading of the letter that President Kennedy wrote Congressman Carl Vinson dated February 26, 1962, would bring any reasonable person to the conclusion that the members of the Kennedy administration who made statements to our industry were speaking with the knowledge and authority of the President.

"During the Government's fiscal year which ended June 30, 1961, total textile imports came in equivalent to 430,000 bales of cotton. During the first 5 months of 1962, the equivalent of 295,000 bales of cotton has come in. Preliminary figures indicate that the relentless tide of cotton textile imports continued to rise during June and July. If imports continue at this rate, more than 700,000 bales will be imported during 1962 instead of the 430,000-bale ceiling we were promised.

"The major reason for this all-time high in textile imports is due to the tremendous windfall that comes to the importer because of the difference in price paid for cotton by the U.S. mill and the foreign mill. So long as an extra profit of $42.50 a bale can be made on cotton textile imports, the incentive to violate the Geneva arrangement makes it almost impossible to enforce that arrangement. This fact is apparent to any thinking person.

"In point four of President Kennedy's program for the textile industry, he recognized the need for eliminating or offsetting the disadvantage the U.S. mill is in in respect to its raw material cost. In November of 1961, he asked the Tariff Commission to investigate whether or not an 8½-cent offset fee should be imposed on textile imports. He asked for this investigation in November of 1961. It is now August 3, 1962 and no action has been taken. This same Tariff Commission took less than 60 days to determine that more than two bales of imported cotton in the form of picker lap was hurt-

ful to the cotton price support program and must be stopped. How much longer is needed to determine that imports at the rate of 700,000 bales are breaking the back of the American cotton industry and negating the raw cotton price support program? What action does President Kennedy have in mind to implement his commitments to the cotton industry?"

The Carded Yarn Association, Inc., published import figures through June 30, 1962

Country	Short-term Geneva agreement quota versus actual imports, Oct. 1, 1961 through June 30, 1962	
	Carded	Combed
Portugal:		
Quota	5,289,000	2.353.000
Imports	10,374,480	1.923,811
Colombia:		
Quota	0	0
Imports	2,295,732	94,295
Israel:		
Quota	419,000	0
Imports	1,543,310	169,119
Egypt:		
Quota	849,000	44.000
Imports	2,086,015	401,390
Mexico:		
Quota	408,000	0
Imports	1,178,629	0
Taiwan:		
Quota	0	0
Imports	1,000,000	0
France:		
Quota	816,000	25,000
Imports	733,678	4,836
Spain:		
Quota	1,427,000	123,000
Imports	237,208	402,237
Switzerland:		
Quota	55,000	113,000
Imports	22,095	181,047
Italy:		
Quota	94,000	8,000
Imports	176,433	320
United Kingdom:		
Quota	1,000	88,000
Imports	1,000	58,716
Lebanon:		
Quota	4,000	0
Imports	50,809	0
Belgium:		
Quota	2,000	1,000
Imports	200	17,546
Greece:		
Quota	0	0
Imports	0	116,976
West Germany:		
Quota	1,000	2,000
Imports	0	83,826
East Germany:		
Quota	0	0
Imports	19,606	0
Canada:		
Quota	0	0
Imports	33.930	0
All others:		
Quota	411.000	34.000
Imports	6,000	2,693
Total:		
Quota	9,776,000	2.791.000
Imports	19,759,125	3.456,812

THE CARDED YARN ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Charlotte, N.C., August 8, 1962.

The executive committee of the Carded Yarn Association, meeting in Charlotte, N.C., today to consider the problem created by the flood of imported yarns took note of the interim report of President Kennedy's Textile Advisory Committee, as quoted in the Charlotte Observer.

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, Chairman, reporting to the President for the Committee noted that the Committee, "is as much as ever concerned to press forward with the full range of measures proposed in your program of May 2, 1961," and "in particular, we would wish to note that the differential in the price of cotton purchased by domestic producers and the price paid by foreign producers continues to result in severe import pressures on the American market."

Under present Government policies foreign spinners buy American cotton 8½ cents per pound or $42.50 per bale cheaper than can American spinners.

W. R. Austin, president of the Carded Yarn Association speaking for his committee, said that the impact of imports on the carded yarn industry is dramatically illustrated by published Department of Commerce figures which show that as of June 30, 1962, 19,759,125 pounds of carded yarn had been imported in the first 9 months of the short term international textile agreement against a 12-month quota of 9,776,000 pounds.

The executive committee is convinced that the import offset fee is the most effective means of restricting excessive imports of carded yarns and urges immediate and favorable action by the Tariff Commission and the President.

Nebraska Farmer Speaks Out on the CED Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Committee on Economic Development, CED, issued a highly controversial report on agriculture. They produced what they call a solution to the farm problem.

In the August 4 issue of the Nebraska Farmer, a publication which reaches 9 out of every 10 farm families in Nebraska and is widely read and highly respected both in Nebraska and elsewhere in the Midwest, there appears a penetrating commentary on this program. I would like to point out that unlike some other journals devoted to agriculture, the Nebraska Farmer is published by a man who is himself a farmer.

Mr. Glenn Buck, publisher, is a farmer, a landowner and a man who personally supervises his operation. He is knowledgeable on the subject of farming and knows a good deal about agricultural economics, not only through reading about the problems and the possible solutions but also from practical and personal experience.

Because this editorial appears in a highly respected magazine published by a man who is thoroughly and competently conversant with farming and farm problems, I believe that it would be well for my colleagues in the House to read the editorial.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

THIS FARM PROPOSAL A "GASSER"

"Apparently the way to solve the farm problem is to line up 2 million farmers and shoot them."

That's the way one farmer sized up the recent statement of a group called the Committee for Economic Development on its recommendations for farm economic adjustment.

The Committee recommended that 2 million workers be moved off farms in the next 5 years. It also recommended "immediate reduction of the prices of wheat, cotton, rice, and feed grains so that farmers will not be misled by high price supports into retaining excessive resources in agriculture."

The most charitable thing we can say about the Committee is that it is badly misinformed. There are three resources that go into agricultural production: (1) Land, (2) capital, (3) human labor. The record shows that removal of a portion of the people who supply the human labor has absolutely no effect on the surplus production that is at the core of agriculture's problems. For many years, people have been moving out of farming—and farm production has been increasing.

There are many other reasons why the Committee's proposals are repugnant. For instance, what would such a program do to the family farm? What would it do to unemployment in this country which already has a sizable unemployment problem? Where would displaced farmers go to earn their living? How much would the program speed the decay of small—even medium-sized—towns?

But again let's be charitable and analyze it as just a poorly informed proposal that would not work. And let's add that it certainly should not be given serious consideration by anyone as a solution to the problems of agriculture.

Perhaps a look at the connections of some of the men on the Committee may give a clue to why it got so far off the beam. On the research and policy subcommittee which formulated the recommendations are representatives of automobile manufacturers, an encyclopedia publisher, life insurance companies, department stores, a business machine manufacturer, and a number of other companies whose names do not automatically identify their types of business. Such folks are getting into a strange field when they attempt to become experts in agriculture.

The presence of representatives of a mail order house, a power company, an oil company and some others who likely do business with farmers is difficult to understand. However, it is encouraging to note that some of these submitted "memoranda of comment, reservation or dissent," according to the Committee's statement.

Less difficult to understand is that the Committee had professional assistance from economists from such institutions as Harvard University, Northwestern University, and the University of Chicago. An economist from Michigan State University is also listed, and it would seem he should be better informed since Michigan State is closely in touch with agriculture. But perhaps he was overpowered by other economists who could hardly be expected to be well informed about farming.

The Triumph of Cloture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Triumph of Sense in the Senate," published in the New York Herald Tribune of August 15, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Triumph of Sense in the Senate

Yesterday, for the first time since 1927, the Senate voted to invoke cloture. It was a close thing, 63 to 27, just above two-thirds of those present and voting, but nevertheless convincing.

Thus the Senate, under bipartisan leadership, affirmed that it is overwhelmingly in favor of the administration measure to set up a privately owned, Government-regulated corporation for launching and operating satellites in a world communications system. Telstar, of course, is only the beginning.

No doubt there were plenty of Senators who voted against the filibuster reluctantly. For this is the weapon of the minority, and what Senator knows when the roadblock of interminable laryngeal exercise may not be useful to his lights and purposes?

Yet it has been often said that the Senate can always cut down the filibuster whenever it is strongly and genuinely of the mood for action. So the filibuster, when it succeeds, is evidence of the lack of united, overwhelming opinion. That is the theory, at least, for allowing this restrictive device.

But in the matter of the communications satellite bill, the plain fact is that the great majority wants it. The giveaway hobgoblin didn't frighten. Just as the House voted almost unanimously for the bill, argument after argument has piled up that there is nothing horrendous or revolutionary about extending the present setup in communications facilities. For this country has been served well so far, and the idea of Government and private industry collaborating in this part of the space program, with a monopoly for neither, sounds exciting and practical.

Certainly Government operation has been zealously avoided heretofore in the communications arts, and with excellent result. And for this reason the Senate decided that the Wayne Morse circus had run long enough.

In short, the filibuster can be overcome when the pressure of responsibility is great enough. The Senate is to be congratulated for this triumph of sense.

Sacred Hall of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained permission from the Reader's Digest to use an article which appeared in their July 1962 publication, entitled "Sacred Hall of Independence," and as the Representative of that part of Philadelphia in which Independence Hall is located I would like to share the recognition of this historic edifice with all of my colleagues. It is an extremely interesting and well written article and I commend it to all Americans:

Sacred Hall of Independence

(By Paul Friggens)

Here, on July 4, 1776, was adopted the Declaration, from which flow all the blessings of our life and land.

Some time ago guards at Independence Hall in Philadelphia noticed that a graying, shabby little woman came in frequently to visit this national shrine. Then they discovered that on occasion she would leave a dollar bill beside the Liberty Bell. Questioned, the refugee from an Iron Curtain country explained in halting English, "Now I know what freedom mean to me, I give something back."

Every year more than 1,500,000 visitors, including 50,000 from abroad, make their pilgrimage to this spot marked simply by a tablet at the entrance: "Birthplace of the United States of America." A Wyoming ranch family, driving through Philadelphia late one night, wanted to see the shrine and asked a policeman for directions. After dark the Liberty Bell is spotlighted through glass-paneled doors, and the Wyoming couple and their youngsters stood in rapture. "They'd come so far that I opened the doors and let them in to touch the Bell," says Guard Joe Ostrowski. Equally inspired was a blind war veteran, as his wife guided his fingers over the raised inscription on the Bell: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Today Independence Hall has come to symbolize the rights of free men everywhere. "Ah, the Bell," Premier David Ben-Gurion of Israel cried, and started to examine it. He stopped short. "But am I worthy to touch it?"

Historian Carl Van Doren points out that in Independence Hall the United States was created on July 4, 1776, with the framing of the Declaration of Independence, and perpetuated on September 17, 1787, with the adoption of our Constitution. Here also we created a Continental Army and Navy, adopted the Stars and Stripes as our Nation's flag and established the temporary capital of the United States.

In recent years Independence Hall was rundown and surrounded by slums. Now an eight-block jungle of firetraps and dilapidated shops has been razed to give it a dignified setting in a new Independence National Historical Park. Some 110 structures in the Federal park, including a 10-story office building, have already been leveled in a bold $30 million project first sparked by civic and patriotic organizations banded together as the Independence Hall Association. The park will preserve perhaps a score of other treasured buildings and sites in "America's most historic square mile." Eventually the shrine will be fully restored, with imposing mall, brick walls, wrought-iron fences and serpentine, shaded walks as in the late 18th century.

The noble old two-story Georgian building, erected between 1732 and 1753 as the Pennsylvania State House, is commencing to look fresh and prideful again. The National Park Service has peeled off some 60 coats of paint in places, and is carefully investigating the fabric and physical history of the edifice. Its researchers have pored over musty records here and abroad to piece together all that happened in this stately building. "There's no more stirring story," says Park Superintendent Melford O. Anderson, "and Americans ought to know it better."

Step into the historic assembly room with its high colonial windows, twin fireplaces, green-covered desks and quill pens, together with the commanding portrait of George Washington by Charles Willson Peale, and the American Revolution comes alive again.

The Revolution, said John Adams, occurred "in the minds and hearts of the people." King George III and his ministers provoked the people with harsh customs regulations and a stamp tax on everything from newspapers to playing cards. The crowning blow came with the British Parliament's insistence on legislating for the Colonies "in all cases whatsoever."

In September 1774, 12 of the 13 Colonies dispatched delegations of leading citizens to an assembly in Philadelphia to seek redress for their grievances. (Georgia did not participate until the next year.) Philadelphia was then a "greene towne" on the edge of the wilderness. It was plagued by insufferable summer heat, horseflies, and the dread yellow fever, but it boasted 35,000 inhabitants, cobbled streets, a thriving commerce, and culture. It was to become the center of American resistance.

From their hostels the delegates walked to Carpenters' Hall for their first meeting as the Continental Congress. They adopted a manifesto of grievances, pledged support to the beleaguered people of Boston, embargoed British goods, and petitioned the King to restore the "rights of Englishmen."

The following spring, on April 19, 1775, the thin line of embattled minutemen at Lexington and Concord stood fast against a detachment of redcoats sent to seize some military stores, and the Second Continental Congress convened under a cloud of war. Gathering for the first time in the State House, Congress chose George Washington as general and commander in chief of the ragtag Continental Army, and addressed a final olive-branch appeal to Britain.

The Revolution took a decisive turn on June 7, 1776. On instructions from his Virginia Convention, Richard Henry Lee rose in the State House to propose a dramatic resolution: "That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States." The resolution loosed a torrent of debate.

After days of bitter argument delegates favoring independence won out, and a five-man committee, including Benjamin Franklin and John Adams, was selected to draft a declaration "setting forth the causes which impelled us to this mighty resolution." One of its members, 33-year-old Thomas Jefferson, was asked to write the document. So this lanky, redheaded Virginian toiled between June 11 and June 28 in a second-floor room of a German bricklayer's house, penning the finest statement of democratic principles in all history.

On July 3, Jefferson slipped into a rear seat in the Assembly Room and listened while Congress took up his draft of the Declaration. Written in Jefferson's neat, clear hand, it was an eloquent series of charges against the Crown, but what breathed eternal fire into it and stirred the Congress was this passage: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." And again, the immutable principle that government derives its powers "from the consent of the governed." This is the heart of American democracy.

Congress spent nearly 2 days pruning and editing the document. But in the end the lofty sentiment, timeless philosophy and cadenced phrasing of the Declaration remained almost wholly Jefferson's—and wholly American. John Adams called it "the very essence of the American mind." It was afternoon, July 4, when Congress, mutually pledging "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honour," unanimously adopted the Declaration, ordering it to be published and proclaimed.

Legend has it that on July 4, 1776, an old bellman stood in the steeple of Independence Hall, eagerly awaiting the signal from a boy stationed at the assembly room door. As the Congress jubilantly approved the Declaration, the boy shouted, "Ring, Grandfather, ring!" And so, it is said, our liberty was first proclaimed to the world.

Today, on rare state occasions, the Liberty Bell is tapped with a rubber mallet, and its muted tone has been recorded for posterity. But its real message is symbolic. As the guides tell tens of thousands of visitors to Independence Hall, "The Liberty Bell reminds each of us not only of our rights and privileges but also of our duties and responsibilities."

On July 4, 1826, the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams died within a few minutes of each other—first, 83-year-old Jefferson, at Monticello; then, in Quincy, Mass., hardy John Adams, at 91. Shortly before, when a group of citizens asked Adams for a watchword for the 50th-anniversary celebration, he had offered a toast that is meaningful to all liberty-loving people. "I give you," said the old patriot, "independence forever."

Judicial Methods of Dealing With Juvenile Delinquents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of Senators an excellent editorial entitled "This Judge Talks the Right Language," published on August 3, 1962, in the Woonsocket Call.

Lately there has been on my mind—and I am sure it has been on the minds of many others—the problems of juvenile delinquency. Frankly, we hear from the law enforcement authorities that our judicial system has coddled those juvenile delinquents who willfully destroy and harm property and people. However, I am proud to say that in my home State of Rhode Island there has been initiated a family court which can best be summarized as a combination of the juvenile court and divorce calendar of the superior court system.

This court has functioned since its inception in an extremely effective manner. One of the most important reasons for this is because of the high caliber of the men who sit upon its bench. I am sure that you will agree with me, Mr. President, that some old-fashioned straight-from-the-shoulder talk to delinquent young men sometimes proves very effective. Therefore, I commend Judge DeCiantis, and ask that this editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Woonsocket (R.I.) Call and Evening Reporter, Aug. 3, 1962]

THIS JUDGE TALKS THE RIGHT LANGUAGE

Recalcitrant teenagers would be better off if they were handled as judiciously as a quintet of young Warwick punks. Accused of harassing a residential neighborhood in the Buttonwoods section of the city, they found themselves before Judge Michael DeCiantis of the family court.

"If I sink my teeth into you, brother, they'll stay there," the judge warned the youths. "I'm going to break up this band and I'm going to do it my way."

That may seem like strong language, but it undoubtedly is language the youths can understand. The judge warned them that if they so much as see or speak to each other again they will be sent to the Rhode Island Training School for Boys.

What happened in Warwick is that a group of seven youths constantly harassed householders to the point where neighbors armed themselves with brooms and golf clubs in self-defense. Charges against two of the youngsters were dismissed, but the other five, one of whom is 15 and the other four 17, were brought before Judge DeCiantis.

We think the judge probably put them on the right path and it is significant that he pointed out the relationship between school dropouts, unemployment and delinquency. All five of the boys dropped out of school during the last year and none was employed when the trouble took place. The judge instructed them either to return to school or to get jobs.

The case involving Buttonwoods is not isolated, as we read of similar instances in other areas from time to time. When we do, we're always gratified to know that youngsters in this area are pretty sensible when it comes to living in a civilized society. In mentioning the case at Buttonwoods, therefore, we again happily point with pride to youngsters in Greater Woonsocket who, in general, appear to have their feet on the ground.

But those with any wild ideas may find themselves before Judge DeCiantis, who seems to know just how to handle such cases.

The Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a number of distinguished Members of the House have introduced identical quality stabilization bills in the 87th Congress. It is my privilege to join them in so doing.

The quality stabilization bill, as enacted, will equalize certain rights and opportunities in the distribution of branded articles; it will further the advancement of independent retailing; it will help consumers to have a true standard of value combining both quality and fair price, for the things they buy; it will discourage monopoly by promoting competition; it will help the national economy.

The bill would give manufacturers of branded goods certain rights. For example, it would permit a brand owner to establish a price, or a range of prices, below or above which his branded product may not be resold.

This is a right that is already enjoyed by many brand owners—but not by the great majority of brand owners.

Some $30 billion of goods are sold at retail each year in the United States by brand owners who lawfully established the absolute price at which these goods could be resold at retail. These brand owners include the great retail chains of the country. They own private brands—private in the sense that these brands are sold only in the stores of the respective chains. In each case, the chain establishes a uniform price for a particular branded article, notwithstanding differences in operating cost among the various outlets of the chain. In the case of the chain, this is considered good business. There are other brand owners who lawfully establish the price at which their products are sold to the consumer. These include companies which sell brushes, perfume, electrical appliances, etc., house to house through canvassers, and the publishers of newspapers and magazines that sell on consignment. The list can be continued indefinitely. These brand owners have one thing in common: They not only own certain brands, they also own or control the means for distributing them.

The quality stabilization bill which I have introduced extends the same rights to individuals, partnerships, and corporations who are brand owners but who do not own or control the means for distributing their brands. They do not own the distribution system—which includes not only chains, supermarkets, and the like but also, and most importantly, the nearly 2 million independent retailers who make up the bulk of most business. These brand owners, and the members of their distribution systems, rightfully believe that they, too, should have the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of uniform but competitive pricing. I say competitive pricing because my bill requires that a branded product—to be eligible for application of the provisions of the bill—must be in free and open competition with articles of the same general class produced by others. This requirement, incidentally, need not be met by brand owners who also own or control the means for distributing their branded products. What this bill would promote is more competition—but fair competition. The small, independent retailer would have a better chance to compete effectively, and therefore, successfully because he would be given a better opportunity to sell, and at a reasonable profit, the bread and butter items on which his existence depends. I mean, of course, the big, popular, best-seller brands of the marketplace—the brands that some outlets like to sell at low, low prices—even at severe losses—in order to entice customers into their stores. In other words, quality stabilization would restore a real measure of integrity into the marketplace. And integrity of marketing practices is the American shopper's finest guarantee of fair dealing, of honest values.

There is a social as well as an economic aspect to the quality stabilization bill. I know something about independent merchants for I have been a director of the Community Chest in my own community. I know that the independent merchants of the community contribute substantially in time, talent, and money to all the good works of the community—including the Community Chest. They probably give 10 times as much as absentee-owned retail chains to the Community Chest in the community—when giving is compared on the basis of so many dollars contribution for every thousand dollars per year of sales. Who replaces the independent merchant when he is driven out of business—largely because he does not have enough dollars in sales to compete against the tactics of price-juggling absentee operators?

I have never heard a customer complain that she cannot shop around for the lowest price of a particular chain brand because every chain outlet in her territory charges exactly the same price for that brand at a given time. A chain, however big it is, simply could not afford to charge various prices in its many outlets for the identical brand. It would lose its reputation for fair dealing at once. As a matter of fact, all the reputable stores in the United States have a one-price-to-every-customer policy. It is a policy in which mass distribution has developed more and more to keep pace with the advancing technologies that have made mass production possible. It is a policy that has assisted in making the United States the world's greatest consumer market.

The quality stabilization bill offers an extension of the one-price-to-every-customer policy. It promotes orderly marketing; it promotes more effective marketing; it promotes the economy. It will be good for our country.

Secretary Rusk's Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members of Congress will read the excellent address on American foreign policy delivered by the distinguished Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Convention in Minneapolis, Minn., on August 13, 1962.

The text of the address was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, 1962, at page A6232, by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD.

I should like to include in the RECORD an outstanding editorial concerning Secretary Rusk's address from the Washington Daily News of August 15, 1962.

The editorial follows:

SECRETARY RUSK'S JOB

Anyone fearful of U.S. appeasement of the Soviets should note the address of Secretary of State Rusk before the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Minneapolis:

"We are prepared to discuss ways and menas for reducing tensions in central Europe * * * but we will not be forced, harassed or squeezed out of West Berlin.

"Disarmament must be achieved * * * with fully adequate assurance that agreements are fully carried out. * * * We see no way in which the abolition of all nuclear testing can be achieved unless the Soviet Union is ready to abandon its obsession with secrecy."

The address was Secretary Rusk's answer to his "no win" critics in both parties who challenge all manner of negotiations with the Soviets.

"No one has to convince us," he said, "that the contest between Communist imperialism and freedom is for keeps. * * * Of course we intend to win. * * * Our hope and purpose is to win without a great war and the damage which the weapons of today would inflict upon the human race—a military climax to this struggle is to be prevented if possible."

Mr. Rusk's job, simply stated, is to protect our national interest without war. If he fails, then the military takes over. It is his duty to negotiate, even when the chances of progress are dim and the bad faith of the opposition is obvious.

Our superior arms are our best guarantee against attack and Secretary Rusk's most powerful, if unspoken, argument. But patient negotiation, seeking to reason away provocations, is another line of defense against war which, even though won, would case us vast suffering and material damage.

Mr. Rusk's "no win" critics, it seems to us, abandon all hope in diplomacy without giving it a chance. Their fears as to risky concessions should be calmed by Mr. Rusk's acts and statements, including his repetition of American principles before the veterans in Minneapolis. In our opinion American foreign affairs are in good hands.

Minshall Traveling Office To Make Annual District Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 years it has been my privilege and honor to represent the people of the 23d Congressional District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States. As a Representative of this outstanding district, I have made every effort not only to be well informed of the opinions of the people through personal contact and use of opinion polls, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with Federal agencies and departments. To help accomplish this, I maintain on a year-round basis a congressional office in room 525 of the Federal Building in downtown Cleveland where I can meet with people personally during trips back to the district when my official duties permit. While I am in Washington, a competent staff is in charge of the Cleveland office.

A further service to the people of the 23d District is my Washington Report which, in newsletter form, periodically presents the major legislative activities of Congress, background information on the issues that confront the Nation, and Capitol Hill opinion.

During my service in the Congress, I have considered it of primary importance to be present at the Capitol whenever Congress is in session in order to participate in committee work and to vote on important legislation. This year with Congress in nearly continuous session, I have not been able, with intervening Appropriations Committee work, to return to Cleveland as much as I should have liked. Therefore, in accordance with the practice I initiated 8 years ago, I am bringing a traveling office to the various communities in the 23d District. This method of meeting with the public has been tremendously popular and it gives me an excellent opportunity to discuss and learn at firsthand the opinions and individual needs of the people.

With the expectation that Congress will not be in session during the early part of October, I will again this year, from October 8 through October 12, bring my traveling office to the people of the 23d District to make myself available to meet personally every resident of this suburban district who can conveniently arrange to visit me. These are not group meetings but office conferences for individuals which will enable them to discuss their views and problems directly. No appointments are necessary and I not only welcome, but I urge individuals to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient. Every resident of the 23d District is cordially invited to talk over problems of national concern, to discuss personal problems with the Federal Government, or just to get better acquainted. The knowledge thus obtained will better enable me to represent the people of the 23d District in the Congress.

I am most thankful for the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available as an aid in rendering this public service.

Following is the schedule for these office conferences:

Community	Location	Date	Time—p.m.
Lakewood	Lakewood City Hall, 12650 Detroit Ave.	Monday, Oct. 8	2 to 4:30.
Westlake, Bay Village, North Olmsted	Westlake City Hall, 27216 Hilliard Blvd.	do	6:30 to 9.
Berea, Olmsted Falls, Olmsted Township, Westview.	Berea City Hall, 57 East Bridge St	Tuesday, Oct. 9	2 to 4:30.
Rocky River, Fairview Park, Parkview	Rocky River City Hall, 21012 Hilliard Blvd.	do	6:30 to 9.
Parma Heights, Brookpark, Linndale, Middleburgh Heights, North Royalton, Strongsville.	Parma Heights City Hall, 6281 Pearl Rd.	Wednesday, Oct. 10.	2 to 4:30.
Independence, Brecksville, Broadview Heights, Brooklyn Heights, Cuyahoga Heights, Seven Hills.	Independence City Hall, 6675 Brecksville Rd.	do	6:30 to 9.
Chagrin Falls, Bentleyville, Glenwillow, Moreland Hills, Solon.	Chagrin Falls Village Hall, 21 West Washington St.	Thursday, Oct. 11	2 to 4:30.
Warrensville Heights, North Randall, Orange, Warrensville Township, Woodmere.	Warrensville Heights City Hall, 4301 Warrensville Center Rd.	do	6:30 to 9.
Shaker Heights, Beachwood, Hunting Valley, Pepper Pike, University Heights.	Shaker Heights City Hall, 3400 Lee Rd.	Friday, Oct. 12	2 to 4:30.
Maple Heights, Bedford, Bedford Heights, Oakwood, Valley View, Walton Hills.	Maple Heights City Hall, 5353 Lee Rd.	do	6:30 to 9.

Coal Operations by FMC Corp. in Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, several weeks ago I spoke before the Senate on the pioneer work done by the FMC Corp. on the development of a coking coal process from Western coal deposits at Kemmerer, Wyo. Today I should like to mention the work done by this fine organization in the Green River Basin in Wyoming.

This basin in ancient times was a gigantic lake. It is the residue which provides the trona deposits which are the formation of FMC's new mining and processing operation near Green River. From this plant flows a steady production of soda ash, which is used in many industries throughout the Nation.

The FMC Corp. recently published a very informative brochure on their Green River trona operation, which I think would be of great interest to anyone who is interested in how a modern American firm using the latest technological developments can successfully develop the mineral deposits found in the West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have portions of this brochure printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Excerpts from "In the Green River Basin of Wyoming," published in behalf of an area, a State, and an industry by FMC Corp., Intermountain Chemical Co., Green River, Wyo.)

The lake in which Wyoming trona was deposited, existed some 50 million years ago. It was a large, fresh water lake in its first million years, under a climate similar to that of today's Texas gulf coast. Later the climate became more arid, about as dry as that of Great Salt Lake, but with warmer winters, as a result of which it shrank to about 12,000 square miles in area and became saline, shrinking and expanding, a characteristic of salt lakes the world over. While at its smallest size, 1,000 square miles or even less, its brine became so concentrated that beds of trona deposited. In the intervals when not depositing trona the lake expanded, grew deeper and instead, deposited layers of mud which became shale. At some of its higher water stages the lake was twofold, consisting of a brine lake with a lake of fresh water floating on top, the latter somewhat larger in extent. Microscopic plants and animals lived in great abundance in the fresh water part of the double lake. Their remains collected at the bottom of the lake and eventually became beds of oil shale. Thus, today there is found, not only below but also above and between the trona beds, thick and thin layers of oil shale and ordinary shale.

Eventually the climate changed back to its former more humid state; the lake expanded, grew fresher and, upon reaching the great size of 15,000 square miles, finally overflowed. For the rest of its life (about 2 million more years), it remained a fresh-water lake. The sediments which accumulated at its bottom buried the trona layers deeper and deeper. Still more sediment was piled on when the lake had disappeared. At length the trona layers lay buried nearly a mile below the earth's surface. Millions of years later this part of the earth was uplifted and partially eroded so that today the lakebeds are exposed and the trona beds, though still buried, can be mined economically. (Based on material furnished by Dr. Wilmott J. Bradley, U.S. Geological Survey.)

THE NEEDLE-SHAPED CRYSTALS WERE SOMETHING NEW IN THE WORLD

In the overall development of the trona project near Green River, two events transpired which will never be exactly duplicated. They were, first, sinking the mine shaft was not dissimilar from other such mining operations. But at length, when the mineral being sought was reached about 1,500 feet below the surface, that particular moment was an exceptional occurrence in history since no solid body of trona had ever been found before. The dry well John Hay No. 1, which had been abandoned 8 years before had, in reality, brought to man's attention the source of an important mineral which would prove the well a most remarkable and amazing success after all.

The second event connected with the project, which came only after many additional years of research and expense, was the form in which the trona was ultimately crystallized—a needle-shape crystal different from any other soda ash previously manufactured. This, in addition to its unprecedented purity, gave the final product these qualities: flowing more freely, better mixing characteristics and, a most desirable feature, a minimum of dust which ordinarily accompanied the handling of soda ash as previously manufactured.

In the years ahead these two fortuitous events were to become the factors which began a new era in the economic history and development of an historic area.

THE MINE

Two techniques—called conventional and continuous—are employed to mine the trona ore. Conventional mining, which has been in use since operations began in 1947, is a modification of typical coal-mining procedures. The face of the ore body is first undercut, and is then drilled for blasting. Following this latter operation the broken ore is swept up by mechanical loaders, dumped into trackless shuttle cars and moved to the belt conveying system which ultimately discharges the ore into a pocket at the bottom of the No. 2 shaft. From here, a skip hoist delivers the ore to the surface operations.

Within the past few years FMC has been instrumental in developing a continuous mining machine which eliminates many of the cumbersome operations of conventional mining. It also aids in improving general mining conditions.

This machine, in effect, bores out the trona directly, eliminating the need for cutting, drilling, and blasting.

THE PLANT AND THE PROCESS

Although trona ore is remarkably pure, it does contain impurities which must be removed before a suitably refined product can be produced. Fortunately, these contaminating impurities are almost all insoluble in hot water, while trona itself is quite soluble. Mined ore is first crushed to a powder so that it can be readily dissolved to form a concentrated solution. Most of the insoluble matter is removed in large settling tanks and is discarded to a waste pond. The remaining undissolved particles are completely removed by large filters. The clear, hot solution is then cooled under vacuum. This causes the dissolved trona to recrystallize in a needle-like form. The crystals are removed from the residual solution, and the excess water and carbon dioxide are driven off in long, rotary calciners which contain banks of pipes heated with high-pressure steam. It is at this step that the material becomes soda ash. After cooling it is shipped in bulk hopper cars or in 100-pound bags.

Located as it is away from any large center of population and the wide range of every type of service which populous areas possess, a mining operation such as FMC's has to be a completely integrated operation, not only as to skilled workmen, but also in equipment for maintenance and repair. Exacting schedules for operations below and above ground have to be maintained. Since the mining of trona had never been attempted previous to the development of the Wyoming trona, much had to be learned, many experiments made before a steady flow from mine to surface to treatment to shipment was perfected.

During the past decade the demand for soda ash had held relatively constant. The alltime record consumption of 5,650,000 tons occurred in 1956. Soda ash producers not only compete with one another but with other alkalis as well. This is one of the reasons that normal growth for this product has been retarded—and will be in the future. The burgeoning chlorine industry constantly generates additional quantities of soda ash's strongest competitor, caustic soda. However, in spite of this many pronged competition for consumers, the soda ash industry has continued to expand its total producing capacity. At the present time 7 million tons per year could be manufactured if the sales for this quantity existed.

Wyoming trona would still be a mineralogical curiosity rather than the extremely important economic raw material that it is today except for one fact: Men of vision and high scientific ability had the intelligence and courage to develop a process that overcame the natural disadvantages of geography.

Wyoming's trona is fairly centrally located in the country, but is relatively far from the concentrations of soda ash consumers. Only an efficient and economical operation combined with a competitively superior product and outstanding service would enable it to compete for soda ash markets. FMC's process does exactly this. A twofold gain for the intermountain area is thus accomplished. A naturally occurring raw material is used to supply distant markets while, at the same time, the nearby consumers receive the savings resulting from a local producer.

Finds Stray Balloon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers and constituents of my district are maintaining their deserved reputation for alertness to threats of foreign invasions. The other day, a story appeared on the front page of the Public Mirror of Arapahoe, Nebr., reading as follows:

FINDS STRAY BALLOON

An unusual find was made in the watermelon patch at the I. L. Carskadon farm on the valley, southeast of Arapahoe, Sunday.

It was the remains of a small blue balloon, which from its fringed condition had suffered a peculiar explosion. Attached to the long string on it was part of another red balloon.

The advertising on it reads: "Vote for PETER H. DOMINICK for U.S. Senator."

Research shows that Mr. DOMINICK, of Englewood, Colo., was last year a Colorado U.S. Representative and it is guessed that he is now campaigning for the Senate.

How far and from where the balloons had traveled is a matter for conjecture.

Not only was the story interesting, and the detective work accurate, but the editor was even kind enough to send Congressman DOMINICK a copy of it. I had recognized that my able colleague and good friend, Congressman DOMINICK, of Colorado, was putting on a vigorous and high-flying campaign for the position of U.S. Senator, but I had not realized how high flying it was until I saw this article. It seems particularly appropriate that the balloons descended from orbit in Arapahoe, Nebr., as my good friend Congressman DOMINICK claims as his hometown Englewood, Colo., which lies comfortably and prosperously in Arapahoe County, Colo.

On behalf of the Public Mirror, the citizens of Arapahoe, and myself, we wish him well in his campaign for the Senate and assure him that he, as well as his balloons, are welcome in Arapahoe, Nebr.

Happy Birthday, Bernard M. Baruch—Salute to Dr. Simon Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am happy to include an editorial which appeared in the East Side News of August 10. The East Side News is a weekly publication widely circulated in my congressional district under the guidance of its able editor and publisher, Abraham Schlacht.

The editorial follows:

AGE, 92: HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO YOU, BERNARD M. BARUCH—AND A SALUTE TO DR. SIMON BARUCH

August 19, East Siders, New Yorkers, Americans everywhere salute the great elder statesman, former star athlete, P.S. 69 and C.C.N.Y. graduate, financier, philanthropist, author, philosopher, humanitarian, faithful servant of the American people, adviser to U.S. Presidents, patriot, New Yorker, famed distinguished citizen, and one whose unselfish deeds have made him a living American legend, All-American Bernard Mannes Baruch, on his 92d birthday.

"We express our gratitude to the Baruch family for their noble contributions to the community, to their country and to all humanity."—Harry H. Schlacht, late famed East Sider, newspaperman, city official.

July 29 marked the 122d anniversary of the birth of one of East Side's and New York's brilliant physicians, war veteran, pioneer in the surgery of appendicitis, leading exponent of hydrotherapy, professor of hydrotherapy at the College of Physicians and Surgeons at Columbia University, pioneer in free public baths, philanthropist, Dr. Simons Baruch.

The father of Statesman Bernard M. Baruch contributed much in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases. He founded the first free bathhouse on New York's Lower East Side. Today, this historic building has a gymnasium, game room, and a swimming pool. Dr. Simon Baruch contended that the physician's chief reliance should be on the agents which maintain health food, cleanliness, exercise, rest, water taken internally, and externally.

A salute to the memory of a famous New Yorker and public-spirited citizen to whom the profession and humanity owe much for the improvement of the health of the people.

Unforgotten Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, our impoverished migratory farm citizens are the only identified group of workers in the Nation who have not shared in the prosperity characteristic of the American labor force generally. Consequently, the plight of the migratory farmworker and his family is an unfamiliar problem in our affluent society which has, for almost 30 years, appeared to defy solution. Within the last few years, however, the commendable efforts of the junior Senator from New Jersey, Senator WILLIAMS, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, have resulted in the practical legislative program for migratory labor currently pending in the Congress.

During the last session of the Congress, five of Senator WILLIAMS' migratory farmworker bills were passed by the Senate. This legislation, which has administration support, would provide improved educational opportunities for migratory farm children and adults, improved health services for migratory farm families, prohibitions against harmful agricultural child labor, Federal registration of crew leaders, and the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor. These bills are pending before the Rules Committee.

That we have the opportunity to respond to an acknowledged need for remedial legislation in this neglected area is the subject of a succinct editorial in the Washington Post on August 6, entitled "Unforgotten Americans." The editorial is, I believe, deserving of our attention, and I therefore, under unanimous consent, include the editorial in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 6, 1962]

UNFORGOTTEN AMERICANS

The House Rules Committee now has before it four bills that ought not be left in limbo. These measures concern the 1 million migratory farmworkers whose lamentable lot has in the past stirred more words than deeds. This year, Congress has an opportunity to extend certain minimum standards to migrants by approving four bills that would broaden child-labor restrictions, provide Federal aid to the States for the education of migrants, require the registration of crew leaders and create a National Advisory Council on Migrant Workers.

All four bills have been favorably reported out by the House Education and Labor Committee; all have passed the Senate. They represent the first installment of a group of bills resulting from extensive hearings conducted by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey. Their passage would oil the wheels for the remaining legislation and would begin to ease the sense of nagging guilt about workers whose plight has weighed on the American conscience. Congress owes it to itself and the country to see that these bills do not suffocate in committee.

Good Politics—Bad Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Newsday's economic analyst, Eugene Miller discusses some facts the President should have faced up to in his tax speech on August 13:

J.F.K.'S TALK JUST POLITICS TO ECONOMISTS

(By Eugene Miller)

President Kennedy's speech deferring plans for an immediate tax cut was a classic lesson in the political use of economic data. The President's performance, replete with charts, on TV Monday night was high-quality politics by any yardstick. However, to most businessmen and economists, it was pretty slipshod economics.

The major irritant to the professional economists were the several charts the President used to indicate how far the economy had traveled since he took office in January 1961. At that time, the economy was just starting to come back after a mild recession, and the charts showed the extent of the recovery in the 18 months Kennedy has been in office.

They showed, for example, that in the past 18 months:

The gross national product (the total of all goods and services produced) was up 10 percent.

Industrial production was up 16 percent.

Wages and salaries were up 10 percent.

Corporate profits were up 26 percent.

The unemployment rate was down 23 percent.

National debt as a percentage of national wealth had decreased sharply since 1945.

On the surface all this looks fine, but when you take a hard look at the figures and at the economy, some of the dazzle begins to wear off. For one thing, the periods selected provided maximum visual impact, painting the brightest picture possible. The 18-month period of the Kennedy administration actually ranged from the bottom of a recession to the top of a recovery period. And this, most economists would say, certainly stacks the figures to provide the sharpest gains. Secondly, the President chose as indicators those that looked most favorable. If he had used instead such economic barometers as stock prices, or new orders for machinery and equipment, or several other important economic yardsticks, the lines on the chart would be moving down instead of up.

More than that an 18-month period usually is too short a period to really indicate economic trends. Most economists use 5 years, 10 years, or even longer periods to really assess basic economic trends. For example, Kennedy pointed out that corporate profits were up 26 percent in the 18-month period. Yet the rate of long-term corporate profits is on the decline. And corporate profits for the current quarter are expected to be down, too.

Gross national product seems to be up sharply, but on a long-term basis it has been growing at a very modest rate—a rate that Kennedy himself has said on previous occasions is too low. And while Kennedy stressed the fact that the unemployment rate had been cut 23 percent in the 18-month period, the current unemployment rate is 5.5 percent, which Kennedy earlier had declared was too high.

As for our national debt, it is true that the debt was equal to 120 percent of national wealth in 1945 and now was only 60 percent of national wealth. However, this obscures the point that, despite promises to the contrary, the national debt in absolute terms has increased to a record high. Wages and salaries totals are up 10 percent, but a good part of this can be accounted for by the fact that population has increased in 18 months and so has the workforce.

It is true that the economy in the past 18 months has moved up from the recession low of January 1961. However, it has grown nowhere near as fast as Kennedy had advocated when he ran for office in 1960. The country's growth rate is still well below the 4 to 5 percent that he advocated; unemployment is still above the level he called "intolerable," and the country's productive facilities are far shy of being down to the point where even Walter Heller, the President's chief economic adviser, says it may be "warning us of an economic decline." Most of this was left unsaid in the speech.

West Point Football

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial on the so-called West Point football bill appeared in the Omaha World Herald of August 13, 1962. I commend it to my colleagues for reading:

WEST POINT FOOTBALL BILL

Louisiana's Senator RUSSELL LONG has failed in his one-man campaign to defeat what he calls the West Point football bill. But he made his point in so describing the measure. It permits the Army and Air Force Academies to select about 50 additional cadets to replace dropouts.

Mr. LONG cited figures to show that when the Academies do the appointing, 75 percent of the boys chosen are football players. Moreover, the Academies reportedly prevail upon some Congressmen to appoint football players from outside their States.

Over the years, appointment of cadets by Members of Congress has worked reasonably well and is doing better in these modern times. Most Senators and Representatives, including all those from Nebraska, make the appointment on a merit basis—scholarship merit, not football merit. Football ability is no substitute for the intelligence needed in the armed services officer corps in the missile age.

Redirection of Mideast Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the Middle East by the American Jewish Congress which was so widely endorsed by members of the New York congressional delegation. I feel this statement superbly reflects my own views on the need for a redirection of American policy to promote peace in the Middle East. It outlines the kind of positive action that deserves the attention of all the Members of the Congress:

STATEMENT ON THE MIDDLE EAST

More than ever before in American history our Government is committed to the defense of freedom, the strengthening of democracy, and the establishment of peace throughout the world. It is increasingly clear, however, that our present policies in the Middle East have failed to promote these ends and that a fundamental reappraisal of those policies is imperative.

We are gratified at the frequently affirmed public commitment of the United States to the continued existence of Israel. Our recent Near East policies, however, do not effectively implement that commitment. We deplore the failure of the U.S. resolution adopted by the Security Council to note the profound moral distinction between those who commit aggression and those who react in their own self-defense.

Our foreign policy objectives cannot be achieved by continued accommodation to Arab intransigence. Episodes of violence will inevitably recur as long as there is no permanent peace between Israel and its neighbors.

We, therefore, earnestly urge a redirection of American Middle Eastern policy toward the following ends:

1. The initiation of direct negotiations for a settlement of all outstanding differences between Israel and the Arabs. Such negotiations are the only reasonable and feasible way of resolving present conflicts. In this connection, we profoundly regret the negative vote cast by our Government against the so-called Brazzaville Resolution during the last session fo the General Assembly. That resolution, introduced by 16 delegations, would have invoked the authority of the General Assembly in calling for direct negotiation between the states. For the first time it held out substantial hope of advancing toward a general settlement of differences.

Our Government's position, in direct contradiction of the concepts articulated by the President during his campaign, in large part precluded the adoption of the Brazzaville resolution. We call upon our Government to redeem the Middle East programs outlined by the President during his campaign by giving early and public support to any comparable multilateral effort that may be attempted in subsequent sessions of the General Assembly. We call upon our Government to exert all of its influence and authority to induce the parties to the Arab-Israel dispute to sit down together at peace tables where they can engage in direct negotiations with honor of all their outstanding differences.

2. The ending of Arab economic boycotts and blockades against Israel which not only seriously impair Israel's growth and development but thwart any significant improvement in the living standards and general welfare of the entire area.

3. The promotion of projects for the fullest utilization of the water, power, and other resources of the area for the common benefit of all groups. Israel has repeatedly expressed her eagerness to cooperate in such developments; the Arabs have repeatedly refused to consider any projects which, while benefiting them, might also benefit Israel. In particular, we call upon our Government to help resist Arab efforts to disrupt Israeli water development in the Galilee and to make known its belief in the legality of this project as developed thus far.

4. The achieving of a permanent solution to the troubling and tragic problem of the Arab refugees. We welcome as a first step the extension by the last General Assembly of the mandate of the Johnson mission. We are encouraged by the fact that the first preliminary Johnson report submitted this year, unlike some prior submissions by other U.N. agencies, examined in depth the arguments of both sides to this dispute. We are confident that objective examination of the plight and potential of the Arab refugee populations ultimately can disclose means of alleviating this difficult and complex problem. We note the continued willingness of the State of Israel to make appropriate financial payment for Arab properties that may have been lost and to assist in carrying out a program for economic assistance that will afford the Arab refugees a chance to build permanent and lasting homes and to live in peace with their neighbors. We believe that the offer made by the State of Israel provides a basis for negotiation and settlement of this obstacle to the attainment of tranquillity in this part of the world.

Fishing Vessels in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today to correct existing inequities in the construction of fishing vessels in Massachusetts. It is my belief that these bills will enable the depressed fishing industry of New England to regain a normal position in the Nation's economy and compete against the massive foreign fleets now fishing off American shores.

While I was pleased when my colleagues passed the Macdonald-Magnuson bill to give aid up to 33⅓ percent, events have proven that this amount should be increased. My legislation would increase the construction subsidy for wooden vessels to 35 percent, and steel vessels to 50 percent. A statute which dates back to 1792 requires American fishing vessels to be constructed in the United States. The price difference between American and foreign shipyard costs is as much as 48 percent. Forced to subsidize American boatyards, the fishing industry in Massachusetts and New England is fighting a losing battle against foreign competition.

Failure to provide sufficient construction differential payments for fishing vessels has subjected our fishing industry to unfair competition. Just 15 miles off Cape Cod, Russian fishing vessels may be seen which are equipped with the latest technological gear. These ships can process their catches and freeze them on the spot and operate in all types of weather for many purposes, including aid in the latest Russian orbital flights. It seems very wrong to me that free world nations fishing off our Massachusetts shores have ships far superior to American vessels. The United States does not have any factory ships or refrigerated vessels. The New England fishing industry has had to compete not only with the lower wage costs of its competitors in Canada, Iceland, Britain, and elsewhere, but with the lower cost of vessel construction in those countries. Action to rectify this must be soon forthcoming.

I also introduced legislation today providing for the construction of two modern stern ramp trawlers, one for service on the east coast, one for the west coast. This legislation is designed to aid in the development of more modern methods in the production, preparation, processing and preservation of fish products. The two trawlers would serve as prototype vessels for future American fishing fleets.

Recommendations of Traffic Safety Conference, Pennsylvania State Police Academy, Hershey, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable David Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania, has always exhibited a personal and material interest in programs for the promotion of safety on our highways.

As Governor, he has officially intensified that interest to assist in reducing the loss of life on the highways in the State of Pennsylvania. To that end, he scheduled a Special Traffic Safety Conference which took place on July 16 at the Pennsylvania State Police Academy in Hershey, Pa.

The conference was attended by State officials, the Honorable Park Martin, secretary of highways; O. D. Shipley, commissioner of traffic safety; Col. Frank G. McCartney, and 16 of his State police troop commanders; and police and safety officials representing some 19 of the Commonwealth's major cities.

It was a worthy contribution to the purpose and resolved in the submission of a series of recommendations that Governor Lawrence will endeavor to implement by presentation to the State legislature and other official means at his command.

May I now ask permission, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks and include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the 15 recommendations of that safety conference. It is my hope and purpose in so doing that our other 49 States, our major cities and local communities, may have recourse to them for guidance and benefit in the saving of human life on their own highways.

The article follows:

SPECIAL TRAFFIC SAFETY CONFERENCE, JULY 16, 1962

To Hon. David L. Lawrence, Governor, from Col. Frank G. McCartney, Pennsylvania State Police; Hon. Park Martin, secretary of highways, and O. D. Shipley, commissioner of traffic safety.

We have the honor to submit the attached list of recommendations presented at the special conference on traffic safety held at the Pennsylvania State Police Academy, Hershey, July 16, 1962, with police and safety officials representing some 19 of the Commonwealth's major cities:

(1) Continue periodic reevaluation of speed limits—The establishment of reasonable speed limits both on expressways and municipal streets must be sustained by periodic reevaluation of speed zones to maintain pace with changing traffic volume and flow. Reasonable speeds, as determined by modern engineering techniques, are more acceptable to the driver and allow police officers to concentrate more on selective enforcement.

(2) Request Congress to amend the interstate highway law to permit construction of roadside service areas—Under the interstate highway law, States are not permitted to construct services areas, forcing weary travelers to continue on their way and possibly into trouble. This recommendation asks liberalization of the Federal act to permit States to construct reasonable facilities to meet the problem.

(3) Request the Bureau of Public Roads to liberalize certain construction regulations —At present the Bureau of Public Roads will not approve stabilized highway berms in excess of 10 feet. It is felt that the additional berm width would provide an extra margin of safety in cases of disabled vehicles.

(4) Increased signing of highways through municipalities—This recommendation is intended to guide the motorist through municipalities more safely and more quickly.

(5) Intensify public safety information and education activities—Safety and police officials at the State and local level were requested to intensify current programs of education to create greater awareness to the problem, better understanding of rules of the road, etc.

(6) Development of better understanding between courts and local police—Cooperation and mutual respect in this area is vital to an effective traffic law enforcement program. The motorist will have more respect for the law and fair, impartial enforcement if the courts and the police authorities work in harmony toward the goal of safer streets and highways.

(7) Adoption of a hazard-reporting system by municipal police—Pennsylvania State Police currently fill out a hazard report form when they observe conditions hazardous to traffic. These forms are submitted to the highways department which then moves to correct the condition. Municipal police could use such a system to advantage while patroling thousands of miles of streets.

(8) Adoption of the uniform traffic arrest report by a greater number of municipal police departments—Also known as the "no fix" ticket, this report is currently used by the Pennsylvania State Police and the police of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and a number of other communities throughout the State. The uniform report or ticket provides insurance against "fixing." It also simplifies procedures for reporting arrests and convictions to the bureau of traffic safety for subsequent action.

(9) Legislation to permit the legalized use of radar in traffic law enforcement by the police departments of major Pennsylvania cities—Radar detection of speeders has proved its worth under State police operation. Operated by properly trained municipal police, it would permit more effective use of the personnel of generally undermanned and overworked local police departments. Radar is a scientific, impartial law enforcement weapon; police departments that can afford the equipment and the training of qualified operators should not be denied its use.

(10) Expansion and improvement of street and interchange lighting—Unlighted or inadequately lighted municipal streets, and expressway interchanges represent a major safety hazard.

(11) Further extend "arrest on view" authority to municipal police—It was recommended that the 1963 general assembly extend to municipal police the authority to execute sight arrests, that is, to be empowered to take certain violators to the nearest available magistrate for an immediate hearing if the officer has reason to believe the individual will fail to answer to a summons. At present, municipal police are empowered only to execute sight arrests with out-of-State operators. State police have authority to make such arrests with all violators.

(12) Institute wider use of chemical test devices—The 1961 general assembly authorized the use of chemical tests for intoxication. It is recommended that additional police departments avail themselves of this modern enforcement tool both as a deterrent to driving while intoxicated and as a prosecution aid in the apprehension of violators.

(13) Strengthen penalties for operating without a license—Present provisions in the vehicle code prescribe only a light fine for this offense, which is totally inadequate to deal with the type of persons who commit the offense. It is recommended that legislation be sought which would prescribe a higher fine and/or prison sentence for this violation.

(14) Step up routine traffic safety checks—Traffic checks on a routine basis are being used by most of the larger police departments in Pennsylvania as a means of detecting drivers operating without valid licenses and unsafe equipment. It is recommended that the routine traffic check be used by all police departments in the State.

(15) Strict, impartial enforcement—Participants in the conference were unanimous in stating that strict, impartial enforcement is the best means of attack on the traffic safety problem. Utilizing such devices as the uniform traffic arrest report form (the "no fix" traffic ticket), and with the cooperation of the courts, police officers are perhaps the best means of educating the public to the dangers of today's highway traffic and to the inevitability of punishment for violations.

Lowell Stockman

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing my most sincere regret at the passing of Lowell Stockman.

I knew Lowell casually prior to the time that I came to Congress but since being a Member of this body I had known him intimately. When I came to

Washington in January of 1946, Lowell immediately offered to be of assistance in every possible way to me as a freshman legislator. He did everything he could to assist me in learning the ropes here and I was most grateful to him.

During the years thereafter when we served together we worked as a team for the betterment of our State of Oregon and he was always cooperative in every possible way.

Lowell deserves a great deal of credit for the large upriver dams built on the Columbia River which have added so much to the prosperity of our State and of the Pacific Northwest.

I want to express my deepest sympathy to his wife Dorcas who was so extremely well liked both in Pendleton and here in Washington, D.C. A very charming and popular woman who was very helpful to Lowell's political career.

Independence Day of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios III; and His Excellency, the Ambassador of Cyprus to the United States, Zenon Rossides, on the occasion of the second anniversary of the independence of Cyprus.

Cyprus is the largest island in the eastern Mediterranean, and an important commercial and strategic spot for the entire Middle East area. It is perhaps the oldest inhabited and culturally historic island anywhere on the globe, for its ancient inhabitants created one of the oldest known civilizations. Yet today the 2-year-old Republic of Cyprus is one of the youngest independent, sovereign states in the Middle East.

This island of some 3,500 square miles, with its Greek-Turkish population of about 560,000, was for centuries part of the Ottoman Empire. In 1878 it was brought under the administration of the British, who in 1914 annexed it. Since the end of the First World War its majority Greeks and minority Turks have been fighting among themselves, the former advocating the union of the island to Greece with the Turks wanting to have it become part of the Turkish Republic. The British of course wanted to maintain its status quo, and they succeeded in doing so until 2 years ago. Particularly since the end of the last war, just as Greek leaders of the island have vowed to prevent the union of the island with Turkey, the Turks were equally determined to prevent its union with Greece. During the late 1950's a bitter struggle between the Greeks and Turks took on the proportions of a civil war, and the British seemed unable to put an end to this internal and destructive strife. Finally both Greek and Turkish leaders of the island realized the futility of continuing the fight among themselves, and agreed to a sensible solution. The British Government also encouraged such a move, and agreed to grant the people of the island independence under certain conditions. This statesmanlike move culminated on August 16 of 1960 in the birth of the Republic of Cyprus.

Today this tiny but important Republic is sovereign and independent. It is a member of the British Commonwealth, and a member of the United Nations. The industrious and brave people of the island have joined hands in repairing the loss caused during the civil war, and they are supremely confident that soon they will regain their former prosperity. On the second anniversary of their independence day, we all wish the people of the Republic of Cyprus prosperity and peace.

Equal Rights Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department has reported favorable results in the field of civil rights, opposition to organized crime, and reduction of juvenile delinquency in the Kennedy administration activities.

I have contributed considerable time and effort on the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee which handles civil rights and Department of Justice legislation to support this favorable record.

The following talk by the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General of the United States, amply shows the results which have been obtained in the Kennedy administration in the important field of equal treatment, protection and proper development of our citizens:

MUCH HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED—MUCH REMAINS TO BE DONE

(By Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States)

I want to talk today about what has happened in the Department of Justice, the areas of special interest, what we have been trying to do for the period of the last year.

I think three major areas where we have made some progress and where a good deal of attention has been given and which might come up during the course of your work over the period of the next 6 months, is the area of civil rights; organized crime; and juvenile delinquency.

I think that we have made a considerable amount of progress in the field of civil rights. First, in the field of employment. When I became Attorney General, there were only, out of some 900 lawyers in the Department of Justice—now realizing the Department of Justice is charged with the responsibility in the field of civil rights—there were only 10 Negro lawyers out of 900 in the whole Department.

I remember at the inaugural parade, the President was reviewing it, and he saw the Coast Guard march by and there wasn't one Negro in the Coast Guard. He came out shortly afterward to greet the President of one of the new African nations, and they marched down in front of the color guard, the honor guard, and there wasn't one Negro in the honor guard.

At one of the early Cabinet meetings he said a study should be made in all of our departments to determine whether more Negroes could be employed, not employed just because they were Negroes but because people of character and ability and integrity who could perform the jobs should not be denied the right of employment because they were Negroes.

This has been done in my Department as it has been done in every department of Government. There are now Negroes in the Coast Guard, at the Coast Guard Academy. There are now Negroes in the honor guard, and there are more Negroes holding important positions in Government than at any time in the history of the United States.

In our Department, there are at least five times as many Negroes employed there now as there were at the time the President was inaugurated.

Now, we have taken a tremendous amount of action in the field of voting, because it has been our feeling that once you gain the franchise, once an individual is allowed to register and to vote, many of these other rights that we are making an effort to secure for minority groups will come.

When I became Attorney General, there were some 10 cases under investigation and where the Department of Justice had gone to court in connection with voting matters. Since, in the last year, the last 14 months we have brought approximately 10 times that number. We now have over 100 cases throughout the United States in connection with investigations and in actual court cases in voting matters. I think this is extremely important because once we can get that right to vote, many of these other rights will be secured. I am sorry that we were not more successful in obtaining the legislation that the President requested as far as literacy tests are concerned because if we could have obtained that legislation—much of the denial of the right to register and to vote has come through registrars sitting across the table and looking at an individual with a darker skin than he might have and saying "You are not literate."

And we have had college professors, we have had those who have received scientific grants, we have had ministers, we have had writers, authors, come in and be told by a registrar that they were not literate and a white person come to the same registrar who hadn't finished the third grade, and be allowed to register and vote.

And when I became Attorney General, there were 16 counties in the United States where Negroes outnumbered white people and yet not one Negro was registered to vote. And we found many, many counties where only less than 5 percent of the Negro population had been registered. We are making a major effort in this field, and as I say, we brought more than 10 times the number of cases.

LOCAL EFFORT

And we also made another effort. We have not brought a case, we are not doing any of this just for publicity. There hasn't been one court case that we have brought—whether it be voting or in any other area, that we haven't gone to the local authority and said, "this is the situation we find. It appears to us to be a violation of the law. It appears to us that we should take some action in this field, and that to meet our responsibilities, we will have to move. But if you take action yourselves, then we will not take any action. If you remedy the situation at the local level." Because we feel that this is the most important thing.

We pointed out that this should be done by the local authorities, not by the Federal Government, and I might say that there have been many, many cases where the local authorities have taken action themselves, where it hasn't been necessary for the Federal Government to come in. So where we have taken court action, it has only been after we have made an effort, and made an attempt, drawn the matter to the attention of the local authorities, in the county and in the State to see if they would remedy the situation themselves.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

We have also taken a good deal of action in the field of transportation. Through the efforts of the Department of Justice, more than 100 bus terminals in the United States have been desegregated. That means virtually every bus terminal that handles interstate commerce has been desegregated. All of the railroad terminals in the United States that have handled interstate commerce have been desegregated, and that is more than 200 railroad terminals.

Many of the airport terminals have been desegregated and where they have not, we are preparing legal action. So these are important steps forward.

The Vice President's Committee on Employment dealing with Government contractors—which I am sure you will hear more about—has also made tremendous progress. So we have taken steps forward in this extremely crucial and critical area of civil rights. We have a great deal more to do and certainly the job is not done.

We have the problem of schools. We cannot initiate school cases, but we worked for 6 months before the schools were opened last September, around the United States, where it was anticipated that there would be difficulty and problems.

We went to Memphis; we went to Dallas; we went to Atlanta and we went down into Florida, and then we worked with the local school authorities, and we explained what had happened in Little Rock, and what had happened in some of these other communities, and what they could do in each one of those areas to prevent any mob violence or prevent any disorder. I think that you can look back to the papers last summer, where they anticipated that they would have all of these problems, and then when the schools opened up last September, there were no difficulties. All those schools were desegregated—and there wasn't any violence.

RESULTS OF TEAMWORK

Those things don't just happen. They are made to happen, and a large part of the credit goes to the local school authorities and the local authorities in the area, but there was a good deal of effort and work done by the Federal Government also, to help and assist in these efforts.

So I think that it is a good record and a great deal needs to be done. On my trip that I just completed around the world I don't think that there was any place, any press conference or any meeting that I had with students, with any other group where we were not asked about the question of civil rights. This is the great problem. Unless we make additional progress in this field over the period of the next 8 or 10 years, we are going to have a difficult time—not only here in the United States, because in my judgment, Negroes are just not going to be satisfied to move along small steps at a time—but we are going to have great difficulties and problems overseas.

U.S. RELATIONSHIP

Carlos Romulo (former Ambassador of the Philippines) when he left here from Washington, came to see me—he has long been a great friend of the United States—and he said that we were going to have great trouble maintaining our position of leadership around the world if we didn't really make major breakthroughs in the field of civil rights. He said that we cannot go to people in other parts of the world and say that we believe in the Constitution of the United States and we believe in the Declaration of Independence if we treat part of our country, part of our population, a minority, as inferiors. But we are going to continue to work at it, we believe that it is right; and it has such a tremendous effect in our position around the world.

In the area of "organized crime," at the time the President was inaugurated, back in January of 1961, the various investigative groups of the Federal Government worked on the bigtime gangsters and hoodlums—worked independently. The Internal Revenue Department did its work. The Federal Bureau of Investigation did its work. The Bureau of Narcotics did its work. The Intelligence Service did its work.

EFFORTS COORDINATED

There are approximately 26 investigative groups of the Federal Government and they all went their own separate ways. Eventually, in some cases they would work together, but it was the exception rather than the rule.

Well, the first thing that we did was to get all of them in together and say that we wanted a coordinated effort on the bigtime gangsters and hoodlums throughout the United States, and for the first time in the history of the United States these groups are working together.

We established a group within the Department of Justice, made up of approximately 40 lawyers who pool all the information and knowledge regarding the bigtime gangsters and hoodlums in the country. We are now treating organized crime as the Federal Bureau of Investigation has treated communism over the period of the last 30 years.

GATHERING INFORMATION

We have an intelligence group that obtains and brings in information regarding the bigtime gangsters and hoodlums. The information is filed so that it will be available; perhaps we are not going to be able to take action against the bigtime gangster this year or next year, but perhaps 4, or 5, or 6 or 7 years from now, action can be taken based on information which is obtained at the present time.

All of that information on about 700 of our biggest gangsters and hoodlums throughout the United States is now all being correlated in the Department of Justice. And we set up in some of the biggest cities across the United States smaller groups which work closely with the group here in the Department of Justice.

There hadn't been any new legislation in this field for the last 30 years. We are still living, really, on the reputation that was secured by Elliott Ness. And Al Capone was taken care of and that was really the end of it. The gangsters and the hoodlums in the meantime made great progress. They knew where they were going and they knew what they wanted to do, but there were no new tools that were given to the Federal Government, and so we asked for some new legislation, and more legislation was passed in the last year in Congress than has been passed by Congress for the last 30 years, since 1934, and they are extremely important bills.

THREE MAJOR BILLS

One bill deals with the travel for an illegal business and an illegal business is described as "gambling, narcotics, liquor." Another deals with the transmission of gambling information by phone or wire across State lines. Another deals with the transportation of gambling paraphernalia across State lines. Those are the three major bills.

And these are the ones that have really had a tremendous effect because they are aimed primarily at gambling and gambling provides the money for the bigtime operators in the United States and unless the bigtime hoodlums can deal interstate, they are in great difficulty because gambling is not gambling for them; it is business, and when they get the bets in, they have to lay off those bets and there are major layoff centers in about 10 sections of the United States. Now, they cannot telephone information across State lines because, regarding gambling, it would be a violation of Federal law. They cannot transport gambling paraphernalia; they can't bring gambling paraphernalia from Chicago into New York, or from New York into Ohio. That is all illegal now, so the result is, gambling has been cut down tremendously and I know that's true in the cities that all of you represent.

GAMBLING CUT DOWN

In the big football games they used to bet—the year before last—up to $70 million in the United States. Last year in the bigtime football games, it was down to $3 or $4 million, less than 10 percent of what it had been in the past. The bigtime hoodlums have been badly hurt by the passage of this legislation, and in addition to that, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is now conducting investigations in more than 4,000 cases based just on this legislation.

The head of the Royal Mounted Police in Canada said that they were having a tremendous problem in Canada now because of the fact that the bigtime gamblers—the bigtime gangsters in the United States—because of the effort that was being made in the United States, were now all coming into Canada and that they were having to deal with them.

We have convicted some major gangsters, such as Mickey Cohen on the west coast, who has now been sent away in a conviction that has been upheld by the Supreme Court; Frankie Carbo, who was the underworld king of boxing for so many years; and others all across the United States. If you are interested in details of some of these figures in your own comunities, in your own areas, in your own States, we would be glad to provide them to you.

There have been about more than four times as many hours of grand juries than before, and the convictions of people involved in organized crime have jumped tremendously.

Again, it is just the beginning, and it is too early to tell what the record is going to be. But certainly we have made a beginning.

And now just briefly on the last area which is juvenile delinquency—as you know I don't think there has probably been a subject which has been discussed more, written about more than juvenile delinquency. And less done about the juvenile delinquency.

AREA OF GREAT INTEREST

It has been an area that has been a great interest to the President and to the rest of us and we have made an effort, we were able to get some legislation passed last year, for the first time, legislation that has been discussed over the period of the last 10 years—we got laws that gave us $10 million a year for 3 years.

We have about 5,000 young people in our Federal prisons and we set up "halfway houses," one in Los Angeles, one in Chicago, and one in New York in an experimental operation. Young boys instead of being returned to the same environment, to the same friends, to the same home life that they came from, right out of prison, will go to this "halfway house." And we have special counselors there who will help them. They will spend about 3 months in this "halfway house." They will be helped and assisted in getting a job. They will be told how to dress before they go to an employment agency. They will be told where they can go for recreation; they will be helped and assisted as far as friends and associates are concerned.

All of this effort will be made over a period of 2½ or 3 months. This program has been in existence now for about 9 months and has been tremendously successful, and I hope will be expanded.

We don't feel that juvenile delinquency is going to be solved by the Federal Government. It has got to be solved at the local level—but at the local level in New York, they solve it one way, they deal with it in one way; in Chicago in another way; in Los Angeles in another way; in North Carolina a different way; in Florida a different way.

What is the best system? Nobody really has known. Who are the foremost experts in this field? So we are going to establish a center where everybody can come who has a responsibility at the local level, local authorities, the voluntary organizations. There will be one place where they can come and find various methods to deal with juvenile delinquency.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

Also no statistics have ever been kept on young people who get into difficulty—and there are more than 2 million every year, the ones that actually go to prison. Where did they come from? How did they behave when they were in prison? What happened to them once they got out? There is nothing known about that at the present time. But what we are doing is correlating all of the information across the country and have that in one place, so that we follow these young people who get into difficulty, and find out what happens to them after they get out. We feel that in a period of 8 or 10 years a great deal can come from that.

We have also given grants in 8 or 10 cities for a study of juvenile delinquency. Juvenile delinquency is not just a matter of better prisons. It has to do with housing, it has to do with education, it has to do with home environment, it has to do with recreation.

What can be done in the city of Washington; what should be done in the city of Chicago, or the city of New York, or the city of Los Angeles, to deal with this problem?

Now, it doesn't do any good just giving them a million dollars—and then they continue the same programs that have been continued in the past. What we have done is given a number of these communities anywhere from $100,000 to $250,000 to make a study, to come in with a plan as to what they can do and what they might do in that local community to deal with this problem.

We have set up a group of experts to go around and to examine the various communities, to find out who has the best ideas to deal with the problem. Then a grant is given to make a more systematic study that should go on for anywhere from 6 months to a year. The study will be considered here in Washington, and we will then make a determination as to what should be done.

Again, this is a step forward. It is not going to answer the problem of juvenile delinquency, but at least something now is being done about it. We are not just talking about it; we are not just preaching about it. We have an organized plan to try to deal with the problem and try to help these young people who get into difficulties.

These are three areas where we have tried to take some steps. As I say, we haven't licked them, but in my judgment, we have taken some major steps forward.

A Resolution To Establish a Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a resolution to establish a Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament to consist of 13 members chosen for their special knowledge of foreign affairs, armed services, atomic energy, science, and astronautics.

Under the provisions of the resolution, the committee would be authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of proposals for arms control and disarmament including, but not limited to, first, efforts made by the United Nations in seeking the control and reduction of military forces and armaments of all types; second, disarmament proposals developed by the United States and other governments as well as by private groups and individuals; third, methods by which the attitudes of the American people and their Government on the subject of disarmament and world peace may be communicated abroad; fourth, the relationship of armaments to the state of the world economy; fifth, the relationship of underlying international tension to the problems of disarmament; sixth, the dangers implicit in unilateral reduction of armaments; and, seventh; methods of assuring that plans for reduction of armaments shall not endanger the security of the United States.

This resolution is introduced, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that initially it will stimulate discussion and consideration. I am aware that, since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, only 2 standing committees have been added to the 34 committees then established. Both of these committees were created to deal with the new dimension of space.

In the House of Representatives, the new standing committee is known as the Committee on Science and Astronautics and was approved July 21, 1958. The corresponding committee in the other body is the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences, created July 24, 1958.

Meeting the challenge of space by establishing these two new standing committees, seems to have had a broad appeal in both the Senate and the House. This factor undoubtedly facilitated amendment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I submit that, as in the case of space, arms control is a new and growing field, highly technical in nature, that inevitably impinges on several related fields in which the House has long-established standing committees.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, that we create an additional standing committee. That would certainly be premature and perhaps ultimately unwise. I do believe, however, that the field of arms control is one of great significance that deserves and requires the attention of a committee of the House. Obviously, the quest for practical, effective, multilateral procedures by which arms control or disarmament can be achieved is a continuing concern of national policy at the highest levels.

We should recognize these developments by an appropriate committee of the House of Representatives. Since its membership probably would include key members of the Committees on Armed Services, Atomic Energy, Foreign Affairs, and Science and Astronautics, appearances before the proposed Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament would facilitate coordination of policies in these related fields and reconciliation of differing viewpoints in the interests of unity and achievement.

We should be mindful, also, of the continuing impact that the proposed Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament could have on world opinion. Let the whole world know that the Congress of the United States backs the President's efforts to achieve arms control. Establishment of a Select Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament would be telling evidence of the importance this House places on the massive effort the United States is making to prevent a nuclear holocaust. What other Nation has a comparable body in its legislative structure?

In my judgment, these are compelling reasons which should gain favorable consideration for this resolution. I do not, of course, anticipate action during the remainder of this session. However, I would hope that discussion would ensue in the coming months with respect to the resolution to create a Special Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament. As a further contribution to this discussion and consideration, I should like in conclusion to review the history of the Subcommittee on Disarmament created July 25, 1955, pursuant to the terms of Senate Resolution 93—84th Congress, as amended by Senate Resolution 185 and Senate Resolution 286—84th Congress, and Senate Resolution 61, Senate Resolution 151, Senate Resolution 192, and Senate Resolution 241—85th Congress. In August of 1958 this subcommittee published a final report—Senate Report 2501, 85th Congress—and merged with the full Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Three years after this subcommittee was created to make a "full and complete" study of the disarmament problem, Senate Resolution 241—85th Congress—approved by the Senate in January of 1958, dissolved the subcommittee as of July 31, 1958. This resolution gave the following reason for its discontinuance:

> Inasmuch as the question of armaments reduction and control is primarily a problem

of foreign policy and a problem intimately related to many other foreign policy matters and in view further of the responsibilities of the Foreign Relations Committee over foreign policy matters, at the expiration of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, on July 31, 1958, all records, duties, and functions of the subcommittee should be turned over to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Another argument for the abandonment of the subcommittee was that the Disarmament Commission designated by the General Assembly of the United Nations should be the appropirate forum for conducting negotiations on the regulation of disarmament.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has found no record of the establishment of such a subcommittee in the House of Representatives. Neither House has, to my knowledge, previously entertained a measure to create a Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament.

It is my hope that this proposal will receive the personal attention and consideration of each and every Member of this House.

Patriotism in Procurement Scandal Rewarded With Vicious Reprisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in past reports to my colleagues on the shocking waste that goes on in military departments, I have mentioned the difficulty in securing the cooperation of American industrialists to ferret out wrongdoing and chicanery. I have said point blank that there is a scandal underneath military procurement that will make Teapot Dome look like a ladies tea party, and I have also said American business is afraid to speak up for fear of reprisals that could ruin any single business. These reprisals come swiftly when the inefficiency and duplicity of a military agency is unveiled for all to see.

Today I want to call the attention of the House—and the entire Nation—to a profoundly disturbing situation that illustrates what I have been contending throughout my own personal procurement study. There is a brazen, callous, and shocking attempt underway right now to retaliate and exact reprisals on a businessman who is a key witness in the Justice Department prosecution of men charged with accepting bribes in exchange for Government contracts. For reference purposes, Members may consult the RECORD for July 13, 1962, and get the full details. Suffice it to say that two of three men arrested were high-ranking civilian officers of the Signal Corps. They were caught with bribe money in their pockets after Electronic Manufacturer Robert Snoyer, cooperating with the Government, paid them bribes in a restaurant. Snoyer patriotically told the FBI about the bribe demand and cooperated to bring the men to justice.

Since the arrests, a preliminary hearing has been held on the case and the men have been ordered held by a U.S. grand jury. Also, since that time, I might inform my colleagues, the FBI has broadened its investigation into the Signal Corps considerably. I want to predict here today, before I proceed any more, that other shocking instances of corruption will soon come to light and will be presented to a grand jury.

This sort of practice, which leads to rigged contracts, fat prices, and fatter profits, is picking the taxpayers' pockets of billions of dollars each year. This is the idea I have been hammering away at for 18 months, and I am going to continue.

Within the past week I have received what to me is stunning information about a development in the FBI's investigation into Signal Corps procurement. It is a development that proves what I have said—the military conducts reprisals against anyone who dares expose its corruption. It is also a development which is outrageous and which threatens the success of any similar investigation in the future.

Mr. Snoyer's firm, which blew the whistle on corrupt Signal Corps officials, is called Consad Corp. of Santa Monica, Calif. I think the Members will agree this firm is entitled to the respect and gratitude of every Member of Congress and of every person in the country for helping uncover the first of the bad apples in the Signal Corps barrel. It should also be entitled to the gratitude of the Signal Corps for helping ferret out this corruption within its own ranks. Instead, Consad Corp. has been harassed repeatedly since the arrests were made. There seems to be a concerted effort to default Consad on a current Government contract and to drive it entirely out of military production.

I should like to take as much time as possible to explain just how these reprisals are being worked. To effect that I asked Mr. Snoyer to give me a complete memorandum on the pressures being exerted, and he has done that. I shall insert his memorandum to me at this point in my remarks, and I shall refer to it as I progress:

THE CONSAD CORP.,
Santa Monica, Calif., August 8, 1962.

Hon. EARL WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I pass along to you the detailed information relating to the pressures that have been exerted on the Consad Corp. and the undersigned since July 12, the day of the arrest of two U.S. Army Signal Corps employees at Fort Monmouth, N.J. The pressure which has been exerted relates mainly to four contracts held by this corporation: (1) Contract No. 19388–PP–62–C1–41, dated April 25, 1962; equipment description, cable assembly; (2) contract No. 19389–PP–62–C1–41, dated April 25, 1962; equipment description, cable assembly; (3) contract No. 19394–PP–62–C1–41, dated April 27, 1962; equipment description, cable assembly; (4) contract No. 19417–PP–62–C1–41, dated May 25, 1962, equipment description, cable assembly.

For your information, the reason most of these contracts were dated in April is that I visited the Philadelphia Signal Supply Agency and asked why these contracts had not been awarded, since the date of their bid opening, under competitive bid circumstances, had been at least 6 weeks earlier.

From date of award until July 15, 1962, only one communication was received from the Signal Corps. This was a request to change packaging, which resulted in a price increase of $0.04 per unit on one of the assemblies. On July 12, 1962, the arrest of the Signal Corps personnel occurred. On July 16, the Signal Corps requested I visit their facility; and they requested from me the status of these contracts. I advised them that Consad had closed its manufacturing facility and that it planned to subcontract performance of these contracts to a vendor, CleCal Corp., of Van Nuys, Calif. Mr. Weinfield, conracting officer, verbally agreed with this request; however, it was suggested by a Mr. Perkins and concurred in by Mr. Weinfield that they discuss this program with our proposed subcontractor.

On July 17, 1962, Mr. Kreiger, president of CleCal, and the undersigned visited the Signal Corps offices. At that time, several persons were brought into the meeting. They advised Mr. Kreiger that there were approximately 200 specifications that he must have in his possession and adhere to if he were to successfully complete performance of these contracts. They further indicated that it would take them at least 6 weeks to provide him with these initial specifications which were pertinent to the contracts. They further indicated that each of these 200 specifications could contain references to anywhere from 2 to 20 additional specifications; and that he was expected to adhere to all of these requirements. Then, they called in the packaging expert who, in great detail, pointed out the criticalness and complexity of packaging these products. They further indicated that the penalty for default under the contract was severe and that if this material were not produced in accordance with all of this data his future as a contractor could be jeopardized.

To put this into context, the above represented at least 3½ solid hours for various Signal Corps personnel on these matters.

After this meeting, Mr. Kreiger indicated to me that he had decided to withdraw from the program in that: (a) It was impossible to obtain the specifications in the time necessary to meet delivery under the contracts; (b) "It was apparent that every rule and regulation would be carefully implemented"; (c) It would cost more "to review the specifications, contractual documentation, and satisfy the quality control personnel than the face value of the contracts."

On July 19, 1962, in accordance with terms of the contracts and a request made by the contracting officer, we submitted a technical action request to the contracting officer. We had, previously, advised him that preproduction assemblies and test data required by the contracts had been submitted directly to Fort Monmouth by one of our subcontractors. We were advised that it was necessary to submit the technical action request outlining this action that we had accomplished. At that point, and time, it was mutually agreed that a reproducible copy of this technical action request would be submitted directly to the western regional office of the Signal Corps, where all of these negotiations had taken place.

On July 19, 1962, this technical action request was submitted. On July 23, we received a telephone call from the production specialist, Mr. Perkins, stating that this technical action request was not adequate. Since I had submitted this type of paper to various agencies over the past 12 years, I was, naturally, surprised that this particular document which simply described the transmittal of preproduction samples was not adequate. When I asked the reasons, I was informed by Mr. Perkins that he did not know but that a Mr. Levine who was the Fort Monmouth representative at the Western Regional Office would call me to tell me.

When I did not receive word the next morning, July 24, I again contacted Mr. Perkins, at which time he indicated that he did not know why Mr. Levine did not call me. Then, I contacted the contracting officer, Mr. Weinfield, who indicated he would look into the matter and advise me. On July 27, 1962, I received a letter dated July 25, 1962, signed by the contracting officer, that set forth four reasons for this rejection. These objections mainly concerned placing the same information into two areas of the technical action request, instead of indicating a lack of information in the technical action request.

On July 27, 1962, we resubmitted a reproducible copy to the Signal Corps, doing as requested in the original correspondence. We were then advised, upon receipt of this document, that it should not be sent by them but distribution should be made directly as indicated on the form itself. I reminded them of my correspondence of July 23, 1962, addressed to the contracting officer, which confirmed my understanding with them that this should be submitted directly to their office for distribution. They admitted that they had agreed to this verbally, but had changed their minds, indicating that contractually we were required to make this distribution. While I was unable to find this clause in the contract, we did make the distribution, as suggested.

On July 27, 1962, I received a certified letter, return receipt requested, signed by Mr. R. Weinfield, the contracting officer, basically referencing the contracts concerned, and containing the following statements: "Failure to make satisfactory progress may endanger the timely performance on the four following contracts: (These are the ones listed on the first page of this letter).

"It is accordingly requested that the undersigned contracting officer be kept concurrent with your progress in this problem area."

On July 23, 1962, I had advised the contracting officer of our intention to subcontract these contracts to the El-Tek Division of El-Tronics in Hawthorne, Calif., and specifying a change in place of performance of these contracts. This letter was based on confirmation of verbal conversations held betwen the undersigned and the contracting officer on July 23. On July 24, 1962, I was advised by the proposed new subcontractor, El-Tek, that they had received a call from an unspecified person in the Signal Corps; wherein they had been advised that these contracts were in jeopardy of default and that they should be careful in undertaking a program of this sort. On July 25 or July 26, a survey of El-Tek facilities was conducted by Mr. John Stritch of the Western Regional Office of the Signal Corps. I was advised by Mr. Jacobi, vice president and general manager of El-Tek, that he had never had such a tough survey and that he was told he had quality control problems, and certain other areas of his production department did not appear wholly adequate. On or about July 27, I was advsied by Mr. Jacobi that El-Tek had decided to withdraw from performance of these contracts. The stated reason was that he could not come to a satisfactory financial arrangement with us. This was even though he and I had visited Consad's bank and had received every assurance that funds adequate to cover the value of these contracts, plus $5,800 would be placed in escrow and paid to him upon the shipment of the material under the above-referenced contracts.

On July 30, I requested a very close friend who is a senior executive in the defense industry and who is very close to many personnel in the Western Regional Office of the Signal Corps to call some of his friends to find out what the attitude of that office was to our corporation. He indicated that their position was as follows: "Unless he can find a subcontractor who is so reputable that we can't possibly criticize him, it our intention to force a default. If he finds this level of subcontractor, it will cost him enough money, because of high overhead rates, that that payment will be sufficient for our purposes."

Additional correspondence was received on July 31, 1962, from the contracting officer, Mr. R. Weinfield, again indicating potential danger of default.

What we had done, in the meantime, was to seek another subcontractor who could fill the following conditions: (a) Primary business was with another service, other than U.S. Army Signal Corps; (b) cognizance and resident inspection was in the hands of another military department, other than Signal Corps; (c) price to perform said contracts would be in line with our corporation's bid; and (d) technical capability and facilities would be adequate for performance.

We contacted Glentron Systems, Inc., of Sun Valley, Calif., which agreed to undertake these subcontracts. We did not advise the Signal Corps of this action until a firm contract was signed. We did advise Glentron principals of our position with the Signal Corps. They advised us that, since the Air Force was cognizant over their activities and that they had built a considerable number of comparable assemblies for the Air Force, they foresaw little or no problem in harassment by Signal Corps personnel. On July 31, 1962, we formally advised the Signal Corps to change the place of performance from the El-Tek Division of El-Tronics to Glentron Systems, Inc.

Please bear in mind that these assembly jobs require labor which does not exceed more than 10 minutes per unit. At the time all of this correspondence was going back and forth, 90 percent of our material was on hand, and initial deliveries were not due until August 23, 1962. The preproduction samples required by our contracts had been submitted 4 days prior to the contractual due date.

We had not received an answer to our correspondence of June 26, 1962, relating to the packaging, which constituted a delay in the program. We had not received information as to certain inaccuracies in the blueprints and technical data supplied us, upon which performance of one of these contracts is contingent. We had not received any reply other than warnings of possible default to our correspondence of July 23, which requested a contract change for place of performance. As of this date, August 9, 1962, we have not received any information nor any correspondence relating to our request for changing place of performance to Glentron Systems, Inc. We have submitted technical action request relating to preproduction samples, together with the material, and have not received acknowledgment nor any information as to adequacy or inadequacy of these samples. Admittedly, the due date for final testing is August 24, 1962.

On July 30, 1962, I placed a call to Colonel Painter, commanding officer of the Western Regional Office of the Signal Corps, outlining to him the above problems. On July 31 1962, he called me back and stated he was unable to identify that any of these problems existed.

On July 30, 1962, I was subpenaed to appear at the preliminary hearing on August 1, 1962. I thereupon prepared a letter to General Cook, commanding officer of the U.S. Army Signal Corps, Pentagon, Washington, requesting an audience with him on August 2 or August 3, to state these problems to him; advising Colonel Painter of my intentions. I arrived in Washington on August 2, contacted General Cook's office, was advised that he tried to contact me on August 1 to tell me that he would be out of town on August 2 and 3, but that he would arrange for his deputy commander, Maj. Gen. Howard Scofield, to listen to my statement. I spent from 3 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. with General Scofield, with the following results: (a) He was very grateful and indicated a willingness to always be available to hear problems a contractor was encountering; (b) he had absolutely no command authority over the areas in which I was having my problem and suggested that I go to Philadelphia to discuss the problem; (c) he commented that perhaps I really did not have a problem and that this was mostly hearsay, evidences and documentation that I showed him which might be construed in another manner; (d) he suggested I not go to Philadelphia, but rather, attempt to work with Western Regional Office of the Signal Corps more closely; (e) he was very pleased to see that the contractor was willing to take the risks involved in reporting "alleged violations of the law by employees of the Government," but that he had seen cases wherein they had gone on for several years with the result that the personnel were vindicated; consequently, we could not be positive of guilt or lack of guilt at this time.

This about completes my discussion with the Signal Corps personnel to date on this subject. I must say that I have stated my case to Congressman BELL, Mr. Howard Williams, who is executive assistant to the head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, and to the staff assistant of Senator TOM KUCHEL. They seemed to be more greatly concerned with this harassment and pressure than any of the Signal Corps personnel. Never before in my experience of over 13 years in the defense industry have I seen correspondence which promises contract default 30 days prior to any delivery date, when all material is on hand and a very simple assembly job is involved. Never before have I seen such a careless attitude on the part of senior management in a Department of Defense agency when such thoroughly documented information is presented. Admittedly, we are a very small company and, as such, may not be of great importance to the defense posture. However, we feel that our staff includes some the most competent technical personnel in the country, at the Ph. D. and subordinate technical levels. Each of us has enjoyed personal success in their endeavors to date, and our work in the past certainly has been accepted by those agencies with whom we have dealt. Never before have I received certified letters with this type of warning included. Never before have so many detailed specifications and obscure restrictions been relayed to me. At any rate, this corporation is presently ahead of schedule on all of these contracts. I continually advised the Signal Corps of the fact of this status. They have been requested to review this in detail, and we have indicated our willingness to cooperate with them in this review relating to internal financial data, production schedules and similar data, which would substantiate our position. The reaction to date to each of these suggestions, as you can see, has been another warning letter.

It is my hope, Congressman WILSON, that by publicizing incidences such as this, that some gain may be obtained by the Government of the United States and the Defense Department in avoiding situations of this type in the future. I fully recognize that this letter can possibly result in even greater pressure being placed upon me by various lower level personnel within the Government agencies. It is my intention, if this happens, to fully exhaust every means at my disposition to bring these matters to light in the full knowledge that this is not representative of the truly dedicated Government executive; hoping that the result of this information will be to eliminate or minimize occurrences of this type in the future. It is my belief, after spending many years in procurement activities on the industry side, that corrective legislature and particularly the improvement of administrative procedure that truly reflect existing laws would be helpful in reducing the costs to the Government of procured equipment in the defense effort. The loopholes and inconsistencies that exist are indeed extensive.

Please consider that the undersigned and resources of our organization, small as they may be, are at your disposal in assisting with the correction of these matters. At your request, we will be more than happy to detail certain areas which appear to be most flagrant.

Thank you for your assistance and interest.

Sincerely yours,

THE CONSAD CORP.,
ROBERT S. SNOYER,
President.

Now that is Mr. Snoyer's record of treatment his firm has received since he acted as a patriotic American. You will note when you read the memorandum that 2 weeks ago Mr. Snoyer came to Washington to complain to the Signal Corps about this treatment. He talked for 90 minutes with Gen. H. L. Scofield, after being diverted to that officer by the man with whom he actually had an appointment.

What action did he get from Scofield? Well, in my opinion, General Scofield said in effect, "Very interesting, if true. But your problem is outside my area of responsibility now. My main concern these days is with the new Defense Supply Agency. Take your problem up with Signal Supply Headquarters in Philadelphia."

This sort of statement was made by the head of the Signal Corps procurement division. It is an outrage that is absolutely incredible. You might ask why is it happening. I think there are several reasons:

First. Even the honest members of the Signal Corps procurement system apparently feel that this investigation is a blot on their record for they are a part of the procurement mechanism that this manufacturer has helped prove can be perverted for corrupt ends. Apparently honest members of the Signal Corps feel that as originators and administrators of this system, this investigation is a reflection on them. So they are doing everything possible to discredit this firm. It is the old story of "close ranks" and "protect one of your own"—even if your own is crooked.

Second. The stake that the remaining corrupt officials have in discrediting this firm is obvious. The entire electronics industry is watching to see what happens in this case. If this firm can be made an example, if it can be harassed out of the procurement field, it will stand as a lesson to all other contractors. If you blow the whistle on the Signal Corps—or on other corrupt procurement officials in any service—then "you'll get it in the neck." So keep your mouth shut and pay the shakedowns and kickbacks that are often necessary for smaller firms to get Government business.

Mr. Speaker, this situation cannot be permitted to continue. If Signal Corps officials from the chief signal officer, Gen. E. F. Cook, and the chief procurement officer, General Scofield, on down do not put a stop to this—immediately, without equivocation—then we may as well say goodby to all hopes for honesty—and equally important, for economy—in defense procurement. Such action is a blaring invitation for every procurement officer in every service to wheel and deal with impunity, to milk the taxpayers dry by selling defense contracts with under-the-table payments like they were being peddled on an auction block.

I understand that this situation has been brought to the attention of the Justice Department, and that the Attorney General is taking a personal interest in the matter. He is to be congratulated. Someone has to see to it that a firm which does its civic duty—and there are far too few firms willing to take such steps—is not penalized as a result.

I would like to make one thing clear at this point. I am not suggesting that this firm be rewarded for the brave action it took. Nor does this firm expect a reward. All I am asking—and all the Consad Corp. is asking—is that it be treated no differently than any other firm doing business with the Signal Corps. It is entitled to no more, but it is also entitled to no less.

Personally, I intend to demand from the Department of Defense and the Signal Corps a full report on this situation—an explanation why this was permitted to happen and a list of the names of the persons responsible. I also intend to recommend that the General Accounting Office, if possible, act as an impartial arbitrator in this situation to determine whether this firm is being subjected to discriminatory treatment by the Signal Corps' west coast office.

I hope that all other fellow Members of Congress interested in honesty and economy in procurement—and particularly my colleagues from this firm's home State of California—will join with me in calling the public's attention to this shocking situation and in urging the Defense Department to stop this disgraceful conduct on the part of the Army Signal Corps.

I am today directing a letter to Secretary of Defense McNamara asking for a full investigation of this outrage by the Defense Department Intelligence Agency. If the Secretary's performance in this case follows past patterns, do not look for any earthshaking developments. I say this because I have been denied information on military procurement by the Secretary of Defense himself.

To conduct a study such as mine it is necessary to have "before the fact" information on procurements. For some time I was receiving this information from several agencies. Since the findings began to come out, however, and since I have been proving that the taxpayers' money is being thrown to the winds, the Secretary of Defense himself has had me purged from lists to receive such information. He, too, follows the "close ranks against the foe" approach of all the rest of the military.

If this sort of action is typical of the man who has been called the "whiz kid" of the Defense Department, then I think it is time he went back to the Ford Motor Co. where he belongs and we got a Secretary of Defense who will cooperate with the Congress and who will work for the best interests of the American people.

The reason the Defense Department has shut off information to me is the same reason why reprisals are being taken against Consad and others. We are hitting the tender spots. We are uncovering the waste, the inefficiency, and the corruption. In short, Mr. Speaker, we are hitting them where they live, and they are trying to cut me off to stifle my work. I want to state here and now that the Secretary of Defense or no other person can do that, and I shall continue to investigate every example of abusive procurement I can uncover.

That, then, is the report on reprisals against Consad. What is Secretary McNamara going to do about it? Is he going to do anything? I think you will agree that it is indeed a shameful situation and one that should be corrected.

In closing, I want to inform my colleagues that I have just received a report on another phase of my study from the Comptroller General which shows that an American industry received a 100-percent larger profit for making a simple power supply than should have been the case. Next week I intend to spell out the facts in that case, and I think the Justice Department should proceed against the company, demanding return of the excess profits.

Communists Critical of U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose the U.N. loan bill will be very interested to know that the Communist world is also critical of the U.N. At the recent Soviet youth festival the Communists described the U.N. as "the most insidious, dangerous weapon available to the imperialist powers and a body completely subject to the evil Western colonialists."

Several American youths attended the world youth festival in Helsinki, Finland, and made an admirable attempt to counter Soviet propaganda and to advance the truth about United States and free world aims. One of these young people, Barney Frank, I am proud to say, is a resident of my congressional district. Barney, who is a student at Harvard, told me of the work of the dedicated young Americans who attended the festival. He also drew my attention to the following letter, which was signed by young people who attended the Helsinki meeting. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The letters follow:

AUGUST 15, 1962.

Representative CORNELIUS GALLAGHER,
Old House Office Building,,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GALLAGHER: Enclosed is a copy of the letter I spoke to you about on Tuesday. After my discussion with you, I learned that it had been reproduced and sent to all Members of the House. Since it was a mass mailing, however, I am sending a copy directly to you in the event there is any delay.

I am very glad that you will be able to read it into the RECORD, and I hope it will be of assistance to you in getting a positive vote on the issue. I will send you my thoughts on Helsinki in the near future. Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

BARNEY FRANK.

INDEPENDENT RESEARCH SERVICE,
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1962.

GENTLEMEN: In the course of the past several weeks we, the undersigned, have heard the United Nations cursed, reviled, threatened, and implicated in every unjust cause in recent history. We have listened as it was called the most insidious, dangerous weapon available to the imperialist powers and a body completely subject to the evil, western colonialists. These insults have been hurled as a part of the Eighth World Youth Festival staged in Helsinki, Finland, backed by Soviet funds and organized by the Communist-dominated festival international preparatory committee.

We are Americans of all political persuasions who have attended this festival in an attempt to present both sides of the international struggle in which our country is enmeshed. Not strong in numbers ourselves, but well organized, purposeful, and prepared with foreign language abilities and information, we have combined the efforts of several groups, each financed and organized by private initiative, to stage a cultural exhibition better than that of the Soviets, to present Western views on disarmament, colonialism, the cold war, and other burning issues, and to counteract on a personal basis the propaganda issued by the Soviet bloc states participating. Now we learn that by refusing to purchase $100 million worth of U.N. bonds, the Congress of the United States may cripple the one organization in which all people in the world have hope.

A picture has emerged from the attacks on the United Nations which have been made here this week, largely by Africans from Friendship University in Moscow. It is this: The United Nations seems to be the one forum in which the neutral nations who have suffered from colonialism, real or imagined, can express their independence. This independence is a great hindrance to the local Communist Parties. Without a forum such as the United Nations, the claim that these countries have a sham independence would ring more true to Africans and Asians; Communist efforts to organize revolutions in these areas, therefore, would meet with much easier success than they have so far. The United Nations is also dangerous to them because of its successes in maintaining peace in the Congo and Israel. In both senses, it is in fact one of the best weapons available to the free world.

As we understand the issue now before the House, there are to be no more amendments to the bill to purchase United Nations bonds. The issue now is yes or no. The plan for bond purchases may or may not be perfect, but it is a plan and an adequate one. This issue shall determine the future existence of the United Nations and the continued free existence of that three-quarters of the world which is emerging from poverty and colonial rule in our era.

Once in every decade such an issue comes before the Congress of the United States. The League of Nations was weakened irreparably when such an issue was presented following the First World War. Western Europe was saved when the Marshall plan was passed following World War II. Now such an issue is before you once again. If it fails, history will condemn all our people. We argue now from our experience here meeting real, not paper, Communists.

We do not pose as experts on communism; no American should, for it is extremely difficult for one of us to grasp the circumstances in which the rest of the world finds itself. But the United Nations is made up largely of the very people it benefits—the uncommitted nations. It can be no danger for us to have a free tribunal of the nations of the world. On the contrary, it is dangerous to those with whom we have met this week. For the sake of us who will inherit the world from your hands, for the sake of us who have already begun to show our initiative in this struggle, gentlemen, save the United Nations. We will bear the cost.

Respectfully,

James R. Newcomber, Chairman, Ad Hoc Committee; Harold Swayze, Michigan; Wendy Goepel, New Jersey; Karen Orren, California; Samuel Reiken, New York; Timothy F. Harding, Betty Garman, California; Tom Burns, Maryland; Iaoid Baker, Michigan; Barney Frank, New Jersey; Arthur S. Monhan, New York; Rensselaer W. Lester, New Jersey; John Mansfield, Connecticut; R. James Woolsey, Oklahoma; Martin Oppenheimer, Philadelphia, Pa.; Christine Mansfield, Connecticut; John A. Butler, Michigan; Steven V. Roberts, New Jersey; Ann Garfinkle, Helen Krilzter, New York; Michael Zach, Massachusetts; Fred Notehelfer, California; Don Price, Massachusetts; James R. Newcomer, Oregon, Sally Oppenheimer, Pennsylvania; Matthew J. Iverson, Wisconsin; Rose Banke, New Mexico; Griffin Crump, Indianapolis, Ind., 11th District; Neil SS. Welsa, Idaho; Todd Jeffrey Lefko, Minnesota; Ronald D. Levin, Pennsylvania; Joseph Rubin, New York; Bary Lando, Canada; Susan Newcomer, United States of America; Elliott F. Keelick, Pennsylvania; Norman Uphoff, Minnesota; ——— Groche, California; Mack Leighin, New York; Marguerite McKay, Minnesota: John R. Rasen, John D. Owen, California; Thomas Cotton, Texas; James W. Roberts, California; P. Edward Haley, Michigan; Thomas J. O'Leary, Garnett D. Green, California; John F. Meigs, Pennsylvania; Thomas C. Grey, California; Elinore Schaffer, New York; Theodore W. Volckhausen, Redding, Conn.; William Bestor, A——— Bestor, Washington; and Fred Goff, California.

Address by Hon. Theodore S. Gutowicz at Polish Soldiers Day Celebration, Philadelphia, Pa., August 12, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address given by my very good friend, the Honorable Theodore S. Gutowicz, insurance commissioner of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at the Polish Soldiers Day celebration, sponsored by the Polish Army Veterans Post No. 12 and its Ladies Auxiliary, in Philadelphia, on Sunday, August 12, 1962:

ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE S. GUTOWICZ AT SOLDIERS DAY CELEBRATION, PHILADELPHIA, PA., AUGUST 12, 1962

Mr. Toastmaster, reverend fathers, honored guests, officers and members of the Polish Army Veterans and Ladies Auxiliary, Post No. 12, and friends; I am deeply honored by the invitation to be your guest and speaker at this annual and memorable Polish Soldiers Day celebration.

I am also proud and privileged, as a member of the Governor's cabinet, to bring you a message from His Excellency, David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on this historically eventful day. The Governor wishes to express and extend his personal greetings, best wishes and congratulations to everyone gathered here for setting aside this day, in order to pay tribute to the heroism and valor of the Polish Army, not only in World War I but also in World War II.

People of Polish ethnic origin have ample reason to celebrate August 15 as Polish Soldiers' Day, so decreed 41 years ago by the Constitutional Parliament of Poland known as the SEYM. The reason is that 42 years ago, on August 15, 1920, the Polish people rose as one and routed the hateful aggressors from the East, the great Bolshevist hordes that invaded Poland practically at its rebirth to national independence, freedom, and liberty. The famous volunteer army, recruited hastily in the capital city of Warsaw, included young and old—from early teens to men past 70. It was a crucial period in the early life of a reconstituted and reunited land which, for more than a century, was divided by the three neighboring empires—Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary. The enemy was practically at the gates of Warsaw.

The nation united, and with a combined effort, drove the invaders out of their country under the supreme command of Joseph Pilsudski, who awakened the fighting spirit of the Poles earlier in World War I when he organized his famous legions. Many volunteers from America, who in 1917 and 1918, sailed across the Atlantic, over 26,000 strong, to fight on the western front in France under the command of Gen. Joseph Haller, joined Pilsudski's volunteer army at Warsaw.

Polish Soldiers' Day is more than a remembrance here today. In this audience, there are many comparatively recent arrivals in our country, most of whom are now citizens, who have repeated the 1920 performance, insofar as the call to arms is concerned, in World War II—but were defeated by treachery and a secret treaty, concluded earlier in Moscow, by Hitler's Ribbentrop and Stalin's Molotov. Coming from the East, 17 days after Hitler's armies invaded Poland from the West, Stalin's Communist hordes overran eastern Poland in execution of that secret treaty. The latter was in violation of all that is law, for Poland had nonaggression pacts with both Germany and Soviet Russia. While Adolf Hitler, with his usual effrontery and open "Greuel propaganda" started his "blitzkrieg" from the air, land and sea on September 1, 1939, first bombing hospitals, churches and Red Cross buildings, Joseph Stalin sent his armies westward into Poland on September 17, pretending to give aid to the Poles in their mortal struggle with the Germanic invader. And so today, we gather here to celebrate both Poland's 1920 effort which was compared to the ancient Greek heroic stand of Leonidas at Thermopylae, and the Polish peoples valiant stand in 1939, a stand which gradually, over the years, has changed the entire Polish nation of heroic fighters for liberty into soldiers of the famous underground and now spiritual resistance against the onslaughts of godless communism, imported from Moscow and ruling the country against the will of the governed.

This is indeed a great day to observe as we all pay homage and tribute to Poland's heroes and honor them in our midst here in America. The final battle of Warsaw has not been lost as yet. The spirit of Polish independence is still strong in the hearts of 30 million Poles in their homeland. We salute here today the Polish soldiers of Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who fought for Poland's and America's freedom in the 18th century—We salute the glorious fighters of 1830, 1863, 1905, 1920 and 1939 through 1944—those who fell during World War II fighting with our Western Allies and the United States at Narvik, Norway, at Tobruk in Africa, at La Falaise, in France, and Arnhem, in Holland, at Monte Cassino, in Italy. We salute them all. May their supreme sacrifice not be in vain. May Communist-ruled Poland again enjoy national renascence and for the second time in her history rise, again to full national independence and personal liberty of every one of her citizens.

Long live the glorious spirit of the Polish soldier.

And now, with your kind indulgence, I would like to make a few remarks in the native tongue of many present here.

Youth Thinks It Over: Political Comedy of Errors—To Be or Not To Be a Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I had called to my attention, a very significant and refreshing article on the great public question of extending any economic assistance to Communist-occupied countries. This article, written by Joseph A. Eszterhas, appeared in the July 29 issue of the Catholic Hungarian Sunday Katolikus Magyarok Vasarnapja.

This article is significant because it was prepared by a young man of 17 years, who graduated from Cathedral Latin High School, Cleveland, this June, and is preparing to enter college this fall. Though, young in years, he has had considerable experience with the realities of Communist governments.

His family left Hungary because the Russian Communists occupied this unhappy land and they came to the United States to build a new life in freedom.

What Joseph A. Eszterhas has to say on this burning issue of the day provides clear evidence that our younger generation are thinking, studying, and anxious to break with the failures of the past and to get our country moving again in the worldwide struggle against imperial Russian communism.

By leave previously granted, I insert this article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Catholic Hungarian Sunday, Katolikus Magyarok Vasarnapja, July 29, 1962]

YOUTH THINKS IT OVER: POLITICAL COMEDY OF ERRORS—TO BE OR NOT TO BE A COMMUNIST

(By Joseph A. Eszterhas)

While Khrushchev was babysitting Moscow's Communist Youth Festival last week with the soothing, motherly tones of the Kremlin's doubletalking jargon of prevaricated sophistry: "There is now an ever-increasing possibility of a war of major proportions * * *. The Western bomb tests are a crime against humanity"; the youthful, vigorous, never-to-be-outdone President of the United States returned from the annual all-star baseball game and had a typically new-frontierish comeback: "I am confident," he clipped, "that the administration proposal to supply Yugoslavia and Poland with increased foreign aid will pass the House with ease."

Both comments from both sources had been expected in both Moscow and Washington, and no event of any major significance was expected to follow in either quarter. The result was that both quarters exploded.

In Moscow, some six members of that youth delegation, evidently not comforted by Mr. K's motherly tones, showed their dislike—by marching right smack into the middle of Red Square with banners of "Down With Soviet Testing" and "Let's Stop Red Tests Too," a fact which caused even the most deadpan Soviet bigwigs to inject a little red in the face.

The Washington occurrence, although certainly not as dramatic, was just as volatile. South Carolina's flamboyant Democrat, STROM THURMOND, who in 1957 held the Senate floor for a 24-hour filibuster, now followed the President's statement with his own: "The United States has been contributing, and contributing substantially to its own downfall by supporting economically a government whose leader reaffirms his dedication to the eventual overthrow of our way of life."

Like the shot in the dark, both statements were followed by a menacing quiet—in Moscow and in Washington. Moscow's events are insignificant compared to Washington's, since the youth festival will end this week, whereas Congress will reassemble and keep reassembling.

Very evidently, the "aid to Yugoslavia and Poland" question has been blown wide open, with chain reactions expected to follow when the actual vote on the question will be taken.

Since our money is involved, it is a very interesting though also a very old issue. So many charges and countercharges have been coined that it seems almost impossible to come up with new ones. And yet various critics in various corners of the globe manage to keep coming up with newer and newer ones.

It has been widely argued in columns and political features from coast to coast that aid to Yugoslavia will aid the people and not the government; that it would make the Yugoslav and Polish regimes less communistic; that the action really serves our purposes because it would ease Soviet strain on both nations. The longtime exponent of aid to Communist countries, George Kennan, describes aid as "the only humanitarian thing to do," while the Oregon Democrat and Mormon bishop, WAYNE MORSE, sticks to the Bible and claims "we should continue our Christian principles and give them (Yugoslavia and Poland) aid."

Indeed, the best way to answer arguments factually is by a good look at the record. In this case, it may be argued that the record here depends on where you're looking at it—from the West, or from behind the Iron Curtain. It seems only fair then that the record is to be looked at from both sides. First, to see why Yugoslavia and Poland are deserving of our aid, and then to see who the people are that we're giving aid to.

Since Tito was expelled from the Cominform in 1948, we've invested roughly $2 billion in aid, both military and economic, to Yugoslavia. For a number of years, our military aid program alone operated at the rate of $100 million per year. Our aid to Gomulka since Poznan's 1956 uprising has amounted to $1 billion.

In essence, our policy planners' reasoning is that the individual nations now under communism will become more and more independent of Moscow as the rising tide of nationalism takes hold. Each will eventually evolve into a peaceful, nonaggressive, socialist state. It is by this means that international communism is to be thwarted. Presumably, our policy planners are satisfied that the theory they have concocted is a valid one, but an examination of the facts forces a contrary conclusion.

Yugoslavia has been reputed in the past to be aiding in the export of the Communist revolution, through Cuba and into the whole of Latin America. Even Under Secretary George Ball has admitted in open hearing that Yugoslavia is supporting the export of the Communist conspiracy.

In 1961 the freighters *Troboville* and *Gundelec* left San Diego loaded for Yugoslavia with jet trainer planes. Mr. Ball admitted that at least one of the ships had a stopover in Havana. The fact that the Cuban Communist pilots have been trained in Yugoslavia lends credence to the belief that at least some of these trainer planes got no further than Cuba.

There is intelligence information indicating that Yugoslavia contributes substantially to Communist activities in areas of the world other than South America, including southeast Asia and Africa. For while we have been giving aid to "underprivileged" Yugoslavia, Tito has been carrying on a trade setup with India, Indonesia, Burma, Ghana, Ethiopia, and other Afro-Asian nations. In short, we have been underwriting, through American greenbacks, the extension of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev. The only question left unanswered is how the amount of money which Yugoslavia spends in these activities compares with the amount the United States contributes to Yugoslavia.

State Department officials have many times used the argument that Yugoslavia has very clearly shown, through its U.N. voting record, that it is not a stand-up-and-be-counted member of the Soviet bloc. But then how is it that on December 12, 1953 Yugoslavia voted "no" on the 37-power resolution condemning continued defiance of General Assembly resolutions on Hungary. Although the resolution was adopted by a vote of 54 to 10, the entire membership of the Communist bloc voted against it—plus Yugoslavia.

Throughout the entire period of the Hungarian uprising, Yugoslavia lent taciturn approval to the slaughter of the freedom fighters by a total and obvious lack of criticism. If they maintain strict adherence to Communist line and unflinching loyalty to the Communist movement, then how can it be said that they are not a member of the Communist bloc?

In the 1961 session of the General Assembly, Yugoslavia voted with the Soviet Union and against the United States on 21 separate issues. These included the question of Tibet, the item of Hungary, against the U.S. resolution not to seat North Korea, and for the admission of Red China. On all questions of any importance to the Communist movement, Yugoslavia voted with the U.S.S.R.

In a 1956 interview with Edward R. Murrow, in response to the request that he describe the basic differences between Communism in Yugoslavia and Communism in the Soviet Union, Tito said:

"These are not big, ideological differences. They are not too big. We have the same aims—that is to say, the building of socialism and Communism."

On May 6 of this year, Tito announced a series of drastic new measures, destined to bring the Yugoslav economy under tight Communist control.

"Some will say the Communists have taken everything in their hands again," he said, "but we know what has to be done and what the people want."

He has already joined with Nasser in an attempt to direct their economies against the newly formed Common Market. He has again jailed Milovan Djilas for rejecting the tyranny of communism and finding little difference between Stalin's brand and Tito's. He has, through Ben Bella's own admission, taken a part in the Algerian crisis; taken part in a Sofia meeting of Bulgarians and Rumanians, and has recently announced his intention to visit the Soviet Union sometime this summer.

And finally, this past week, while aid to Yugoslavia was being voted on, he joined Khrushchev in condemning American testing by calling it "a danger to mankind."

In short, he has, through a hundred of different actions, shown where he stands. His stand is understandable, for Josip Broz Tito has been, ever since those early days, a diehard Communist guerrilla. What is not understandable is how a free nation, founded on the precepts of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, can believe in a Tito. And what is completely beyond reason, is how the citizens of that free nation can be expected to not only feed him, but his whole party breed as well.

That's the Western side of the argument.

The surest way to see how the Reds think is to check their press. Since it is a government enterprise, it will always reflect the party line. Not unexpectedly, their thinking mirrors itself in a double reflection. One is ideological, the other is social.

In Hungary, which is as Sovietized as the other satellite countries, ideological hocum is jammed into a compact 4 by 6 red and white monthly with coarse paper, coarse writing, and the even coarser, wornout Red slogan: "Proletarians of the World, Unite" plastered over the cover. It is called the Társadalmi Szemle (Social Review), and it terms itself the "intellectual and political magazine of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party."

Throughout the year, the Társadalmi Szemle has kept up a stinging, biting, knock-'em-dead barrage on American principles, politics, policies, and Presidents.

In its January 1962 edition it quotes Khrushchev: "It is undoubtable that in numerous capitalist nations where capitalism is still strong, and where gigantic military and police organs still exist, it is unavoidable that a class struggle will be intensified."

In its February edition, it goes even further: "The time is rapidly approaching," it says, "when the United States will lose its lead in its overall consumptive demand. The working class of the United States, if it achieves political mastery, will quickly adjust itself to the socialistic reorganization of its society; that is, the buildup period for socialism will be shorter."

Both statements call for open revolution of the working class. Both statements come from members of the bloc to which we will be giving aid.

And then, punchlining its message, the February 1962 edition of the Társadalmi Szemle builds up to an intensely frightening crescendo which reveals psychosis and deception, when it maintains, in an article by Dezso Nemes, that "the agricultural level of the United States is too low for communism."

Now there is quite a statement. The only reply possible, and the easiest reply to make, is that if what Mr. Nemes holds is true (U.S. agricultural level is too low for communism) then why are we giving them aid.

In April, the Társadalmi Szemle keeps right on rolling and rolling. "Revolution and a State in Cuba" is the article head, and Irene Komjat has some choice words to say about U.S. business and Cuban economy.

"It is true," she says, "that America businessmen have built roads, modern factories, and beautiful residential areas in Havana's outskirts, as well as grand hotels and department stores * * * but American business has made Cuba, which is rich in its natural resources, a poor nation."

Choice words, they are indeed. For they make one wonder if the distinguished writer of the Társadalmi Szemle has ever heard of the word "logic." From what she writes, the word isn't in the Communist terminology.

Applying itself to the newest Federal bid to register the U.S. Communist Party, the Társadalmi Szemle shows its true color most clearly in its June issue. On page 82 appears this statement from "the intellectual and political magazine of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party."

Throwing Soviet cliches around as if they were the mainstay of the Hungarian language, the Szemle makes this point: "But the American imperialists have failed in their attempt to liquidate the party. The Communist Party of the United States lives and is working today, and it is the leader of the American people's battles in the present, and in the future."

"Imperialists" and "liquidate" are terms we've heard before. But never before have we been so pleased to hear them as to shell out our money in gratitude. We've heard them tell us before about "U.S. levels being low" and "businessmen ruining Cuba" and "ripe for revolution." But never before have we paid them for it.

And yet this is only one side of their barrage. The other reflection—the social side rips up customs, traditions and personalities of America, with a coracity twice as vicious and twice as low. Their social attack is targeted to reach the working man through large, tabloid sized gossip—sheets or comic—type editions which are embarrassingly cheap in style and content.

These range from mocking, black and white shots of American Art (Ország-Világ, Dec. 1960) to an underhanded swipe at the Nation's legislators. The March 1962 Ország-Világ (The Nation and the World) comments beside a large picture of Charles Laughton playing the "typical American Senator" in "Advise and Consent," "that it seems that in America the actors play Senators and the Senators play actors." What makes it a little more than ironic is the fact that these very Senators whom the Ország-Világ says are "actors" will be the ones dispursing the aid.

There are other tidbits thrown in between: A reference to John F. Kennedy in Ország-Világ "Don't worry John, even if you wouldn't have won the election, you could've bought the whole Nation." A ridiculous statement that in the West, those people who don't have the finances to pay "dog tax" have their dogs torn from them. The canine caper story is of course spiced by a shot of a little boy playing tug-of-war with a mustached badman, with of course, a dog in the middle, and the caption: "Poor boy can't pay his dog tax."

In the April 1962 issue of Világ Ifjusága, The World's Youth (the paper in itself is a sight to behold-its is twice the length of Life, it's make up twice as poor as Mad) appears an article entitled "Ignorant Graduates." Spaking of American youth in general, the article says: "Much of the American youth's education doesn't exceed that of an illiterate. There is talk that the vast majority of college graduates are incapable of composing an everyday theme." The article is accompanied by a cartoon showing a college grad in cap and gown, learning his ABC's on a blackboard.

But if this be a false image of America and the American people, it rates a zero as compared to the depiction of the American in the May issue of Tábortüz (Campfire) the Hungarian Party's scrap-sheet for its "Pioneer" movement.

Featured attraction of the May issue is a set of comics entitled "The Heroic Island." The first two caricatures show a Cuban Communist hero, Jose, and his schoolteacher sweetheart, Juanita, who claims: "Within 1 year there will not be a single illiterate in Cuba." Continuing, the cartoon shows soldiers paratrooping into an invasion on Cuba. Immediately recognizable by their uniform as American GI's these "warmongers" land, and upon the invasion, are so dumb that they ask where they are. From there on they go to bigger things. One soldier asks Juanita: "Honey, what are you doing among so many dirty niggers?" And while this same soldier paws at the innocent schoolteacher, the other empties his machinegun into the "nigger." The last sequence shows them bawling: "After them, we'll get every one of them."

What the cartoon did was simple. In two pages, it managed to draw a razorblade image of the American as brutal and cannibalistic, a complete ignoramus, a prejudiced "nigger-hater," a rapacious animal, and finally, a cold-blooded murderer.

Indeed, their cartoon wasn't comical. In fact, the only comical thing about the whole grim affair is that we'll be giving our aid to these Communists. And that, indeed is very funny.

Well, that's the other side of the argument. What they think about us.

One wonders about the Congressman who will vote for giving the aid. He has been called an "imperialist," an "actor," "liquidator" and "a man learning his ABC's." He has been shown to be a merciless killer and a brutal, rapacious animal. The people whom the Congressman represents have been urged to revolt against him and have been told that "the time is ripe for a socialist revolution." The image of the American in uniform, the image the Congressman himself once shared, has been defiled to that of a nigger-hating merciless killer, pawing away at the innocent female.

And then one wonders of the aid they'll be getting. To call more Congressmen more names. To urge more people to newer revolts, to spread communism with more funds.

And then one really wonders: How is it that if we know all this, our Congress doesn't, our President doesn't.

And then again, maybe they do know.

But in all this controversy, we've lost someone. That youth—what does he think?

For an answer, we turn to the area's biggest concentration of teenage political opinion. It is a Mock Student Congress. Bills and resolutions are drawn up by high-schoolers, who for 1 day address each other as "distinguished Senator," and become legislators. Most resolutions are defeated. It takes either a very well worded resolution, or a resolution expressing the opinion of the vast majority to pass.

At 1962's first Mock Student Congress in the Cleveland area, only one bill passed. It read thus:

"RESOLUTION TO RESTRICT FOREIGN AID TO YUGOSLAVIA

"Whereas American taxpayers have been losing money steadily in foreign aid programs to Yugoslavia and other Soviet satellites;

"Whereas these aid programs have directly helped the growth of the Communist conspiracy here and on other continents;

"Whereas the Communist conspiracy poses an unmatched danger to Western security: Be it

"*Resolved by the Northern Ohio Student Congress*, That (1) all aid to said countries (Yugoslavia and Soviet satellites) be immediately halted."

The resolution passed by an overwhelming majority. It meant that youth has its own opinions, and sometimes they are directly contrary to those of present day legislators. And it meant that at least there is hope for the future.

The resolution can be criticized on the grounds that the resolution's author is a very young man.

And so he is.

But then, President Kennedy is not a very old one.

What the Public Works Acceleration Bill Will Do—Questions and Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Public Works Acceleration and Coordination Act, H.R. 10113, has been granted a rule and will soon be brought to the floor of the House.

The Public Works Acceleration Act is one of the most important bills that the House will vote on this session. Its purpose is to combat the continuing high level of unemployment through the construction of urgently needed Federal, State, and local public works. This bill will give every Member an opportunity to show whether or not he is concerned over the plight of the unemployed, and whether or not he is willing to take constructive action to help the jobless.

The bill and the need for action are clearly set forth in the report of the Committee on Public Works—House Report No. 1756. To state emphatically just what the bill would do and what it would not do in the clearest possible terms, I am inserting in the RECORD an explanation of the bill in question-and-answer form:

Question. What would H.R. 10113 authorize?

Answer. First, the bill authorizes the appropriation of $900 million to expand employment through the construction of Federal, State, and local public works. Second, to meet the long run need of better planning and coordination of information on public works, the bill would establish the Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration.

THE IMMEDIATE PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Question. Why do we need to spend this $900 million.

Answer. Unemployment has been above the 5 percent level continually for the past 5 years and there is nothing in recent statistics or business reports that indicates a rapid return to full employment. In fact, the present economic slack threatens to pull the entire economy into another recession unless something is done to stimulate business.

Question. Where would these public works projects be located?

Answer. To assure that the program will have its first and greatest impact in areas where unemployment is most serious, aided projects would have to be located in one of the cities or counties eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act or in one of the 122 other communities which have suffered from high unemployment—6 percent or more—for most of the past year. Altogether this comes to a little over 1,000 eligible places which are listed in the committee report.

Question. Will these eligible areas be the only ones to benefit by the bill?

Answer. Certainly not. The program will stimulate the entire economy through the purchase of construction materials and will have a multiplier effect as the incomes created are spent and respent.

Question. How many jobs would be created under the bill?

Answer. At least 150,000 man-years of employment would be created in on-site construction employment and in the factories and mills which produce construction material. As the incomes generated are spent and respent, at least 150,000 additional man-years of employment would be created through the country.

Question. What kind of Federal projects could be undertaken under the bill?

Answer. Only those Federal projects specifically authorized by the Congress and which meet the other requirements in H.R. 10113 could be built.

Question. What Federal agencies would get these funds?

Answer. The President could allocate the money to whichever Federal agencies could use the money most effectively. These would include the Corps of Engineers, the Forest Service, Soil Conservation, or any other Federal agency authorized to undertake construction.

Question. What kind of aid would be available for local public works?

Answer. The bill authorizes Federal grants to cover 50 percent of the cost of local projects.

Question. How large could these projects be?

Answer. The bill limits projects to small- and medium-sized ones through the requirement that a substantial part of a project must be completed within the first 12 months. This rules out any disproportionately large undertaking.

Question. Could a community get these grants for something which is merely a luxury, like a swimming pool?

Answer. That would be impossible under the bill which states that any project aided must "meet an essential need."

Question. How quickly could this program get underway?

Answer. Many projects could be started almost immediately and it is expected that most of the aid would be committed in a matter of 1, 2, or 3 months. Unlike some public works programs in the past, this aid would not be used for very large projects which have a long leadtime. There are a tremendous number of projects which would be eligible that are already fully planned and could be undertaken quickly if this aid were available. A list of about 500 projects in eligible areas, on which planning is completed but construction net yet started, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 16, 1962, just as an indication of the backlog which exists.

Question. What kind of local public works could be aided?

Answer. Any local community facility for which Federal loan or grant aid is authorized under existing law, except schools which are not eligible. For example, the grants could be used to help finance water and sewer lines, public buildings, streets and sidewalks, and so forth.

Question. Could low-rent public housing be built with these funds?

Answer. Public housing would not be built under this bill because that program already has ample authorization to carry it for the next 3 years, and the assistance provided in the Housing Act is greater than that authorized in H.R. 10113.

Question. Is this another depressed areas bill?

Answer. While most of the eligible areas are those designated under the Area Redevelopment Act, there is a clear difference in purpose and in the assistance provided. The Area Redevelopment Act is a basic long-term effort to cure fundamental economic problems, by creating new private enterprises, or expansion and modernization of existing ones, and requires comprehensive planning as a first step. That law was never intended as a shot-in-the-arm for employment. The public works bill is designed to meet the immediate problem of high unemployment and at the same time build useful community public facilities which will make these communities better places in which to live and help their long-term growth. At the same time this bill will stimulate the entire economy and create jobs throughout the Nation.

Question. What is the difference between this bill and the public facility grant provision in the Area Redevelopment Act?

Answer. The aid for public facilities under Area Redevelopment Act is strictly limited to those projects which are directly related to the creation of new permanent employment, such as a factory. The aid in this bill could be used for the whole range of public works—except schools—which are justified on their own merit.

Question. Won't this $900 million increase the Federal deficit?

Answer. The principal threat to a balanced budget is the danger of a recession. The largest peacetime deficit in our history—$12 billion—came as a result of the 1958 recession. About three-fourths of that resulted from the loss of revenue and most of the rest came from increased expenditures such as temporary unemployment compensation. The economic stimulation that this bill would give would increase Federal revenues. Also, it should be kept in mind that we are currently spending $4 billion a year for unemployment compensation.

Question. Why would this bill authorize matching grants for projects now eligible only for loans?

Answer. Loan assistance may be adequate to meet ordinary community facility needs, but the present circumstances of high unemployment and uncertain economic outlook call for a more direct and effective aid.

Question. Could not the President use the $2.5 billion of unobligated funds under existing programs, such as urban renewal, VA, home loans, farm home loans, and community facilities, so that this bill would not be needed?

Answer. None of these programs would provide the right aid at the right places to meet the present problem of unemployment. Half of that total is for the urban renewal program and urban renewal is necessarily a long and time-consuming undertaking. Moreover, the first object of urban renewal expenditures is the acquisition of land and existing structures, and this does not create employment. The highly successful community facility program authorizes only loans and carries an interest rate of approximately 3¾ percent which simply is not enough aid to stimulate enough additional construction promptly. The home loans for rural areas under the Farmers Home Administration and Veterans' Administration cover many areas which, while lacking sources of private mortgage money, are not necessarily those in which unemployment is serious. Moreover, two-thirds of the VA loans are made to purchase existing homes and thus generate no employment. In contrast, H.R. 10113 is carefully designed to stimulate construction promptly and in areas of greatest need.

THE PUBLIC WORKS COORDINATOR

Question. Is the Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration a new idea?

Answer. No; it has been advocated by the Morris-Cook Commission of the Truman administration, both Hoover Commissions, and the Committee on Government Organization in the Eisenhower administration.

Question. Does not some existing agency, such as the Bureau of the Budget, now do the kind of work which the Coordinator would do?

Answer. There is no existing agency charged with the responsibility of coordinating information on public works projects at all levels of Government. Under the previous administration a Presidential assistant was appointed to perform approximately the same function that the Coordinator would have.

Question. Would this Coordinator be some kind of a public works czar?

Answer. He would not. The bill would not give him any operating responsibilities whatsoever. His function would be simply informational and advisory.

Question. Would the Director of the Office of Public Works Coordination determine which projects would be accelerated under the immediate acceleration program?

Answer. He would not. Responsibility for approval of projects would rest with the Federal agencies responsible under existing law for the administration of the programs which construct or provide assistance for the construction of public works. The President would have the responsibility of allocating the funds appropriated under this bill among these operating agencies. The Director would only be an advisory and informational arm of the Congress and the President.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address by Senator Goldwater Before American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 17, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on August 8, 1962, before the assembly session of the American Bar Association, in San Francisco, Calif.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF U.S. SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY SESSION OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, AUDITORIUM OF THE CALIFORNIA MASONIC MEMORIAL TEMPLE, SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. President, members and guests of the American Bar Association, I am both delighted and honored to be here today to participate in this important session of your very fine organization. Of course, you know that the American Bar Association is one of those groups of which we poor laymen stand in some awe. Its high professional standing and the great legal knowledge of its members are such that those of us with no law training approach an engagement such as this with considerable trepidation.

But perhaps it is proper, now and then, for you who are skilled in the details of the law to hear from one whose primary job it is to participate in the writing of new laws or the alteration of old ones.

And today I should like to direct your attention primarily to one area of law—that area which deals with the problems of labor-management relations. This area is becoming increasingly important in the life of the Nation. It has a direct bearing on the Nation's economic future in a time of extreme uncertainty and hesitancy. And it is an area which, I believe, warrants the closest attention of all Americans who are interested in our concepts of freedom and in sound economic growth.

The newspapers have been filled with news of serious labor disputes during recent months. The problems of the flight engineers and the Eastern Air Lines have become familiar to many Americans. The labor troubles in the aerospace industry have found their way into many headlines. Here, in California, a strike in the construction industry has recently taken place. Other disputes have occurred or are occurring at missile sites, in the automobile industry, on the east coast docks, and on our railroads. The list goes on and on.

In addition, the Government figures for the first 5 months of this year show a 60-percent increase in the number of work days lost due to labor disputes. It should be clear that the process of collective bargaining and its effects upon the economy and national security pose a problem of transcendent importance to all Americans.

Concern about the current labor picture and the various problems surrounding it is not mine alone. It has been voiced recently by such diverse publications and political leaders as the Washington Post, Senator KARL MUNDT, Life magazine, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN and even the New York Times. The Post calls "the need for additional law in this field clear and unmistakable." The Times refers to "a need for improved legal machinery to deal with emergency labor disputes." The Life article was titled "The Need for New Labor Laws."

Too frequently we attempt to find a cure without first acquiring a full and complete knowledge of the cause of the difficulty. The problem only becomes greater if we sweep the cause under the rug. This is particularly true where a problem has been created by actions of the Congress and continues to exist because the Congress refuses to recognize the cause and acknowledge the necessity for corrective action.

What I wish to discuss with this audience today is, in a broad sense, the subject of concentrated power. In my understanding of the Constitution the intent written into it by our Founding Fathers, was the prohibition against the gathering of power in any one branch of our tripartite system of government or any segment of our society. You gentlemen as lawyers are constantly aware of the dangers involved in such concentration and a good deal of your activities are directed against it. We are witnessing in our national Government today, and we have been for nearly three decades, the movement of more and more power away from the people and the States into the hands of the bureaucrats in Washington. And we have witnessed how this power can be used to benefit one segment of the economy, giving it monopolistic power.

I refer specifically to the concentration of power in the hands of labor leaders of today. This power came about as the result of Federal legislation. Its correction can only come through congressional action which would remove those portions of the labor-management act which confer a privileged status on labor unions. This exempt position is not related to the unions' bargaining power in legitimate labor-management disputes.

I would suggest the tremendous concentration of potential power in the hands of labor is contrary to the public interest and in the public I include the working union members.

Labor unions enjoy many special privileges and immunities under Federal law which are creative of power. By far the most important of these is the exclusive right to represent all the employees in the unit for purposes of collective bargaining, even if the union has been selected as bargaining agent by only a narrow majority, which in many circumstances under our existing law, in fact, constitutes only a minority. Under the law, those employees who do not wish to join, as well as those whom the union for whatever reason excludes from membership, can neither bargain for themselves nor select any person or agency other than the union so designated to bargain for them. They are, in reality, the involuntary principals of agents imposed upon them by law. In granting unions this right, the Government, in effect, has bestowed upon them the power of government itself. Although this provision of law has a certain usefulness in the area of collective bargaining, it results in the most serious injustice to those employees who wish to join the union but are excluded by the union itself. They have no voice in helping to determine the union's bargaining demands and policies, are not permitted to do their own bargaining, and they are compelled to accept and work under the terms and conditions of the agreements between the union and the employer, even if they find such terms and conditions highly unsatisfactory.

Moreover, in certain industries there is a widespread practice whereby employers recruit their labor force through the local unions in the particular area. This is particularly true in those industries where the most highly skilled, and consequently the most highly paid employees are needed to perform the work. It is precisely in these industries where union membership exclusionary policies are most widely and persistently applied. As a result, untold numbers of completely qualified workers, who for one reason or another are denied admission to union membership, are excluded not only from many jobs, but particularly from the most highly paid jobs as well.

There is an unconscious tendency on the part of many to regard labor-management relations as the exclusive concern of the parties directly involved; that is, of the union and employer.

Where a settlement is reached as the result of collective bargaining and without the intervention of a work stoppage resulting from either a strike or a lockout, it is safe to say, almost without exception, that in reaching the settlement none of the negotiating parties paid the slightest attention to its future impact on the economy of the Nation or its effect on the public interest.

The labor union representatives have a tendency to identify their own interests with those of the public—to believe, often in good faith, that what is good for the union and its members cannot possibly be bad for the public as a whole. Or, to put it another way, they have a tendency to regard the membership of the labor movement as constituting the general public itself. They do not usually think of themselves as the spokesmen for a special interest group.

Management on the other hand thinks in terms of the profitability of its operations, for in a free enterprise system, continued profitability is the basic condition for the survival of the enterprise. Unless the business is one enjoying a monopoly status which would enable it to share its profits directly with the public, it is the belief of a free enterprise economy that the natural forces of competition compel management to pass the results of economic and technical progress on to the public in the form of lower prices, improvements in quality, and new and theretofore unavailable products and services.

Unfortunately, even where an enterprise enjoys a temporary monopoly—and in a basically competitive economy most industrial and commercial monopolies are temporary—the greater profits of such an enterprise, where they are shared at all, are, as a result of union bargaining pressure, shared with the employees of the firm in the form of higher wages and increased benefits, rather than with the general public.

The public itself, generally, remains largely unaware of these underlying considerations which characterize the collective bargaining scene. It is only when the bargaining negotiations break down in a major or nationwide industry, which is engaged in production essential to the national security or welfare, that there is a shocked realization on the part of the public that it too has an important, perhaps the most important, stake in the outcome of the controversy.

The public is the overlooked body in most of the legislation written in the Congress of late, particularly in the field of labor-management relations. There are protections written into the labor-management law, and while they are not adequate, they exist, but the tendency today is to ignore them and by this action to further ignore the important role the public plays in any labor-management dispute. The key to these actions is not just the seeking of more power to be used from a central position, but the actual adoption of this power in an ad hoc manner or, to put it more plainly, working around existing laws. To understand this we must review briefly the recent comments of Archibald Cox, the Solicitor General of the United States and a key labor adviser to the President. He stated that under present conditions, the public consequences of decisions made by labor and management are so wide and serious that "the Government must have the opportunity to bring those consequences to bear in the making of decision."

Cox went on to spell out the administration's contention that "the public is entitled to a voice" in labor-management decisions. Translated this means that the Federal Government should take an ever-increasing role in the settlement of labor-management problems. It means that we can look forward to more, not less, Government encroachment in the collective bargaining process.

This becomes understandable when you consider the three recent examples of the extralegal approach to labor matters.

First, of course, we have the Government acting as a full third party in the recent steel negotiations. Following the signing of the Government-induced contract in that industry, the President thought his work was done. But when the steel companies, acting upon the mistaken belief that they were free to manage their own affairs, raised their prices the President immediately reasserted the Government's role. The results of that episode in Government-business relations are too well known to require comment. I mention it merely to illustrate one point—that the entire chain of events took place without reference to the Taft-Hartley Act or any other law, with the notable exception of the antitrust laws which were trotted out as part of the attack on the steel companies.

Second, we have the prolonged dispute in the airlines industry concerning the flight engineers. In this, the President and Secretary of Labor Goldberg have seen fit to operate outside the restrictions of the applicable law, the Railway Labor Act, on a number of occasions. Once again, the use of ad hoc boards became a favorite device of the administration.

Finally, in an effort to stave off a strike in the vital aerospace industry, the President and his Secretary of Labor came up with what they called a board of distinguished citizens and a 60-day postponement of the walkout on the part of the unions. Once again, the solution was completely ad hoc and once again the established procedures found in the law—in this case the Taft-Hartley Act—were completely ignored. It is also evident that this administration is not disposed to request new labor legislation; a number of bills have been offered in the Congress to deal with problems created by work stoppages in vital industries.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, for example, recently introduced a bill to amend the Taft-Hartley Act's national emergency strike provisions. This proposal would compel workers to stay on the job in national emergency situations and require compulsory arbitration of the disputes involved. Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, with other Senators, has proposed legislation which would "prohibit strikes by employees employed in certain strategic defense facilities." This bill also requires compulsory arbitration. In addition, Senator MIKE MONRONEY and another group of Senators want to amend the Railway Labor Act as it pertains to the national airlines and introduce the element of compulsion to take care of the engineers' strike against two airlines.

Significantly enough, all of these proposed changes in existing labor laws involve important elements of coercion and compulsion. They seem definitely to be in keeping with the thinking of those who believe that only by action from Washington can any of our problems, social, economic, political, or labor be solved.

In this connection, it behooves us to examine the nature of the continually recurring labor crises in the United States. Even a cursory examination will reveal one obvious truth—that labor unions have access to far to much power for the good of the economy or the health of the Nation.

Now it surprises no one to realize the immense size and the great economic strength possessed by American unions today. It is worth noting, however, that big labor did not gain its present vital position in our society wholly, or even primarily, through its own efforts. The Federal Government, that ever-present arbiter, policeman and entrepreneur of American life, has made organized labor what it is today.

Just to give you an idea of the preferred position held by today's union in the economic scheme of things, I have compiled a list of special privileges, immunities and rights and powers enjoyed by labor unions under the Federal law. And let me emphasize at the outset that most of these special considerations may have been justified when they were initially given to the labor movement because of their weakness and lack of size. However, possible justification from an historical standpoint certainly doesn't justify their continued existence in today's era of monopolistic union power.

The list I refer to is as follows:

1. Almost total immunity under the antitrust laws.
2. Immunity from taxation.
3. Immunity from injunctions by Federal courts.
4. Authority to use union funds for purposes not related to collective bargaining even where union membership is compulsory.
5. Power to compel workers to join the union as a condition of continued employment.
6. The right of a union selected by a majority of the workers to bargain for all employees. This includes the right to bargain for those who were compelled to join the union as well as those who can be arbitrarily denied membership.
7. Power to compel the employer to bargain exclusively with the majority union.
8. Absolute authority to deny union membership to workers employed in the bargaining unit, on any grounds or for no reason at all.
9. The right, in some situations, to invade the privacy of workers, even against their wishes. This deprives them of a legal right enjoyed by all other members of society.
10. The right, in some situations, to compel employers to make available for union use the private property of the employer.
11. The right to compel the employer to provide protection against any physical violence on the part of workers who resist invasion of their privacy.
12. Unions are immune from the payment of damages for personal and property injuries inflicted on employers or others by unions members engaged in activities, such as strikes or picketing. And this stands even in situations where such activities have been officially authorized and directed by the union.
13. The right to strike for objectives wholly unrelated to any proper subject of collective bargaining. This is in contrast to the severely limited right of an employer to engage in a lockout.
14. The right, in some situations, to examine an employer's books and records—including those containing such confidential data as costs, profits, and prices.
15. And finally, the almost complete immunity of unions from any liability, penalty, or restriction under State law under the doctrine of Federal preemption.

Now, I'm sure you realize that no other private organization, institution, association or individual in the United States is the beneficiary of such a powerful combination of immunities, benefits, privileges, rights and powers—under either State or Federal law.

And in presenting this list I am not suggesting that all of these special grants, without exception, should be removed. I do it merely to suggest that the entire question of unlimited powers for labor unions should be reviewed carefully by the Congress. I am firm in my belief that the repeal or limitation of some of these privileges and immunities is required to restore a more reasonable and workable balance in the Nation's labor-management relations. In this way, and only in this way, can we prepare the way for the conduct of free and fair collective bargaining between management and labor without Government interference. It is true that we would still have interruptions in production, but they would be substantially reduced in number. The ones we would have would represent the inevitable price a just society must be willing to pay in order to preserve its freedom.

United Press International Report on Stockpiling Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 17, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last February, President Kennedy expressed some concern about the size of the Government's storehouse of strategic raw materials. In April, the Senate Stockpile Subcommittee scheduled hearings. Since then many grueling hours have been spent and a great deal of contentious testimony has been heard on the subject. I am confident that the investigation, under the capable and responsible leadership of Senator STUART SYMINGTON, will result in a full and objective assessment of our country's stockpile program.

An excellent report on the committee's hearings was written recently by Jerry Landauer of United Press International. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Engle], I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Stockpile Probe

(By Jerry Landauer)

Washington, August 12, 1962.—For 5 months a Senate subcommittee has been digging diligently into the Government's vast storehouse of strategic raw materials. The digging has yielded assorted political skeletons. Some evidence of hanky-panky at the taxpayer's expense, and several instances of incredibly lax management.

The inquiry under Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, likely will last late into the fall. Its pace and progress have been as curious as the circumstances which kicked it off.

Already, some of the findings have been turned over to the Justice Department for more searching investigation.

On January 30 President Kennedy unexpectedly called attention to the secrecy shrouded war stockpiles. He told a press conference he was astonished that the Government had in stock $3.4 billion worth of metals and minerals not needed for defense mobilization.

He hinted at mismanagement and profiteering and called for a full-dress congressional investigation.

A Presidential call for a congressional inquiry is a rarity. Normally Chief Executives are more concerned about stopping investigations than sparking them. Republicans naturally assumed that the Democrats were seeking a foil to neutralize the political fallout from the Billie Sol Estes scandal.

As the investigation developed, GOP Senators suggested three further reasons for the administration's sudden interest: (1) A desire to nail ranking members of the Eisenhower administration; (2) the hope of obtaining authority to sell stockpile surpluses to help balance the Federal budget; and (3) the hope of wresting control of the stockpile from Congress.

Mostly in private, the Republicans went on to suggest that Symington's mission was to stir scandal and thus generate public support for authorizing the President to liquidate surpluses quickly. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower may have had the stockpiles among other things in mind when he lashed at Kennedy in the spring for seeking more power.

Symington sought to shut off these suggestions by hiring Richmond C. Coburn, a highly regarded corporation lawyer and leading Missouri Republican, as his chief counsel. Coburn, a 6-foot-3, whitemaned giant, is not the type to tolerate "going after" such Republican acquaintances as George M. Humphrey, Eisenhower's Secretary of the Treasury.

Humphrey quickly emerged as a central figure in the investigation and, of course, politics rapidly intruded. As Humphrey came under fire for a nickel stockpile contract, his M. A. Hanna Co., had signed with the Government after the 1952 presidential election—but before the Republicans took office—Eisenhower was moved to say that he would mount the cross if Humphrey had ever done anything dishonest.

When Humphrey appears before the subcommittee, perhaps later this month, he will be asked why he kept his Hanna stock while serving in the Cabinet and sitting on the Defense Mobilization Board, the Cabinet-level agency that framed stockpile policy.

Delaware's Republican Senator John J. Williams has been more critical of the Hanna contracts than any Democrat. Williams has observed that the terms practically eliminated risk to Humphrey's company, provided substantial tax concessions, and permitted Hanna to buy for $1.7 million a smelter which cost the Government $22 million to build.

The General Accounting Office, Congress watchdog agency, has been unable to examine the contracts fully because they did not contain the standard "right to audit" clause.

Williams also has flailed in other directions. He voiced astonishment at the President's "astonishment" about stockpile surpluses. According to Williams, Kennedy cast eight Senate votes for bigger stockpiles.

Former Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks and John Hay Whitney, Eisenhower's Ambassador to Great Britain and publisher of the New York Herald Tribune, are among other leading Republicans who probably will be called.

Weeks will be asked about documents indicating that he and Humphrey reserved to themselves a final decision about a disputed copper delivery contract which allegedly permitted a Chicago mining company to reap windfall profits of $5.5 million.

Among other things, Symington and Coburn want to know why busy Cabinet officers took a personal hand in relatively insignificant stockpile deals. All told, the Government has negotiated 30,000 stockpile or supply expansion contracts since 1946.

The investigators' interest in Whitney stems from a much-criticized 1957 nickel and cobalt contract with Freeport Sulphur Co., a firm in which Whitney once had major holdings. The stockpile target for nickel had been reached when the contract was negotiated.

Closed-session records of the Senate Armed Services Committee show that stockpile secrecy has worried Symington for years. On June 2, 1955, he pleaded for declassification of the facts, saying: "In the secretive approach to the stockpile, in my opinion we are costing the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars."

Today Symington believes the facts developed by the investigators amply confirm his suspicions. He said maladministration, inefficiency, and windfall profits to certain contractors contributed substantially to taxpayers' paper loss of possibly $1.3 billion on stockpile operations.

Examples of poor administration developed by the investigators range from the humorous to the allegedly illegal. They include:

Confidence men pretending to be Russian agents who nearly duped Government officials into parting with taxpayers' money for imaginery platinum.

A scrawled note indicating that the war need for $13 million worth of cryolite which nobody wants was reviewed only once in the last 5 years.

Tinkering with stockpile target figures to justify purchases of $204 million worth of lead and zinc to boost sagging domestic industry. (The stockpile now contains eight times more zinc than needed for mobilization.)

The loss of $3.6 million to a molybdenum supplier who "horse traded" the Government with the help of a Government consultant who worked simultaneously for the supplier.

Examples of allegedly lax administration were not confined to the Eisenhower administration. Kennedy men blocked the sale of minute quantities of deteriorating fluorspar, at the behest of domestic producers. And 3 months ago, when cadmium users complained of shortages, the administration did nothing to release any of its 11.7-million-pound surplus hoard.

From 1946 to 1958 the planners simply assumed that the next war would last 5 years, the duration of World War II. Then in June 1958 they lopped 2 years off the expected emergency period. That stroke of the pen elevated many materials to surplus status. Of 98 materials in storage, 65 are now overstocked.

Under existing law few surpluses can be sold without specific congressional approval. It took the legislators 18 months to approve selling a grab-bag list of items worth $160 million, 2 percent of all surpluses.

To speed the disposal machinery Symington has drafted legislation to grant the President power to sell surpluses any time he pleases, at prices he designates. The draft bill also would set up machinery to pay some Government contractors with surplus materials instead of all cash.

Control of the stockpiles would represent an enormous addition to Presidential power.

At home, the President could intervene in labor disputes merely by hinting at the possible release of surplus stocks to make up for the lapsed production of struck factories. He also could release surpluses to roll back price increases which, as, he did in steel, he might regard as excessive.

In foreign affairs, control of surpluses would give the President additional leverage to deal with governments which rely heavily on exports of raw materials at stable prices.

The President has assured producers that he would take no steps to disrupt commodity markets. Industry is jittery nevertheless. Except for the big three aluminum companies who agreed to negotiate long-term buy-back agreements, industry spokesmen resist stepped up disposal with might and main.

Meanwhile the stockpile grows and grows. In the last 3 months its cost value crept up by $26 million. Earlier purchase commitments will move more aluminum and nickel into bulging depots. And other materials will flow in through barter of surplus farm goods.

Symington's hearings have ranged somewhat indiscriminately from disposal policy to a 12-year-old Government bout with a tin cartel; from below-grade chrome ore piled high in Montana to variations in the price of lead; from routine barter arrangements to philosophical discussions about the propriety of the Government making money on commodity trading.

But in a sense the investigators have barely skimmed the surface.

They have undertaken no public review of the reasonableness of stockpile target objectives.

They have not sought to determine whether the Government really needs to stock goose feathers, castor oil, shellac, hog bristles and extra-long-staple cotton.

They have not sought explanations for the stubborn clinging to the 5-year conventional war concept through the heyday of massive retaliation.

Clearly the investigation must move into new, high ground if it is to have much impact on stockpile policy and planning. For the moment things are pretty much as they were.

In brief, the facts are these:

Since 1964 the Government has spent $8.7 billion for 46 million tons of strategic metals and minerals.

These hugh inventories are stored at 213 depots, plant sites, leased warehouses, and at ports of entry.

It costs the taxpayers $11 million a year just to store the stuff.

The inventories were built to provide reserves in an emergency for military, atomic energy, war industry, and essential civilian needs. But the target figures do not take into account materials needed to rehabilitate the economy following a nuclear attack.

For the most part they assume a conventional war.

Tribute to Senator Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 17, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, not often does one of our colleagues receive such meritorious publicity, as has been done in the case of the Senator from Connecticut, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, who is noted for his work and devotion in the area of foreign relations. I, therefore, wish to call to the attention of all my colleagues, the fine tribute which the outstanding columnist, Mr. George E. Sokolsky, paid to Senator Dodd in his syndicated and coyprighted column of August 16, 1962, as it appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald and therefore, ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Dodd's Contribution

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Perhaps for the first time since 1933, a genuine foreign policy debate has been continuous in the U.S. Senate. There was a possibility years ago, of such a debate when Senator Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, led the Republicans. But Vandenberg, an isolationist, with astounding suddenness joined the forces of the internationalists.

Curiously, in the present debate, it is a Democrat whose voice is most constantly raised against a foreign policy which has often produced marked failure. Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, a Democrat, has, in his first term in the Senate, made an astonishingly significant reputation for scholarship and profound penetration into foreign policy.

Recently, Lyle Munson, who runs The Bookmailer, Inc., edited and published a number of Senator Dodd's speeches in a book which covers a wide range of subjects.

Describing our national purpose, Senator Dodd said:

"To the peoples of Europe * * * patriotism has its roots in the past and represents a love of all the similarities and things shared in common with their countrymen. But we in America, in the early years of our Nation, had no past. We had more differences than similarities. Our people had no common history except that of escape from the histories of a score of other nations.

"We had no common religion except a heritage of seeking religious freedom. We had no common tongue, no common nationality, no national music or art, no folktales, no national literature except for the political writings of our Founding Fathers.

"All that we had in common with which to mold a united nation, was a new set of ideas, of attitudes, of institutions; untried, unproved, yet having the universality hopes and yearnings of mankind for a better and fuller life. And we shared together a new virgin continent upon which we could try out our experiment."

The question then is, What is this experiment to produce? Surely, if the American experiment is to mean nothing more than a high standard of living—more automobiles, more ice boxes, more steaks—the terrific cost in human effort was not worth while. Senator Dodd answers:

"That the state exists to serve man and that man's liberty, his property, his family and his individual rights are above and beyond the reach of the state;

"That every man should have a fair chance to succeed or to fail on his own, a square deal, a clear field;

"That every man should be able to speak his peace without fear or reprisal;

"That every man should have an equal voice in choosing those who govern him."

Writing of our enemy, Senator Dodd wrote:

"Perhaps the most popular phrases of those who minimize the evils of communism is that we cannot look at the world scene in terms 'black and white,' which, of course, carries the implication that both the free world and the Communist world are at fault for the present danger and that each side has its good points and its bad points. I willingly concede our bad points, but I have never been able to discover the good points of communism."

FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, Warns of Communist Campaign To Capture the Minds of American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 17, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has become increasingly evident in recent years that the youth of America is considered a prime target for Communist propaganda and subversive tactics. Singled out because of their strategic value as the leaders of tomorrow, and because they are passing through formative years, the young people of our land have been the object of an intensified program of blandishment, persuasion, misrepresentation, and falsehood.

In the August issue of the Follow Up Reporter, published by the National Committee for Children and Youth, there appears a hard-hitting and informative article "Communist Youth Campaign." This enlightening and disturbing message comes from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He is perhaps this Nation's foremost expert on the Communist menace.

Director Hoover writes that the Red drive for acceptance among younger citizens has been evident in universities, at social gatherings, reform groups, and particularly in a stepped up program of public addresses by known Communist leaders. He warns that young people must realize that communism is an active subversion force in America today, and that they should be on guard against its insidious inroads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by J. Edgar Hoover in the August issue of the Follow Up Reporter be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Communist Youth Campaign

(By John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice)

The Communist Party, U.S.A., is today engaged in an intensive campaign to capture the minds of the youth of this Nation.

Twenty-four centuries ago, Socrates, in a noble plea for reason, told the citizens of Athens, "Agree with me if I seem to speak the truth." Today the Communists are making a similar appeal to the young citizens of America, not from any ennobling regard for the truth, however, but as a means of furthering the international conspiracy of the party.

This campaign is a skillfully contrived charade which seems to speak of truth but which is in reality a masked attempt to subvert our young people. For the truth is not important to the Communist except as it may serve his needs; it is important to youth, however, and the Communist, knowing this, has made it the premise on which he is waging this campaign. He knows that youth is a time of seeking after truth, of weighing new concepts and forming ideas; that youthful energies are impatient to be tested against the world's challenges and are quick to respond to proposals that seem to meet these challenges. He, therefore, caters to this impatience with cunning programs which seem to strike at social ills and international problems.

These programs are presented at meetings, social events, or wherever a susceptible group of young people is gathered. The Communist discusses his party's concern for civil rights and civil liberties and speaks of its work to promote world peace and international disarmament. He portrays his organization as the defender of the underdog and the weak.

These are laudable objectives to which all Americans subscribe and so are particularly attractive to inexperienced young men and women who do not know of the sinister hypocrisy of the paryt's propaganda. When youthful interest is aroused by these programs to the point of supporting the party in its alleged espousal of humanitarian endeavors, then the stage is set for gradually bringing the deceived young people into other areas of the party's activities which are more directly concerned with its main objective of subversion.

This method of recruiting new members for the party or its front groups has long been used by the Communists, but the program was revitalized and furnished new impetus at the 17th national convention of the Communist Party, USA, at New York City in December 1959. It was recognized at this meeting that renewed emphasis on youth was necessary as the party was aging and insufficient new members were being recruited. Plans were drawn up for an aggressive campaign with particular emphasis on college students, the leaders of America in the years ahead.

The programs implemented since that convention have led to the establishment of a new Communist national publication entitled "New Horizons for Youth," organization of a special youth committee to win support for Communist activities on many of our college campuses and the initiation of a forceful campaign of speeches throughout the country by party leaders. The programs are being strongly supported by Communists at all levels, and they believe that substantial gains have been made. Party leaders are particularly impressed with the results of the speech campaign.

Many of these leaders have taken part in the speech campaign and college students have borne the brunt of their propaganda. The speakers have sought not only to win support for Communist activities but to sell the party as a legitimate political organization, rather than a subversive conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of our Government.

Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, USA, recently completed an extensive speech tour on the west coast—37 speeches in 12 days—in which he appeared before large numbers of students at various colleges in California and Oregon. He was quoted in the Worker, official party newspaper, as having described the tour as "one of the most exciting experiences of my life." He explained the students' interest in his speeches by stating:

"This generation is faced with the most complex, life-and-death questions. * * * The right to probe fearlessly is a necessity for youth, if they are to achieve answers that will solve their problems, which are actually the problems of mankind. One problem which has been often posed for youth, in a false and hysterical way, is the problem of communism. Their response at these meetings show that they are no longer willing to accept a discussion on communism which does not include Communists in the debate."

With this intensive campaign of subversion in full swing, America's youth must be wary not only of the party, which shows itself openly, but of its many subterfuges in the form of front groups. These organizations generally do not bear the Communist label but have innocuous or patriotic names purposely contrived to deceive the unwary. They are Communist controlled, however, and have but one real function, the furthering of the Communist cause. It has been through the use of front groups exploiting the inexperienced and naive that the Communist Party has gained much of its strength in the United States.

Our young people then should be skeptical of the political blandishments of groups which they do not know and they should make penetrative inquiry into the background of such organizations before committing themselves. Youth must realize that the shadow of communism is stalking our land today and that it seeks to make them its prey.

How Can You Hire the Handicapped if the ICC Won't License the Handicapped?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 17, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement which I have prepared concerning an ICC regulation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN A. CARROLL, OF COLORADO

Senators will remember that on August 13 I addressed the Senate, deploring the existence of an Interstate Commerce Commission regulation which denies absolutely to rehabilitated amputees the right to drive in interstate commerce.

As I have pointed out to the Senate, this unnecessary rule causes hardship and suffering to those whom it is this country's stated policy to encourage and assist—the physically handicapped.

This flatly dogmatic rule is totally unnecessary and unreasonable. If a doctor certifies that a man's loss of limb will not prevent him from safely operating a vehicle, the Interstate Commerce Commission should allow the man to drive in interstate commerce, assuming he is otherwise qualified.

Such is the system employed by the Federal Aviation Agency in certifying pilots. It works well.

The Interstate Commerce Commission regulation causes needless hardship to rehabilitated amputees. Interstate truckdrivers who lose a leg are denied the opportunity to return to their chosen profession.

This is not the only hardship which this rule causes. I am informed that Interstate Commerce Commission regulations for licensing commercial drivers are often taken as models by State and local authorities. I am informed that several of our States and communities have adopted this ban on amputees solely because it is an Interstate Commerce Commission regulation. Others are in the process of doing so.

This means that an ever-increasing number of perfectly capable drivers are losing their livelihood every day. In some areas able-bodied amputee drivers are actually denied a license to drive Good Will and Salvation Army trucks.

The Commission has said it intends to await the conclusion of a study undertaken by the Harvard School of Public Health before it reviews this regulation.

This study, which has been in process for over a year, will not be completed for at least 2 more years and perhaps not for 4 more years.

This wait is unnecessary. The Commission has available today all the facts it needs.

Let me bring to the attention of the Senate the concluding paragraph of an earlier study undertaken by Harvard entitled, "Statistical Study of 624 Pairs of Disabled Versus Nondisabled Drivers Listed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles":

"The date shows a decidedly lower absolute rate of involvement of disabled veteran and handicapped drivers versus their nondisabled counterparts if relative hazard criteria are ignored. The ratio was approximately 2 to 1. That is, the nondisabled controlled group drivers sustained approximately twice as many accidents and were charged with approximately twice as many nonaccident violations as the disabled. This ratio appeared to remain constant regardless of the variable considered.

These conclusions are borne out by other studies made of the safety records of the rehabilitated in heavy industries. The rehabilitated worker actually has a much better safety record than does the physically normal worker.

I believe—and I am sure many in Congress share this belief—that on the basis of the facts in hand and because of the obvious and continuing inequity involved, the Commission ought to proceed now to revise this regulation.

Liberty and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 17, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an outstanding address made by Dr. H. N. Young, director, Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station, Blacksburg, Va., entitled "Liberty and Responsibility."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LIBERTY AND RESPONSIBILITY

(By H. N. Young)

I am speaking to you today on the subject "Liberty and Responsibility," for the following major reasons:

1. Science and education in the United States operate within the framework of government established and maintained by the Federal Republic, including the National Government, the States, and the various units of local government. It is to the interest of all of us that the integrity of this system of government be maintained. The constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and of conscience can very quickly be destroyed by too much complacency on our part.

2. It is my firm conviction that America has grown great—economically, intellectually, and culturally primarily because of the maintenance of personal liberty in this country for more than 175 years. I am also convinced that the most important single problem facing the human race, at present, is the maintenance of human freedom—freedom of enterprise, freedom of thought and expression, and freedom of conscience.

The responsibility of carrying the torch of liberty throughout the world has been thrust upon the United States of America. If personal liberty is lost in the United States, for whatever reason, its death knell will be sounded throughout the entire world. To me this means that the maintenance of personal liberty is everybody's business.

3. The American system of personal liberty—freedom of enterprise, freedom of thought and expression, and liberty of conscience—is under violent attack by the Communist Party in the United States. While the party members live in the United States, they are supporters of a foreign power and are subject to directives from Moscow. This fact has been amply documented.

Communists are not reformers. Among their aims is the complete destruction of our form of government, our economic system, and our way of life. For the American system they intend to substitute a complete dictatorship.

It should be the responsibility of every American citizen to become thoroughly familiar with the aims, strategy, and tactics of communism. It is not our responsibility, however, to play the part of prosecuting attorney, judge, and jury. To participate in "witch hunts" or to accuse others of disloyalty in the absence of overwhelming evidence is contrary to the spirit of American liberty. The gathering, sifting, appraising, and documenting of the facts should be left to the legally constituted authorities—in most cases the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Final judgments, however, will need to be left to the courts.

Every American citizen has the definite responsibility of being sufficiently well enough informed about the Communist conspiracy so that he does not become a fellow traveler or an innocent dupe of the party line. The energetic ignorance of the well intentioned can be equally as disastrous as deliberate malice aforethought.

4. On the eve of the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the land-grant college system of America, it seems especially appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to the basic ideals on which this revolutionary system of science and education are based. One of these ideals is that of intellectual freedom supported by personal

responsibility. Freedom of inquiry or academic freedom has been maintained in our system of higher education throughout the past century with varying degrees of success. Those institutions which have been the major contributors to the economic, social, and intellectual life of the Nation have been the ones which have placed a high value on the intellectual freedom of its professional staff. In most instances, the faculties of these institutions have undoubtedly assumed voluntarily the responsibilities and the restraints which are normally expected of scientists and educators who have mature minds.

The idea of the close interdependence between individual responsibility and personal liberty is not new. It had its origin in Greece. In the great empires of the ancient world, Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, and Persia personal freedom was unknown, even unthought of. It was not until the foundations of these great empires were crumbling that the idea of personal liberty dawned in men's minds. The country where it was born was not in the East but in Greece, the mother of Western civilization.

"You do not know what freedom is," Herodotus reports a Greek as having said to a Persian. "If you did, you would fight for it, with bare hands if you had no weapons."

"The ancient civilizations were alike in one respect, in a refusal to recognize limits.

"Unlimited freedom is chaos. It would destroy mankind. Any order, by whatever means, is preferable. The East had an endless succession of despotisms because it never conceived of order in any other way. The West discovered a way of order through freedom. It was a Greek discovery. Why the idea came to a little country, poor and sparsely settled, and not to majestic Egypt or Babylon the Great may seem at first sight strange, but the reason is not hard to find. It lies in the very nature of freedom. Freedom was born in Greece because there men limited their own freedom."[1]

"We are free," says Pericles of the Athenians of the fifth century, B.C., "because we obey the law—the written and the unwritten law. The latter we consider to be the more important. The unwritten law is comprised of those restraints which voluntarily we place upon ourselves."

For a little more than a century previous to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, the world experienced what was perhaps the most productive period of art and intellectual adventure ever known to man. It was in this era that the idea was born and demonstrated that men are capable of self-government. In Athens, during a century or two, what was then produced in the fields of art and thought have never been surpassed and seldom equaled.

The idea that only those who hold themselves within reasonable and self-chosen limits can be free is one of the great legacies of Greece. This was the Athenian ideal previous to the Peloponnesian War which lasted 27 years.

The Peloponnesian War came to an end in 404 B.C. with the total defeat of Athens by Sparta. The Spartans, however, did not take revenge on their fallen adversaries. They allowed Athens political independence. The Athenian Navy was greatly reduced and she was stripped of her oversea possessions. That was all. The war had left the city untouched, but the people had changed.

"Socrates died soon after the war ended but, as he told his friends in the prison on his last day, it was only his body that died. He himself, the real part of him, lived on.

His death, truly heroic, was the culminating proof of the truth of what he taught and his influence after it was greater by far than before.

"He had watched the state deteriorate as Thucycides and others had, but he set himself, as they did not, to think out how it could be saved. The way he found was peculiar to himself, but not by any mass movements, not by putting an end to poverty or to war or to any gross evil. He saw the salvation of the state in terms of each separate Athenian. Every man's good was the source of good for the community; just as every man's good was dependent on the good of the community. The two could not be separated. Only a good man could be a citizen and a state could be good only when its citizens were good. The condition of the state was bound up with the condition of the souls of men who lived in it. Socrates' eyes were fixed on the individual, and on the most individual part of him, the inner realm where alone he could be absolute master. After the great defeat of the Peloponnesian War the Athensians were proud that they had again become politically free, but Socrates saw the vulnerable life of freedom, entirely dependent as it was on men's inner freedom. He saw the danger it was in, the danger that threatened it everywhere, at all times. The very men he talked to were yielding to what must be deadly to a free state, control by the uncontrolled. Socrates told them that the citizens of a democracy could be slaves. Men were free not when freed from this or that outside rule, but when they were masters of themselves.

"But while they were thinking and talking, always with Athen's great past before them, a change was going on. They could not arrest or even check it. It was something fundamental and of the utmost importance, a spiritual change, which penetrated the whole state and undermined the old foundation. What the people wanted was a government which would provide a comfortable life for them and with this as the foremost object, ideas of freedom and self-reliance and service to the community were obscured to the point of disappearing. Athens was more and more looked upon as a coöperative business possessed of great wealth in which all citizens had a right to share. The larger and larger funds demanded made heavier and heavier taxation necessary, but that troubled only the well-to-do, always a minority, and no one gave a thought to the possibility that the source might be taxed out of existence. Politics was now closely connected with money (economics), quite as much as with voting. Indeed, the one meant the other. Votes were for sale as well as officials.

"The whole process was clear to Plato. Athens had reached the point of rejecting independence, and the freedom she now wanted was freedom from responsibility. There could be only one result. 'The excess of liberty in states or individuals,' he said, 'seems to pass into excess of slavery.' If men insisted on being free from the burden of a life that was self-dependent and also responsible for the common good, they would cease to be free at all. Responsibility was the price every man must pay for freedom. It was to be had on no other terms.

"Plato gave up Athens, 'a lofty soul born in a mean city,' he wrote, knowing that, 'no politician is honest, nor is there any champion of justice at whose side to fight,' and that he can be of no use to the state, 'holds his peace and goes his way, content if he can be pure from evil and depart in peace, with bright hopes.' He does well, Plato says, and yet his goal is second-rate. Only in a state he can work for, only through loyalty and patriotic devotion can a man grow to his full stature. There speaks the true Athenian always keeping clear in his thoughts that the individual's good was the community's good, and that private life could be no more than a part of the fullness of life open to a man who could serve his country. This is Plato's farewell to the good state on earth. He turned away from freedom. He had seen the excess of it in irresponsible Athens, freedom without any compensating weight of responsibility, and he wanted none of it. By that time Athens had reached the end of freedom and was never to have it again."[2]

The American Republic was established at a time when in the Old World respect for human liberty was at a low ebb. The people who braved the Atlantic in small sailing vessels to establish homes in a virgin wilderness inhabited by hostile Indians must have placed a high value on personal liberty. The hardships which they endured and the sacrifices which they made are elegant testimony of their willingness to assume peronsal responsibility.

The persons who drew up the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States understood well the relationship between individual responsibility and personal liberty. In their study of Greek and Latin they became familiar with the Greek and Roman experiences. They were also well acquainted with the disastrous effects on human liberty of the planned economy of the Roman Empire from the time of Augustus Caesar through the reign of Constantine—a period of more than three centuries. Of more importance, however, was the system of government intervention in business and agriculture during the 300 years previous to the American Revolution. At the time the Declaration of Independence was written, the corn laws of Britain had been in effect for about 300 years. The planned economy in France had also been in existence for about three centuries. Andrew D. White in his book "Seven Great Statesmen," concludes his discussion of the French experience in government intervention in the economic affairs of private individuals with the following comment: "Underlying and permeating all this tangled mass of evil was the idea of paternal government—the idea that the duty of a good government is to do the thinking for its subjects on a vast number of matters and transactions on which the individuals concerned would far better think for themselves."

Our Founding Fathers were aware of the dangers of too much government. They, therefore, established a government of limited powers, and one of checks and balances. It was their firm intention that one branch of government should not have more power than either of the other two.

The Constitution of the United States provides for a federated type of government. Those powers of a general nature, which it was thought by the Founding Fathers could best be carried out by central authority, were delegated to the General Government and all powers not so delegated were reserved to the States and the people. There was established on this continent a system of government which has made it practical for each State and locality to assume local responsibility for the conduct and control over those affairs which are essentially local in nature. The degree of success which our federated system has achieved since its establishment has been conditioned to a large extent upon the effectiveness of local responsibility. The recent trend toward centralization of authority at the Capital City has been due in no small degree to a partial breakdown of responsibility at local and State levels. In numerous instances is the ever present illusion that money obtained from Washington comes without cost to the individual or locality which receives it.

---

[1] Hamilton, Edith, "The Echo of Greece." W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., New York.

[2] Hamilton, Edith, "The Echo of Greece." W. W. Norton & Co., New York.

Liberty and responsibility have been inseparably intertwined in all voluntary societies. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that personal freedom cannot long endure in the absence of appropriate individual responsibility. In those instances in which responsibility has been transferred from the individual to the state, the transfer has been accompanied, sooner or later, by a corresponding loss of personal liberty. This fact constitutes a historical axiom sustained throughout the ages.

The close interdependence between liberty and responsibility was perhaps most comprehensively demonstrated in the United States of America from 1776 to about 1933. Since the latter date, to a considerable degree, responsibility has been transferred in this country from the individual to the group and finally to the state. The loss of individual liberty which has resulted has been, it is assumed, in the interest of increased personal security. History may have yet to record the extent to which personal freedom may be exchanged for individual security without endangering both liberty and security and as a result, the strength of the entire Nation.

Greece invented democracy and Rome the representative republic. In these countries each form of government failed. In each instance, however, they were highly successful as long as the people obeyed the unwritten law, which is composed of those restraints which men voluntarily place upon themselves, and assumed what other responsibilities that were necessary to make those forms of government work. When men ceased to control their own actions, they abrogated their responsibility to the state and personal liberty came to an end, not abruptly but gradually. In fact, the process was so gradual that it was not discernible to the average citizen. The illusion that all was well was strengthened by the fact that the old forms were retained many years after they had ceased to function. The gradual development of the welfare state to fill the vacuum created by loss of personal liberty added to the illusion that all was well in Greece and Rome. This was the twilight zone between personal liberty conditioned by individual responsibility and restraint, and massive control by the state. This was the area in which an attempt was made to govern by the uncontrolled. In the past, all attempts to govern by the undisciplined have failed.

Clearly, he who is not master of himself cannot be trusted with the function of self-government. This is a truism which has been valid throughout history.

The fact that history repeats itself is a monument to human stupidity maintained through the ages. In the modern world the study of the experiences of the past is relegated largely to the scholar and the immature students in our classrooms. Many of those who are responsible for guiding the ship of state appear to have learned little from history, and all too often they have lost their perspective and sense of direction. This observation applies to those who elect men to public office as well as those who legislate our laws and make our court decisions.

The history of the past provides a chart for our guidance. Where men are now losing their way, others once did the same, and they left a record of the blind alleys down which they went. In many ways we are like children who appear never to learn from the experienced. We who are mature enough should not find it impossible to learn from the recorded experiences of past ages. Too often, however, our vision is obscured by the idea, "Things are different now." It is true that many conditions are different than at any previous time. This is one of the moving facts of history. That the world is shrinking is one of these moving facts and a very important one.

We very often fall into the error of assuming that because some things are different all things are. It is well known that men are about the same internally as they have been over the last several thousand years. Furthermore, the moral precepts upon which all enduring civilizations depend for their existence have been relatively the same throughout organized society. The destruction, by whatever means, of those moral standards which have sustained men through the ages would, I am sure, spell the doom of the American Republic.

The story of the Garden of Eden is more than a fable. Important segments of mankind have been there many times. In each instance, the breakdown of moral standards because of men's unwillingness to take the responsibility of maintaining them was one of the principal contributing factors limiting man's length of tenure in the garden.

In this brief discussion I have fallen far short of covering adequately the subject "Liberty and Responsibility." Time does not permit me to even begin to enumerate the numerous responsibilities which individuals owe their families, their communities, their State, and the Nation. In the modern world our responsibilities extend even beyond the boundaries of our country.

Must God Get Out of Our Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 17, 1962

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an address by Dean Clarence E. Manion, of South Bend, Ind., one of the Nation's best constitutional lawyers, in which he points out the error of the Supreme Court in the New York School Prayer case when it held that the 14th amendment automatically extended the 1st amendment to the States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MUST GOD GET OUT OF OUR GOVERNMENT?

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

When the Supreme Court decided to take God out of the Government last June 25, I was tempted to have my say then and there—along with those thousands of other people, great and small, who expressed themselves at once. Now I am glad I waited until all or nearly all of the votes have been counted for and against the Court's startling conclusion.

Immediately after the decision was announced, the President of the United States told us to respect it and be glad that we can still pray in our homes. None of the newspaper reporters who were present made the obvious retort; namely, that Khrushchev could have said the same thing to the Russians, to the Poles, or to the Hungarians.

After all, cannot Cardinal Mindszenty still pray in the cubicle of the American Embassy in Budapest, where he has been confined for 6 years in protection against the Communist government?

The popular reaction to this unfortunate Supreme Court decision was like that of children who have just been told by the sad and wise old family doctor that their mother has cancer: "I am so very sorry, my dears, but it is so; all of the scientific tests prove it." The Supreme Court was like that in its decision and the American people were like sad and simple children in their reaction to it. What can the American people know about their Constitution? Theirs is not to reason why; theirs is but to listen to the bad news from the experts—the Supreme Court.

And so, school superintendents all over the country sorrowfully but nevertheless seriously, announced plans to reconsider time-honored customs such as invocations at high school football banquets, salutes to the flag (and, therefore, to God) at their morning convocations, and nondenominational sermons to their graduating classes on baccalaureate Sunday.

Recently someone published a book called "A Nation of Sheep." I have read only the title, but I know now that the author is referring to the people of the United States.

Our reaction to this Supreme Court decision indicates that his conclusion is correct. We have permitted the Federal Government to shear us to the skin and we are ready to respond, like sheep, when a Judas goat—in this case the Supreme Court—leads us up for the slaughter of our spiritual and constitutional heritage.

The decision brought a deluge of editorial criticism, of course, but for the most part the editorials ended up like this one: "Those of us who believe the ruling of the Court to be in error will, nevertheless, obey this decision since ours is a Government of laws." When we all slavishly obey a court decision that we know to be in error, we destroy our Government of liberty-protecting laws and substitute a government by arbitrary decree.

A court decision is not the law of the land; it is merely the law of the particular case in which the decision was rendered and, of course, the parties to that lawsuit will be forced to observe it unless and until they can get the decision reversed.

But when the decision obviously is in error, and particularly on a subject that is as vital to our civilization as the relationship of Almighty God to the Government of the United States, then all Americans who respect the great Author of liberty are under a moral and patriotic obligation to blast the decision for the error that it is, and for what one Justice of the Supreme Court itself declared it to be, namely, "a misapplication of a great constitutional principle" and an attempt to divorce our constitutional government from its official historic "reliance on the protection of divine providence."

The decision of the Court as read by Justice Black is unsupported by any judicial precedents except those that Justice Black himself has made out of legal whole cloth during his long tenure on the Supreme Bench.

I saw this error coming up 14 years ago and addressed myself to it then in a carefully documented criticism of one of Justice Black's 1948 opinions which now turns out to be a part of his foundation for this climatic sophistry. ("The Church, the State and Mrs. McCollum—Notre Dame Lawyer," vol. 23, p. 456.)

The entire case made by Justice Black and his concurring colleagues against the New York Board of Education in the June 25 decision is based upon the gratuitous assumption that the first amendment to the Constitution which says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" must now be taken to read: "No State or any subdivision or agency of a State (such as a local school board) shall make any law or rule respecting an establishment of religion."

How does it happen that a plain constitutional prohibition against congressional action now turns out to be a prohibition against State action through the regulation of a local school board? By whose authority is the unmistakable language of the first amendment thus turned around and transformed?

The answer is that the language has been changed by the repetitious insistence of Justice Black that the 1st amendment which was added to the Constitution in 1791, was made operative against the States by the adoption of the 14th amendment which was added to the Constitution 77 years later, namely, in 1868.

Remember, please, that for 69 years before Justice Black became a member of it, the Supreme Court in a great number of cases had construed the 1st amendment and the 14th amendment, respectively, as entirely separate and unrelated provisions of the Constitution. These repetitious constructions were in complete harmony with historical facts.

When the 14th amendment was ratified its authors and proponents had no idea that it would ever be construed to bring the provisions of the 1st amendment into operation against State governments.

On the contrary, in 1876, 8 years after the 14th amendment had been adopted, a new constitutional amendment was proposed in Congress which read, in part, as follows: "No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This proposed amendment was voted upon in the U.S. Senate on August 14, 1876, and the proposal failed because it did not receive the necessary two-thirds majority.

If the 14th amendment embraced the 1st amendment when it was adopted in 1868, as Justice Black says it did, why did Congress feel it necessary in 1876 to attempt to adopt another amendment specifically restricting the States in the terms that had been used to restrict Congress in the 1st amendment?

Since this specific prohibition against State established religions was expressly rejected by Congress in 1876, by what authority does Justice Black now assume to add such a prohibition to the Constitution in 1962? Justice Black does not cite any authority for this revolutionary transformation of the English language and of American history except his own judicial opinions.

The "wall of separation between church and state," to which Jefferson referred in a private letter written in 1802, has become an obsession with Justice Black, but he conveniently ignores what Jefferson said publicly 3 years later in his second inaugural address; namely, "In matters of religion I have considered that its free exercise is placed by the Constitution independent of the powers of the General (Federal) Government."

Jefferson realized that large areas of American life were expressly made independent of the powers of the Federal Government by the language of the 10th amendment and that religion was merely one of these areas are deliberately reserved for the exclusive operation of States rights.

Justice Black and most of the Justices associated with him on the Supreme Bench during the past 25 years, have been so preoccupied with the 1st amendment, the 5th amendment, and the 14th amendment—that they have never been able to consider the equally valid import of the 9th and 10th amendments which protect the immunities of the States and of the people in the States against the intrusion of unlawful Federal action.

Pursuant to the rulings of Justice Black and his associates, Federal judges are now taking over the constitutional duties of State legislatures in the field of reapportionment of representatives. (*Baker* v. *Carr*, 82 S.C.)

The constitution of Maryland provides that Maryland officeholders shall declare their belief in the existence of God, but that constitutional provision was swept aside last year by Justice Black's Supreme Court opinion that the 1st and 14th amendments will no longer permit the State to protect itself in this respect. (*Torcaso* v. *Watkins*, 81 S.C.)

It so happens that the constitution of the State of Maryland like that of New York begins with an expression of thanks for God's blessings, followed by an invocation of His continued protection; but all this will soon be changed by the Supreme Court under Justice Black's influence, and Justice Douglas, in his separate concurring opinion in the New York school case, confidently predicts that the change is coming.

If this Court has its way, God must get out of government—State and Federal. As a byproduct of this Court-made law, the States will have to disappear as self-governing units of our constitutionally established Federal system and become mere administrative agencies of the tightly centralized, absolute authority in Washington.

A constitutional amendment is now being considered to remedy the situation created by the Court's decision in the New York school case, but constitutional amendments cannot be proposed and ratified fast enough to protect the Constitution from the kind of a Supreme Court that we have now.

Its decisions have destroyed more established legal precedents in the last 20 years than were accomplished in the previous 133 years of Supreme Court history. What this Court will do next is anybody's guess.

The appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is determined by Congress. Article III, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, empowers Congress to regulate and limit the questions of law and fact that may be appealed to the Supreme Court from State and inferior Federal courts. Using this authority, Congress should withdraw all appellate jurisdiction from this Supreme Court now and thus leave final determination of constitutional questions with State courts and Federal circuit courts of appeal.

Unless this is done, and done quickly, the Supreme Court as presently constituted will make a shambles of our republican form of government. If this Nation under God is to have a new birth of freedom, then it is up to Congress to get the present Supreme Court out of the delivery room.

Balanced Power for a Balanced Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, a very fine article by Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs on chemical and biological weapons, which appeared in the Army Information Digest for August 1962:

WHILE NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR OTHER SYSTEMS OF DEFENSE, C–B WEAPONS OFFER ONE IMPORTANT MEANS FOR ACHIEVING BALANCED POWER FOR A BALANCED ARSENAL

(By Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs)

Armed conflict in the second half of the 20th century need not be a matter of holocaust or surrender. In addition to the possibilities of nuclear war, the free world is now faced with gradual encroachment through protracted, limited conflicts in scattered areas of the world. This range of hostility, from gradual encroachment through all phases of political and military engagement to nuclear war, has been called the spectrum of conflict. The very breadth of this spectrum necessitates a broad choice of response.

It is in this realm that chemical and biological (C–B) agents and weapons can play an important part. Not only are C–B weapons applicable to the concept of measured and restrained response; the possession of such weapons also serves as a possible deterrent to their use by an aggressor. And even if this deterrent fails, they provide the ability to engage in conflict on an equal footing. A measured response such as chemical and biological weapons can provide, may avoid employment of stronger methods and the risk of escalating the form of conflict.

There is another aspect to C–B which deserves serious consideration; namely, the Soviet attitude toward these weapons systems. Soviet officials have frequently stated that toxic weapons will be used in the next war. Marshal Zhukov, while Soviet Minister of Defense, told a Communist Party Congress that Soviet armed forces were built on the assumption that future wars would differ greatly from those of the past. "Future war," he said, "will be characterized by the massive use of air forces, various rocket weapons, and various means of mass destruction such as atomic weapons, chemical and bacteriological weapons." Other high Soviet leaders, including Khrushchev, have made similar statements.

As a result, in recent years there has been a marked change in American attitudes toward chemical and biological weapons and defense systems. A greater awareness of the national security implications of these weapons systems has evolved, along with an increasing willingness to examine the implications without the emotional involvement associated with the term "gas" and "germ warfare."

Even the old expression "gas" is somewhat inaccurate today. Most war chemicals are now dispersed as aerosols, rather than as a true gas, and so the term "chemical agent" has come into use.

TOXIC AGENTS

Modern toxic chemical agents may be divided into two broad categories: lethal and incapacitating. Lethal war chemicals are few in number. The nerve agents—discovered by German chemists just prior to World War II—head the list.

In their natural liquid state, or as an aerosol, the nerve agents are colorless, odorless, tasteless—and thus cannot be detected by the senses. Extremely toxic, they will cause death after entry into the respiratory tract, or even by penetrating exposed skin surfaces. Under certain conditions, inhalation can be fatal within 4 minutes. Even microscopic quantities will cause impairment of vision, nausea and muscular incoordination. The major difference between the nerve agents and chemicals used in World War I is the comparatively small amount of the nerve agent required to produce casualties.

Effectiveness of the nerve agents derives from their unique physiological action. The human body produces a substance called acetylcholine, which, when released at a nerve ending, causes muscular contraction. Acetylcholine must be neutralized before the muscle can relax again. An enzyme called cholinesterase does this automatically. When a nerve agent is introduced into the body, it cancels out the neutralizing effects of cholinesterase. The result is runaway muscular contraction, which can bring death if not checked immediately.

NONLETHAL TYPES

Just as the discovery of the nerve agents has increased the scope of lethal chemicals, so has research increased the potential of the nonlethal, or incapacitating agents. Recent developments may signify a revolution in the role of these chemicals in war.

Like the nerve agents, the incapacitants are colorless, odorless and tasteless, and effective in very small concentrations.

There are two types—both of moderate to relatively short term effectiveness, producing no permanent after effects, and allowing complete recovery without medical aid. The first type are the psychochemicals, which disrupt the mental processes. The second are the physiochemicals, which inhibit various bodily functions.

Pyschochemicals produce incapitation by stimulation, tranquilization and sedation, or by causing effects that mimic psychosis. One such compound, for example, produces a considerable degree of confusion and uncertainty with regard to time and space relationships. A man whose ability to integrate time and distance is impaired would lack the coordination to fly a plane, drive a tank, or even dial a phone properly.

The physiochemicals appear to offer just as great a variety of effects as do the psychochemicals. Some will cause temporary physical incapacitation by producing respiratory irritation, low blood pressure, disturbance in body temperature, impairment of vision, laxation, anesthesia, deafness and paralysis. One compound, repeatedly tested on laboratory animals, produces temporary paralysis of the skeletal muscles, but does not effect respiration or heart rate. There are no discernible after effects.

BIOLOGICAL AGENTS

The target of biological weapons is man, but he can also be attacked indirectly through his animals and his crops. Among the many thousands of biological micro-organisms known, most are harmless, many are distinctly beneficial, and only a relatively few are pathogenic for man. Still, there are about 160 serious diseases, caused by a variety of microorganisms, that could be considered for use as biological agents.

The soldier in the field, and the civilian populace as well, must be prepared for the possibility of assault by biological weapons systems which can deliver protozoa, which cause malaria, African sleeping sickness and amoebic dysentery; fungi, which cause San Joaquin fever (coccidioidomycosis) and histoplasmosis; bacteria, which can cause anthrax, brucellosis, cholera, glanders, typhoid fever, bubonic plague, and tularemia; rickettsia, which can cause typhus, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, and Q fever; and viruses, which can cause influenza, smallpox, yellow fever, hepatitis, parrot fever (psittacosis), and various encephalitic diseases.

In addition, there are the microbial toxins, which include several types of botulinum, the most potent toxin known. It has been associated with improperly canned foods. In addition, there is the staphylococcus, the most common cause of food poisoning.

Like some of the toxic chemical agents, biological agents cannot be detected by the unaided senses. They can be produced in very concentrated liquid suspensions or dry powders, making it possible to deliver effective dosages with a minimum of logistic effort. And they have a delayed casualty effect. The incubation period varies with the agent chosen; consequently there is no immediate warning of exposure.

Biological agents also possess another important characteristic—the ability to cover extensive target areas, in the order of thousands of square miles. This coverage is obtained by disseminating the agent in the form of an aerosol.

ON THE DEFENSIVE

Defensive measures against chemical and biological agents may be divided into three major categories: agent detection and identification, individual and collective protection, and decontamination. To these three may be added a fourth which is perhaps the most important of all—a high degree of training in defensive measures and discipline in using them.

Protection and identification: A number of chemical kits have been developed which react to a variety of toxic agents. One Chemical Corps development for field use is an automatic detector alarm that is activated by the presence of very slight traces of nerve agent.

Because they are more complex, and may be employed over relatively large areas, separate detection devices are required to indicate the presence of biological agents. Coupled with the problem of detection is that of identification. This may require laboratory techniques akin to those used to identify microbial organisms that cause naturally occurring diseases. Recent developments in this field have materially reduced. the time required for positive identification of some disease organisms. This, treatment might be initiated before the symptoms of the disease appear.

Individual defense: The primary item of individual defense against C–B agents is the protective gas mask. The newest military type, the M–17, not only provides complete respiratory protection against chemical agents but against biological agents as well. The mask does not require a canister; instead, a protective filter is built into the front of the facepiece. A lighter weight civilian version, now in final stages of development, carries the filtering device in the facepiece.

Individual medical protection against toxic chemicals starts with the antidote for nerve agent poisoning. Atropine, long known to the medical profession, is issued in syrettes designed for self-injection. This drug neutralizes the effect of nerve agents in the body, but it must be administered immediately after exposure to the agent. In most cases, it is necessary to administer artificial respiration in conjunction with the use of atropine.

By far the best protection against biological agents is immunity, either natural or acquired. The development of new and more effective vaccines and methods of mass inoculation is an important element in biological defense planning. Distinct progress has been made in the development of polyvalent vaccines. Other areas of considerable promise are oral vaccines and mass inoculation by means of vaccine aerosols.

Collective protection involves the use of shelters where personnel can work or rest in uncontaminated air, in small shelters, a filter material called diffusion board can be incorporated into the structure. Approximately 1 square yard of this material will filter enough air for one man for an extended period. In large shelters, a mechanical protector can furnish from 300 to 500 cubic feet of fresh, purified air per minute.

For both chemical and biological agents, natural aeration is the best decontaminant. Otherwise, a variety of chemical decontaminants are available. A neutralizing solution is effective against chemical agents, while the varied decontaminants used in medical sanitation are useful against biological agents.

Despite the existence of effective protection and defense against many known agents, there is the urgent and continuing need for defensive measures to keep abreast of new weapons and developments. .

DELIVERY METHODS

C–B agents are extremely flexible, and can be adapted to a wide choice of delivery systems. The logistical requirement is comparatively slight. Intercontinental ballistic missiles and long-range aircraft can carry chemical and biological munitions. Chemical agents can be fired as artillery rounds, or emplaced as mines. Chemical and biological agents can be diffused over large areas as an aerosol, or introduced covertly into food and water supplies. In the case of biologicals, some can even be carried by tiny insect vectors.

This flexibility in delivery systems is complemented by other C–B characteristics which make these weapons particularly effective in a large variety of circumstances.

First, they can be search weapons, seeking out the enemy whether he is widely dispersed, or concentrated in fortifications. Since the agents can seep around corners and penetrate crevices, they can reach personnel physically protected from blast, thermal radiation, and fragmentation weapons.

Second, toxic weapons have little or no adverse effect upon physical installations. They do not destroy buildings, disrupt communications, transportation, power sources, and water supplies.

Third, chemical and biological weapons are both point and area weapons. They can cover specific targets or wide areas. As a result, precise location of the enemy is not required, and dispersal of forces does not provide the same degree of defense that it does against other weapons.

In meeting our Nation's need for a balanced capability to cope with the broad spectrum of possible conflict, toxic chemicals and biologicals in themselves are not a substitute for other systems of defense. However, they do provide one vitally important means of achieving a balanced power through a balanced arsenal.

Hungary Can Save the United Nations From Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD an address which I have prepared for delivery on Sunday, August 19, at Euclid Beach Park, Cleveland, before the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland, at ceremonies commemorating the 60th annual Hungarian Day. The title of my address is "Hungary Can Save the United Nations From Disaster":

This is a memorable day for all the officers and members of the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland, as you and all your friends observe the 60th annual Hungarian Day in our great city of Cleveland.

The period of 60 years which we mark today in the cultural life of our city is filled with events of great happiness and joy and of accomplishment as well as chapters of great sorrow and tragedy.

While the Hungarian Societies of Cleveland are devoted to the advancement of the cultural and civic life of our city, your interest and your cares reach beyond our city, the shores of our country, to the ancient nation of Hungary from whence sprang the heritage of your organization.

This is in keeping with the finest American traditions.

This is an imperative of our times, because the world in which we live compels us to have interest in, concern for, and compassion toward all the nations that have contributed to the building of our great Nation, and which today are denied their freedom and independence.

Among the great cultural works of your organization here in Cleveland we are reminded immediately of the statue of Louis Kossuth which stands in University Circle and which reminds our people of the life and times of a great fighter for liberty and the independence of Hungary.

We then turn to the statue of Alexander Petofi, the great Hungarian poet and patriot, which graces the Cleveland Public Library.

Both of these men are symbols of the enduring character of the Hungarian nation, of its spirit and of its hope for the future.

We are reminded that it was at Petofi Circle in Budapest in October 1956 that the writers and students gathered to recite the stimulating poetry of Petofi, and to applaud his words as a symbol of their defiance of the despotic Russian occupiers now in Hungary.

These rallies at Petofi Circle played a leading part in lighting the fire of revolution which swept throughout Hungary in October of 1956, driving the Russian tormentors from Hungarian soil and winning 7 historic days of freedom and national independence for Hungary.

The spirit of Louis Kossuth ran side by side with that of the poet, Petofi. And in the distant background stood a history of over 900 years filled with the epics of King Stephen, the patriot saint of Hungary, Prince Hunyadi, whose historic stand against the Turks caused the daily angelus throughout the Christian world.

The people of Hungary wrote another gallant chapter in the book of human freedom in 1956 which symbolizes anew the traditional role of the Hungarian nation as defender of Western civilization.

But these thoughts of greatness and national heroism which we enjoy this day must share the platform with the great tragedy which has befallen the Hungarian nation in our times.

I speak of the tragedy which began with World War II when Hungary, caught in the giant vise of Russian imperialism and Nazi imperialism, became the victim of these twin tragedies.

In the wake of the war, the Red army occupied Hungary and under the protection of Russian armed forces, a puppet government was forced upon the people which has endured ever since—with the exception of the great, but short freedom victory in the revolution of 1956.

Hungary today is in chains—Russian chains.

The tyrants of Moscow have been conducting systematic genocide programs against the Hungarian people, calculated to break their spirit and to turn them to soulless, obedient vassals—which the Russians call the Soviet man.

The people of Hungary fight on against the tyranny and genocide, against tremendous odds, and with little or no help, and indeed small comfort from the great Western nations which, in centuries past, enjoyed peace because the Hungarian people manned the barricades of Europe.

This suffering of the Hungarian nation cannot go on forever.

The conscience of the West is tormented by its failure to act in support of the Hungarian freedom revolution.

There is no easy way out in the total war which the Russian imperialists have launched against all the nations and peoples of the world.

The case of Hungary has been before the United Nations since December 1956, when a general assembly resolution on Hungary was adopted by an overwhelming vote, with only the Russians and their puppets voting against it.

Each year the agenda of the United Nations has carried the resolution on Hungary.

No action has been taken on that resolution during the past 6 years but the resolution nevertheless was maintained on the agenda.

That resolution to which I refer condemned Russian aggression against the Hungarian people and demanded the removal of all Russian military, economic, and political elements from Hungarian soil.

Voluminous reports of official hearings and testimony and documents on Russian criminal aggression against the Hungarian people were compiled and distributed by the United Nations.

The Eisenhower administration did absolutely nothing to give practical meaning and purpose to the United Nations resolution on Hungary.

For 4 long years this inaction further troubled the conscience of the West.

The victory of President Kennedy in the 1960 national election was accompanied by the clear trumpet sound of freedom's cause and hope sprang anew that justice would be done to the gallant people of Hungary in the forum of the United Nations.

In recent months there has been much talk and allegation about a secret agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to drop the Hungarian issue from the United Nations agenda.

The Department of State has, on June 28, 1962, publicly denied the existence of any such secret agreement and has declared that the events connected with the 1956 Hungarian freedom revolution and its aftermath remain an unresolved problem in the United Nations.

The final date for completion of the United Nations agenda was last Friday, August 17.

All items for the agenda had to be entered before the close of business that day.

The American delegation to the United Nations, acting in accord with the policy established by the Kennedy administration, took the necessary steps to place the Hungarian question on the United Nations agenda for 1962.

This action was confirmed to me by responsible officers of the Department of State on Friday past.

I know of no reason to prevent the Hungarian question from being placed on and remaining on the agenda.

The Russians or any of their stooge representatives in the United Nations can object to the Hungarian question remaining on the General Assembly agenda.

This action by our Department of State proposing that the Hungarian question be placed on the agenda is consistent with the public statement by our Department of State on June 28, 1962, denying that any deal had been made with the Russians to drop this all-important question.

However, this action by the Department of State, which deserves the enthusiastic support of all thinking people, is only the first step in the long political fight with the Russians.

The fact that the Hungarian question is on the agenda does not mean that an all-out effort will be made to cause the Russians to abide by the United Nations General Assembly resolution.

To bring about successful action requires still another determination by the Department of State, together with a practical program to bring this burning question to final issue.

I am sure you are aware that shortly after the enactment of the United Nations resolution on Hungary, I proposed that the Russians be required to either abide by the terms of that resolution or be expelled from membership in the United Nations.

I introduced a resolution in Congress, the purpose of which was to put Congress on record in support of my proposal.

I believe that the passage of time has proven the merits of my proposal.

N. Khrushchev, addressing a Moscow luncheon for visiting Ghanaian President Kwame Nkrumah, denounced United Nations resistance to the U.S.S.R.'s demand for a 3-member executive representing the Soviet, Western and neutral blocs. He said: "The imperialist powers wish to preserve their rule in the United Nations." "But it is perfectly obvious that the domination of this or that group of states * * * prevents the organization from fulfilling its functions." "For instance, even if all the countries of the world adopted a decision that did not accord with the interests of the Soviet Union and threatened its security, the Soviet Union would not recognize this decision but would uphold its rights, relying on force."

Moreover, everyone is aware of the Russian effort to introduce the troika system into the United Nations through which that body will be paralyzed to take any action, including the mere passage of resolutions in the General Assembly.

Finally, I believe that the Russian refusal to pay their bills at the United Nations demonstrates that they regard that body as nothing but a propaganda forum.

They despise the principles of the charter and have set upon a course to either completely control the United Nations or destroy it.

The time has come for the United States to take whatever actions are necessary to prove the validity and the mission of the United Nations, or give it up as a failure before the Russians reduce it to a state of public contempt.

The resolution on Hungary presents an ideal case to begin this task.

The time is now to cause the Russians to either abide by the terms of the United Nations resolution on Hungary or be expelled from membership in that body.

I hope action in that direction will be taken in the coming session of the United Nations General Assembly.

If our people demand action of this type, your Government will respond.

Let your voices be heard. Write, call or telegraph your President and your Ambassador at the United Nations telling them exactly what you think on this vital question.

The Soblen Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky:

THE SOBLEN CASE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The Soblen case becomes increasingly complex as more countries with their varying laws become involved in it. Even should Soblen be returned to the United States before this article appears in type, the subject is still intriguing from a moral and legal standpoint.

Soblen is a convicted spy. He jumped bail of $100,000 which those who went bail for him shrugged off apparently without much concern. Even rich people do not wish to lose $100,000.

Soblen, when he jumped bail, chose to take a plane to Israel. He chose Israel without the consent of that nation. He traveled on the passport of his dead brother, who used another name. Although Soblen was a convicted spy he was not under surveillance either by the U.S. attorney's office, the FBI, or the New York police. There was no control officers at the airports to prevent a convicted criminal from leaving the country.

Soblen arrived in Israel and registered in a hotel. The Israeli Government was embarrassed because to bring immigrants to the country and to justify its existence as a state, Israel has a "Law of Return" which permits every Jew, except a convicted criminal, to return to the Jewish homeland from wherever he may be and to become a citizen of Israel immediately.

As regards Soblen, the question arose as to whether he is a criminal or a political offender. While this question was being argued, the Israeli Government put him on an El Al plane where he staged his "suicide" which he himself declared was phony. He landed in London and was sent to a prison hospital.

The British washed their hands of Soblen in accordance with their law and judicial procedure. It is not possible to complain of their conduct. Israel found itself in a political turmoil. The leftwing parties in that country, always a nuisance, demanded that if an El Al plane were used to effect his return, he be sent to Israel and not to the United States.

This violates all international traditions, customs, and agreements on returned passengers, including stowaways. If the El Al airplane does not return Soblen to the United States, this country and Great Britain would both be justified in refusing this line landing privileges. Certainly the United States would be warranted in taking that position.

The United States has no extradition treaty with Brazil and if Brazil enjoys having American criminals and swindlers, we can do nothing about it, except to retaliate by not permitting Brazilian coffee to enter this country.

That seems drastic except that one begins to wonder whether we are a nation of men or mice. Our tax dodgers put their money in half a dozen havens, the leading country that engages in this being Switzerland. No agency of our Government is doing anything about it. President Kennedy's proposal to withhold dividends might have been a step toward plugging up the lines to the tax havens, but whoever wrote that bill got it twisted.

We have all kinds of airlines and private planes moving about but we set up no strong measures to guard against contraband. We permit criminals to escape by aircraft and do nothing to check their passports or whether they have a receipt for having paid their taxes.

The Soblen case opens up all these questions which are more important than the spy.

The Facts About the United Nations Children's Fund

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have a part in the establishment, after World War II, of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) by offering the amendment which gave it its first money to start operating. The children of Europe particularly were suffering from severe malnutrition and needed help at once. Some opposed the project because so much would go to children in Communist-dominated countries in Eastern Europe where the need was greatest. I had confidence in the Director, Mr. Maurice Pate, an American proposed for the position by former president Herbert Hoover on the basis of his work with Mr. Hoover in administering relief in Europe after World War I. The accomplishments of UNICEF have been extraordinary. American contributions were more than 70 percent of the total at the outset. No other country had funds to provide at that time. I proposed an initial contribution by the United States of $15 million in order to get the work started, with a total of $50 million to be available as others matched it with their contributions. Gradually the U.S. share has been reduced to 46 percent last year and 44 percent this year. Our contribution has amounted to $12 million a year these last few years. I don't know any money we have spent anywhere that has done more good and been better administered.

Nevertheless there began several years ago, originating from a very few sources, a series of grave misrepresentations regarding the children's fund and they have been spread across our land, raising questions in the minds of sincere citizens who, in many instances have not known how to get the truth for themselves. I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues and the country the following concise statement of the facts regarding UNICEF, its history, work, and development, which I am sure they will find useful in answering questions that may come to them from constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in UNICEF's accomplishments, as can all Americans and those in other countries that have supported it, and I feel a deep concern that the American people know the facts as I know them. The story of UNICEF follows:

THE STORY OF UNICEF

ORIGIN OF UNICEF

1. The United Nations Children's Fund (originally known as the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund) was an outgrowth of World War II. Children were among the worst sufferers. In the war's aftermath, President Truman in February 1946 established a survey mission headed by former President Herbert Hoover. Upon Mr. Hoover's recommendation, the U.S. Government supported the creation of a special body within the United Nations to meet the emergency needs of children, primarily in the war-ravaged countries. UNICEF was established by the U.N. General Assembly on December 11, 1946. The first executive director (and first staff member) appointed by Secretary General Trygve Lie in consultation with the Executive Board of UNICEF, was Mr. Maurice Pate (an American), who had been associated with earlier Hoover-sponsored relief and humanitarian activities. Mr. Pate continues to hold this position.

OPERATIONS OF UNICEF

2. UNICEF helps governments plan programs of permanent benefit to children, provides supplies and equipment needed from outside the country, and aids schemes for training national staff to plan and operate these programs. The main types of projects aided are in the fields of nutrition, health services, disease control, and family and child welfare. In addition, emergency aid is provided for children in such catastrophes as earthquakes, floods and droughts. Both the governments and UNICEF receive technical advice from other United Nations Agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the United Nations Bureau of Social Affairs.

3. During the period of its emergency operation, from 1947 to 1950, UNICEF, in accordance with its mandate, concentrated on aiding children of war-ravaged countries, mainly in Europe. In 1950 UNICEF began to shift its main emphasis to programs of long-range benefit for children in economically underdeveloped countries. From 1951 to date, European countries which have received aid from UNICEF have been: Austria, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Poland, and Yugoslavia. UNICEF aid is currently reaching millions of needy mothers and children in over 100 countries without discrimination because of race, creed, nationality status or political belief in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Europe, and Latin America.

4. Aid by UNICEF is given only on request by governments, and under strict rules of control and supervision set out in a formal agreement which the governments must conclude with UNICEF. This is supplemented by a detailed "plan of operation" to which the governments must agree for each project receiving UNICEF aid. The governments must agree that the supplies provided by UNICEF are to be used or distributed equitably and efficiently on the basis of need. They must agree at all times to admit UNICEF personnel, and provide access to up-to-date accounts.

5. To obtain UNICEF aid for a project benefiting its children, a government must make substantial expenditures, including locally available supplies, buildings, labor, and personnel. In recent years the aided countries have provided an average of at least 2½ times as much as they receive.

6. In many countries receiving aid from UNICEF, the collaboration of voluntary organizations, including mission groups, in the operation of child care programs does extend the possibilities for reaching more children. Although UNICEF aid is provided only for projects for which a government accepts responsibility, in a number of instances the government relies on voluntary agencies to carry out part of the operations.

7. During the first 15 years of UNICEF's operation, over 148 million children and young adults were vaccinated against tuberculosis in programs aided by UNICEF; over 17 million mothers and children were cured of yaws, a disease of tropical sores; almost 9.7 million mothers and children, victims of trachoma and acute conjunctivitis, were saved from possible blindness; almost 700,000 children and mothers were treated for leprosy; in 1961 alone, about 30 million mothers and children were protected from malaria, and 5.5 million children benefited from supplementary feeding programs. In addition many millions of children benefited from the 160 dairies and milk drying plants and the over 19,000 maternal and child health centers which UNICEF has thus far helped to equip.

COMMENTS ON UNICEF'S WORK

8. On October 13, 1961, President John F. Kennedy issued the following statement:

"The world's children offer our greatest promise for the future. It gives me great pleasure to send a message of congratulations and support to UNICEF again this year.

"The United Nations Children's Fund has worked tirelessly and effectively across national boundaries to help children escape the threat of hunger and disease. Their program of education in disease prevention, medical care and nutrition has already had a real impact upon today's children, and its benefits will be felt even more keenly by the millions of children to come. We can feel proud of the cooperative effort which has enabled UNICEF to carry out its work."

9. On October 23, 1959, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in a letter addressed to Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni, Jr., president of the U.S. Committee for UNICEF said:

"It is heartwarming to follow the work of UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund.

"Please give my congratulations to the members of the U.S. Committee for UNICEF for their unceasing efforts to alleviate hunger and disease among all the world's children. In their program, which enlists the support of many generous citizens, they contribute much to the lives of millions in need."

10. On September 10, 1960, Vice President Richard M. Nixon sent the following letter to Mr. C. Lloyd Bailey, executive director of the U.S. Committee for UNICEF:

"This organizaiton, reflecting a universal concern with the welfare of children, despite differences in culture, religion, or political belief, has helped focus world attention on the many needs of children, and on practical ways in which international aid can help countries meet these needs.

"I am pleased that the United States has consistently supported UNICEF since its inception. We have exercised leadership within both the Executive Board and the Program Committee. The U.S. Congress, sympathetic with the noble purposes of UNICEF, has made generous appropriations toward its support. The U.S. Committee for UNICEF, a group of distinguished, dedicated citizens, is the largest private contributor to the organization. In 1959, as a result of its 'Trick or Treat for UNICEF Program,' it was able to raise $1,500,000.

"I am proud of U.S. leadership in this organization which today has underway in more than 100 countries and territories some 350 projects, all helping to break intolerable patterns of sickness, hunger, and ignorance. I am convinced that we all must endeavor to see that this leadership is continued."

11. The general board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America has approved a statement commending "the United States for its support of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations such as * * * UNICEF."

12. In a letter dated January 11, 1962, to Mr. Maurice Pate, Executive Director of UNICEF, His Eminence A. G. Cardinal Cicognani, Vatican Secretary of State, says in part:

"His Holiness continues to follow with keen interest the laudable efforts of the United Nations Children's Fund to assist underprivileged and needy children the world over, and would have me convey to you his wishes and hopes that the work of your organization may be blessed with success and every happy result.

"Further to manifest his concern, and as a mark of the Holy See's participation in your work, the sovereign pontiff his directed me to forward the enclosed check of $1,000 as a contribution toward the financing of UNICEF."

13. The American Jewish committee has approved a resolution which concludes with the affirmation that the organization "Urges all its members to stimulate public interest in and support for UNICEF and its humanitarian activities, and to cooperate with the U.S. Committee for UNICEF."

CONTRIBUTIONS

14. In 1961, 100 governments were contributors and 107 countries were assisted. Of the 107 countries assisted 68 also made voluntary contributions to UNICEF's central fund. The allocations have no relation to contributions which the government may make to UNICEF's central fund for its work throughout the world. UNICEF allocations to help a country's children are based upon the needs of children, and the aided government's willingness to do its share to assure that the programs will be effective.

15. In 1961 contributions to the central account of UNICEF totaled $22,959,796, of which the United States contributed $12 million subject to the condition that the U.S. contribution should not exceed 46 percent of the total government contributions. Governments other than the United States contributed $10,959,796 to the central account and in addition $2,393,189 (mostly in convertible currencies) toward the implementation of UNICEF-aided projects and $921,743 for local administrative and related costs of UNICEF field offices. The U.S. pledges are subject to the condition that the actual U.S. contribution shall not exceed fixed percentages of the total audited government contributions to UNICEF; for 1962 that figure will be 44 percent.

16. Skim-milk powder made available by the United States under title III of Public Law 480 is shipped by UNICEF for distribution through maternal and child health centers, schools, and nutrition education programs in 78 developing countries in containers labeled "Doated by the People of the United States of America." Canada and Switzerland have also donated milk powder through UNICEF. The ocean freight charges for the donated milk costs UNICEF about a penny for five cups of milk.

17. Most of the governments which contribute to UNICEF do so in their own currency. For the most part UNICEF spends these currencies in the contributing country for the purchase and shipment of supplies and equipment for programs it is aiding in other countries. Over the years more than 85 percent of the U.S. contribution to UNICEF has been spent in the United States.

ADMINISTRATION OF UNICEF

18. In 1960 and 1961 UNICEF administrative costs amounted to between 7 and 8 percent of total expenditures. Operational service expenditures, which constitute a direct service to country programs (for example, engineering planning and supervision, supply procurement and shipping services, and services of field staff in direct contact with country programs), amounted to approximately 9 percent of total expenditures in those years. Approximately 83 to 84 percent of UNICEF expenditures was for direct material program aid.

19. The UNICEF professional staff is composed of citizens of 35 countries. This staff, which carries out the decisions of the UNICEF Executive Board, is composed of 163 persons. Of these, 42 are U.S. citizens.

20. Each U.S. citizen who is employed by UNICEF (or any other public international organization in which the U.S. Government is a participant) is subject to an investigation by the U.S. Government under the provisions of Executive Order 10422. Concerning each U.S. citizen in UNICEF employ, it has been notified officially by the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board (an agency of the U.S. Government) that the Board has determined that there is no reasonable doubt as to the employee's loyalty to the U.S. Government.

CONTROL OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNICEF

21. Responsibility for all contributions received by UNICEF rests with the Executive Director who functions under the direction of the UNICEF Executive Board. During the past year there has been some misunderstanding on the part of the general public resulting from certain allegations that the Secretary General of the U.N. used UNICEF funds to help finance the Congo operation. This public concern developed from the fact that in May 1961 the State Department decided to make a loan of $10 million to the Secretary General of the U.N. for use in the general budget. For that purpose the State Department used money earmarked for a forthcoming U.S. contribution to UNICEF—at a time when this contribution was not yet due to be paid. (The U.S. Government appropriation for UNICEF was made with the stipulation that it not exceed a stated percentage of total governmental contributions. It is reassuring to report that UNICEF received a check for $10 million last December 27 for the money that has been loaned by the United States to the U.N.

22. So far as the future is concerned, the Acting Secretary General of the U.N. has advised UNICEF that he recognizes that any funds contributed or collected for UNICEF, from nongovernmental sources are naturally to be used for the purposes of UNICEF, and that they are not to be diverted for any other use. The Acting Secretary General has also given UNICEF the formal assurance that he does not expect to have any occasion to use even the restricted borrowing authority given to him by the General Assembly in respect to funds which have been contributed to UNICEF by governments.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

23. The Executive Board of UNICEF, consisting of representatives of 30 Governments (originally 26) elects its own officers. The Chairmen of the Board, who preside over meetings but traditionally do not vote, have come from the following countries: Poland, Canada, Switzerland, India, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, and Mexico (incumbent 1962).

24. The UNICEF Executive Board meets semi-annually. Its functions are: to set policy, consider requests, allocate aid, evaluate results and establish the administrative budget of UNICEF. Recommendations for allocations are made by the Executive Director and all decisions are by majority vote. The 1962 membership of the Executive Board (elected by the UN Economic and Social Council) is: Afghanistan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China (Nationalist), Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany (Fed. Rep. of), Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vietnam (Republic of).

U.S. COMMITTEE FOR UNICEF

25. The U.S. Committee for UNICEF is made up of individual leaders in the religious, labor, education, social welfare, business, medical and civic life of our country. In its work, the Committee enjoys the cooperation of all major religious faiths, and of many national voluntary nongovernmental organizations. The U.S. Government has formally recognized the function of the Committee and has commended its accomplishments.

26. The U.S. Committee for UNICEF sponsors projects such as the "Trick or Treat for UNICEF" project at Halloween and the sale of UNICEF greeting cards. Through these and other private sources substantial funds are received for use by UNICEF to aid needy children. In addition, Youth Out for UNICEF, a project enabling American teenagers to express their concern for needy children in other parts of the world, and the "Hi Neighbor" series of books and records are sponsored by the U.S. Committee.

27. Sold all year 'round in over 100 countries for the benefit of the Children's Fund, UNICEF greeting cards reflect the ethical and spiritual values of the many peoples who make up the United Nations. Their designs are chosen solely on artistic merit, and are donated by well-known artists. UNICEF cards seek to maintain a universal appeal, and to express a sharing of human aspirations—which is the basic spirit of the Judeo-Christian teachings.

28. Through the "Trick or Treat for UNICEF" project, boys and girls in the United States express their concern for needy children in other countries through the greatest effort made thus far by children to help children. President Kennedy has said, "UNICEF has caught the imagination of our people—especially our Nation's children whose Halloween collections have become a symbol of concern and an expression of tangible aid. I urge all my fellow citizens, young and old, to support UNICEF generously again this year."

Appendix

Retired Medicare Fund Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John J. Ford:

[From the Army Times, July 28, 1962]

THIS WEEK ON CAPITOL HILL: RETIRED MEDICARE FUND PROPOSED

(By John J. Ford)

Last week I discussed here the history of the naval hospital fund which provided hospital care for Navy men from 1799 to 1953. I made two points: that while Congress abolished the fund as a separate Treasury account in 1943, there was a real legal question as to whether or not it had abolished the trust; and that the fund idea could be used to provide hospital care for the ever-growing number of military retirees.

It is the second point I want to concentrate on in this column.

The thought is, quite simple, that providing the right to hospitalization in military facilities would give military retirees something they have been led to expect throughout their careers and would be important to the morale of active duty servicemen. Providing for a small contribution monthly would assure the retirees a vested right to care in military hospitals—as retired Navy men who contributed to the hospital fund had a vested right to care in Navy hospitals. The right could not be taken away by a rider on an appropriation bill or administrative action. And the fund would keep the cost of care for these retirees from being prohibitive for the Government. Indeed, it could probably be shown that it would be the least expensive for the Government in the long run.

Public Law 569 of the 84th Congress—the Dependent Medical Care Act—provided, under regulations to be drafted by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, that medical and dental care in military facilities may be furnished upon request and subject to the availability of space, facilities and capabilities of the medical staff, to retired members of the uniform services.

This changed medical care to a privilege that may be given "subject to availability of space"—which means beds. In the past it had been a right for at least some retirees. This law has been reinforced since its passage by the action of the appropriations committees in requiring Defense to leave out any provision for retired care in planning new hospitals.

There will be some 362,000 on the retired rolls in fiscal 1963, over 410,000 in fiscal 1964. In 15 years there will be close to 1 million, or probably roughly one-third the size of the active duty force. They are going to need medical care and if the present policy continues it is obvious that in a short time there will be bed space available only for a favored few. If the Government would commit itself to a national policy of caring for military retirees in military hospitals it would assure equality of treatment, it would be a career incentive to those still in service and it will probably cost less to the Federal Government.

It is a safe assumption that much of the cost of care for these retirees is going to be met by some Federal system—a certain privileged few in military facilities, some in VA facilities and perhaps most through some form of federally sponsored medical care for the aged. While the medical care for the aged amendment was defeated in the Senate this year, the vote was closer than in 1960 and it is a good bet some provision for aged care will pass in the years ahead. Even Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, Senate Republican leader, who headed the opposition to the amendment, said the debate was not over the philosophy of providing the care but the method of financing.

In any event, there is a good chance the Government will handle much of the cost. By providing care in military facilities it will be using, for the most part, facilities in being and there won't be the added expenses for insurance company profits, doctors' fees and such.

Legislation to provide retired care could include the following:

1. Fund: There would be established a retired servicemen's hospital fund in the U.S. Treasury.

There would be paid into the fund regular deductions from the pay of all military retirees plus an initial appropriation by the Congress. The initial appropriation, to get the fund started, would be considered full settlement by the U.S. Government for all the assets taken over from the naval hospital trust and the Secretary of the Navy would no longer have any powers or responsibilities under such trust. Several millions were spent out of the naval hospital fund over the year and the assets have appreciated to a considerable extent. But as a practical matter the initial appropriation would have to be limited, presumably to the minimum amount needed to get the fund started.

2. Control: Appropriations made from the fund would be approved by Congress.

This would assure congressional control over the fund such as was maintained over the old naval hospital fund and is still maintained over expenditures from the funds of the Army's Soldier's Home Fund. Each soldier contributes 10 cents a month to this fund.

3. Care: Care provided for military retirees under the fund would be limited to hospital care.

In no case shall retirees be entitled to care not provided for active duty servicemen. It shall not include private doctor's fees or care in nonmilitary hospitals. The fund is strictly to assure retirees have a right to care in military facilities.

4. Rights: Those who contributed to the hospital fund would have a vested right to care in military hospitals.

5. Advisory board: There would be established in the Defense Department a Retired Servicemen's Hospital Care Advisory Board.

The Board would have six members, not more than two of them employees of the Defense Department and at least two of them retired military men. The Board would make necessary surveys to determine the hospital care needs of military retirees and would advise the services what retired hospital care needs are in areas where military hospitals are to be expanded or new facilities constructed. The Board would recommend to Defense a standard factor to be used for planning bed needs of retirees in new hospital construction. The Board would also determine the average daily cost of patient care for retirees in military hospitals and the Defense Department would use this figure as a basis for charging the fund.

6. Contribution: There shall be deducted from the account of every one on the military retired rolls a set charge of $1 per month.

The $1 is a suggested figure. Congress might determine after study of the legislation that it should be a little more or a little less. Or it might want to approach it in another way, such as 1 percent of retired pay. The figure should be low enough that it would not be considered a pay cut by retirees.

There are two chief purposes to the contribution: to help defray the cost of hospital care for retirees and to assure retired military men have a vested right to care in military facilities.

7. Accounting: The Board and the Defense Department would have leeway to administer the fund as simply as possible.

With modern automated equipment and central management of retired pay, making the pay deductions should not be a problem. Defense would have authority to deduct on an annual or semiannual basis—which is what the Navy originally asked when it complained of the accounting difficulties of its hospital fund in 1943. The individual service would not keep cost figures on retiree care but would merely keep a record of the total days of care provided for retirees—which they keep now. Once each fiscal year Defense would use these totals to reimburse the services from the hospital fund, using the average daily cost figure for retirees determined by the Advisory Board.

In determining the average daily cost of retirees the Board would use only those additional costs which were incurred because of the retirees. The Board would not have to include a prorated share of the cost of facilities or services the hospitals would have had to provide if the retirees were not there. It is not contemplated cost estimated for retirees will be as high as for active duty personnel.

8. Construction: If, at some time in the future, money in the fund is sufficient, the Board may recommend construction of special facilities to care for aged and ill retirees, with the fund paying part of the cost.

This could include, for example, most of the provisions of the bill sponsored by Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, to set up homes—one on each coast—to provide medical facilities specializing in care of the aged. Presumably, the facilities would be located in areas of heavy concentration of retirees, such as Florida and California.

Comments from retired readers on this proposal would be welcomed.

Ethics in Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Southern Shipper and Motor Carrier Council, an organization dedicated to promotion of better relations between shippers and motor carriers, last June 26–27 held a conference on "Principles, Practices, and Particulars of Business Relations" in Louisville, Ky. So impressive were the featured discussions on ethics that they were the subject of both an article and editorial in the July 7 issue of Traffic World magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, entitled "Firm Foundation for Good Shipper-Carrier Relations," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRM FOUNDATION FOR GOOD SHIPPER-CARRIER RELATIONS

The shipper-carrier conference idea, adopted and put into effect in 13 geographical regions and nationally by the railroad industry many years ago, has in recent years found widespread acceptance in the relatively youthful trucking industry. In the latter, this movement continues to progress as the motor carriers and their customers find that by disclosing and discussing their respective needs, wants, and problems in conference sessions they may ease tensions and eventually find ways of being mutually helpful.

To justify their existence the shipper-carrier conferences generally have the commendable aim of trying to remove or minimize, by cooperative thought and effort, obstacles to performance of good, efficient transportation service. Of course, no organization can be very effective in striving to attain a lofty objective unless its individual members demonstrate that they themselves are dedicated to the organization's objective. In other words, the Hotsytown Chamber of Commerce can't expect to make much of a dent in trying to build for its members a reputation for unusual courtesy and friendliness if each member insults every other individual he meets.

Meetings of shippers with carriers are not likely to be well attended or to engender much enthusiasm for any sort of a cooperative program unless such distrust as may exist between the shippers and the carriers, or among members of either group, is dispelled. Member A, a shipper of unquestioned integrity, must feel confident that member B, a carrier, or member C, another shipper, are not inclined to engage in shady deals. An atmosphere of suspicion isn't conducive to accomplishment of good work.

The Southern Shipper & Motor Carrier Council pointed the way to the placing of shipper-carrier relationships on a firm footing when, in its meeting in Louisville on June 26 and 27, it devoted hours to discussion of the conference theme: "Principles, Practices, and Particulars of Business Relations." The theme might have been stated also as "Ethics in the Transportation Business." It was impossible, of course, to give exhaustive consideration to so broad a subject in just a few hours; but the discussion was informative and stimulating, nonetheless, and some interesting points were brought out and valuable suggestions made.

Now, of course, everyone professes to be an unflinching supporter of high ethical standards in business. Ethics, however, is a complex subject, a fascinating field of study. Certain conduct may be lawful, yet unethical; or it may be ethical and yet, if judged by appearances, antisocial. Perhaps some of the council members assembled at Louisville came out of the meeting feeling a bit uncertain as to what sort of behavior is, or is not, ethical. If so, they can shake hands with many who have studied ethics for years and still have failed to find satisfactory answers to many of their questions. You have to "come down to specifics" in discussions of ethics, and a few "specifics" were included in the discussions heard by the council.

One of those "for instances" was stated in these words by Charles H. Beard, general traffic manager of the Union Carbide & Carbon Corp., New York City, a panelist at the council meeting in Louisville:

"We hear occasionally of shippers pitting carrier against carrier or one mode of transport against another, to obtain reduced costs. Even certain agencies of our Government have been accused of this practice. Is it unethical? Certainly when it reduces carrier revenues to the point of no return it is not the right or moral thing to do. Nor is it good business for the shipper. He gets a bad reputation, and needed cooperation from carriers for reasonable and legitimate adjustments are then delayed or denied."

Mr. Beard said he had been told that some shippers, possessing their own transportation equipment, yielded to pressure of their sales or production departments for reduced costs by in turn pressuring carriers into reducing rates or performing extra services when not warranted by the private carrier facts and arithmetic. He commented that "if this is true, such practices are not ethical and do not develop good trade relations," and he suggested that this could be corrected if the carriers would demand "all the facts and figures for study." If the carriers found inaccuracies in those figures, they must "have backbone enough to decline to yield to such pressures," he counseled.

He deemed it unethical, also, for a carrier to "buy business" or try to gain favor with shippers by promising to take independent action in connection with a rate for an important movement and then, after having such a rate published, arranging with the bureau that published the rate to seek and obtain suspension of it on the ground it would be noncompensatory.

Concern was expressed by some of the council members about disregard of ethical standards by some small carriers that, hungry for revenue, cut corners in order to gain a little traffic. It's a fact of life, certainly, that people afflicted by hunger or poverty or greed don't find it very difficult to justify to themselves a little departure, now and then, from the path of strictly ethical behavior. But there's honesty among poor people and small carriers, too. In childhood we memorized this motto: "There's so much good in the worst of us, and so much bad in the best of us, that it hardly behooves any of us to talk about the rest of us."

References to religious influence on business conduct were made in the Louisville meeting. Mr. Beard said that "the creation of the ideal human character in business is progressing and will further advance as each of us learns to adhere more closely to our religious heritages." And C. D. Hardesty, Jr., president of the council and general traffic manager of Mason & Dixon Lines, Inc., said:

"The whole business world is beginning to awaken to the critical need for reevaluation of the moral fiber of business relations. Individual businessmen are more and more concerned with how to reconcile religious principles and teachings with their business practices."

Agreeing with that view, we believe that relationships among carriers of the same or different modes and between carriers and shippers will continue to improve, founded on acceptance and practice of the Golden Rule.

McKesson Group Forms Lifeline To Aid Coworker's Wife in Heart Surgery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit a copy of an article from the Bridgeport Post describing the wonderful response of workers at the McKesson & Robbins plant in Bridgeport, Conn., to a humanitarian appeal on behalf of one of their fellow workers. It is deserving of the highest commendation.

The article follows:

THIRTY-TWO DONATE BLOOD FOR OPERATION: MCKESSON GROUP FORMS LIFELINE TO AID COWORKER'S WIFE IN HEART SURGERY

(By Sharon Thaler)

Thirty-two employees of McKesson & Robbins, in Fairfield, have teamed up to make it possible for open-heart surgery to be performed upon the wife of a coworker.

They have helped in the only way possible for them: by donating the blood required for the delicate operation.

The object of their solicitude is Mrs. Harriet Freedman, 22, wife of Martin Freedman, of 408 Charles Street, who will undergo the surgery to seal an imperfect heart chamber, September 25 in Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center, New York.

A heart defect since birth has troubled Mrs. Freedman, but only recently have doctors been able to give her hope for the first time that her heart can be made whole.

Mr. Freedman, a plant guard, worried at the prospect that his wife might need valuable blood during the operation, brought the situation to the attention of the McKessons Employees Association.

The association notified employees throughout the plant while Eleanor Lyons, a writer for the Lamplighter, a company publication, crusaded to obtain the approximately 25 pints of blood needed.

Yesterday, 33 pints of blood—one of them from Mr. Freedman—were given at a Fairfield Red Cross blood bank at St. Paul's Episcopal Church parish house and credited to Mrs. Freedman's account, redeemable whenever she needs them.

"What makes the whole thing more remarkable," Mr. Freedman says, "is the spirit in which everyone is helping us. I have never met many of those who are giving blood in my wife's name."

The former Harriet Rotnofsky, Mrs. Freedman is a native of the Bronx, N.Y., coming to Bridgeport 11 years ago. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Isadore Rotnofsky of 140 Sanford Avenue.

A graduate of Central High School, Mrs. Freedman is an employee of the City Trust Co. She will be leaving the company shortly for rest before the operation.

Eleven years ago, when open heart surgery was almost unheard of by the laymen, a Blalock operation was performed on Mrs. Fredeman to relieve her condition. Afterward, she had to report periodically to Columbia Hospital for checkups and observation.

About 6 months ago Mrs. Freedman reported again to the hospital. This time a board of doctors concluded that an open heart operation would bring final success.

One of the major factors in the operation, according to Mr. Freedman, is the use of a heart-lung machine which replaces the heart during the operation.

This enables surgeons to work with the heart while the machine does the work of a normal heart, pumping blood throughout the body.

IN HOSPITAL 3 WEEKS

After a stay of only 3 weeks in the hospital, Mrs. Freedman will return home to recuperate for approximately 6 months, according to her husband.

Those employees from McKessons other than Mr. Freedman, who donated blood, are as follows:

Robert Wade, Frank LaCroix, Ann Godrie, Carl Fargiano, Albert Murren, C. F. Moynihan, Sanford Lunt, Dominic Palumbo, Helen Barbieri, Norton Soule, William Francischiello, Rosemary Gura, Betty Fodor, Mary Eckenrode, Eva Davis, and William Anderson.

Also, Peter Takacs, John Tsutsis, Claude D'Amico, Wayne Soucie, Paula Otash, Matilda Swarney, John Dennis, Joseph Berardi, Montgomery Wilson, Arthur Weidman, John Keegan, Thomas Sutton, Frank Feliciano, Pastor Velasco, and Bernard Wade.

Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Salem, Oreg., Statesman entitled "Poor Medical Care." The article deals with the great American myth that the American people receive the best medical care in the world. Increasing evidence points to serious deficiencies in U.S. medical care, as pointed out by that excellent article.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POOR MEDICAL CARE

American doctors like to boast about the standards of medical care that patients get in this country, and to scare the populace into believing that these standards would be reduced to a low level created by socialized medicine in Europe if the Kennedy administration's health plan for the aged were enacted into law.

Interestingly, the populace of Europe, and especially of Scandinavia where outright socialized medicine is practiced, seems to feel that it enjoys excellent medical care.

And more interestingly, a most authoritative study in the United States has just been released which throws considerable doubt upon the quality of medical care in this country.

Columbia University's School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, in a 116-page report based upon an 18-month study of 406 hospital cases, made these judgments:

One-fifth or 20 percent of the 406 cases studied received "poor care."

Another one-fifth or 20 percent received only "fair care," making a total of two-fifths or 40 percent receiving less than good care.

One fifth or 20 percent of the hospital admissions had been unnecessary in the first place.

In one-fifth or 20 percent of the general care surgical cases, there appeared to be unjustifiable delays in performing the surgery. The quality of surgery in 20 percent of the cases was labeled "poor" and in 26 percent only "fair" for a total of 46 percent less than good.

Of the 60 hysterectomies performed, one-third or 33 percent were called unnecessary and a question was raised about the advisability of another 10 percent. Of the 13 cesarean sections reviewed, 7 were considered "questionable."

According to the study, patients were often overcharged, physicians often split fees with incompetent surgeons, and patients complained that doctors frequently were unavailable in emergencies.

The Oregon Labor Press, the source of this information, says the study was made at the request of the Teamsters Joint Council, whose welfare funds pay over $20 million annually for Blue Cross hospital insurance and some medical insurance for more than half a million members.

The fact that these abuses were found in the treatment of patients under Blue Cross is not reassuring, when it is the Blue Cross approach rather than the social security approach which is being advocated by the doctors for medical care and, at this writing, it looks as though the compromise needed to get the President's health care program through Congress is to allow Blue Cross to administer it.

One must wonder whether our Scandinavian friends are as bad off as the doctors tell us.

People Do Think: Washington Notwithstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial recently appeared in the Iron Age, the national metalworking weekly, written by Tom Campbell, which certainly defends the Congress in some of its disagreements with the administration:

PEOPLE DO THINK: WASHINGTON NOTWITHSTANDING

(By Tom Campbell)

Right now the dope from Washington seems to be that Congress doesn't reflect the people's thoughts. This isn't true.

We have consistently maintained that the people often are away ahead of their leaders. Sooner or later, some leaders catch up and go ahead of the people.

At present, Mr. Kennedy—who has had a lot of setbacks from Congress—feels that the people are on his side. He is said to be toying with the idea that he will go to the people with the issues.

It will be a waste of time. The people are coming to him—via their representatives. No congressman who wants to be elected would go against his constituents' desires and feelings. If he did, he would not be reelected. So, it must be assumed that Congressmen know what they are doing.

For a long time, the people back home have been doing a lot of thinking. You just don't say to yourself, "Let's think," and then take the position of "the Thinker." People think in all kinds of ways: With their eyes, with their ears, with their heart, with their heredity, with their sixth sense, and with unknown or incomprehensible ways and means.

They know we have lost national and world leadership. The leadership they crave is a hard thing to put on paper. It is a feeling, a carrying through of previous promises, a strong drive mixed with a gamble, horse-sense, and a basis of being with and for the people.

Today, the people are a little confused about the Washington front—and in some cases the business front. They still remember Cuba. They sense we lost some time to the Reds on the delayed atom bomb tests.

They are furious locally—and may soon be nationally—about the tax burden. They do sense business needs to make a profit. They invest in business so they know more than the big domes give them credit for.

They know a stock market break when they see one. They know dillydallying when they see it. They know when they are being snowed and snowed and snowed.

Yes, they may go along for the ride with a lot of things. But there comes a time when the people stop, look, listen, and act—either through their representatives or by themselves. We think that day is here.

The people are aroused. It may take time. But taxes, lack of leadership, and humdrum talk, plans, and action will bring a reaction.

The Public Works Appropriation Bill, 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Deparement of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO BEN JENSEN

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of kind words spoken here today, about both people and projects.

I cannot remember a year in my eight sessions here when there has been less acrimony on this bill than this year. Perhaps we are becoming more polite, but I like to think we have become more wise. We realize that these great projects are capital improvements, but there is a certified benefit to be reaped from each of them, in varying degree.

I sit on the public works legislative committee, and I know that we listen carefully to these requests for authorizations. They have to make just as good case for us as they do later when they come before the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee. We do not wave a doubtful project through, hoping that it will get stuck in the money committee for lack of merit.

Therefore, at this point, I would like to commend my earnest colleague from Iowa, Ben Jensen, for his conscientious work on the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with these countrywide projects.

He comes from the Missouri River side of our State, while my district lies along the Mississippi River. But when it comes to a sympathetic ear for funds to create necessary public works, my constituency could have no greater friend. I am extremely pleased to have him in his position of prominence on the powerful Committee on Appropriations. When the Republicans capture the House this year, as it begins to look increasingly likely, Iowa's Ben Jensen will become one of the most powerful men in our Government, and right at a time when this country can use him most.

Ben Jensen, fighting mainly from a minority position, has already saved this country billions of dollars. Whether he becomes chairman after this year or not, his influence will still be felt considerably. His is not a blind conservatism. He recognizes the responsibilities and obligations of the Central Government in many constitutional fields. He is generous where the veterans are concerned, and their widows and orphans. He supports all kinds of medical and scientific research.

He is a leading soil conservationist and watershed advocate; he supports enthusiastically meritorious flood control projects, and he has strongly supported for his 24 years in the Congress the basic purpose of the act creating the REA. He favors bringing low-cost energy into farm homes not served by investor-owned companies, and his record shows that.

So, I find it a labor of love to recite these encomiums relative to the dean of our delegation.

He is an asset to Iowa, and practically a necessity to our country. We need more like him. We should not expect him and a few others to shoulder the whole burden.

Despite all efforts by Ben Jensen and a handful of other sound thinkers, this country continues to slip deeper and deeper into debt.

I hope we can bring about some miracle which will alter that bankruptcy course, but in the meantime we can sleep easier knowing that but for Ben Jensen and others of similar philosophy on the Appropriations Committee we would be another $50 or $60 billion in the hole.

Drug Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a strengthened drug bill will soon come before the Senate for consideration by the full membership.

I certainly hope that the legislation as approved will contain provisions to insure competition in the drug industry and to assure our citizens a fair price for necessary drugs.

The Pentagon is the largest customer of the drug industry and they have had to go to Europe to secure reasonable prices. In doing so they have saved the taxpayers millions of dollars, and called attention to the high prices of U.S. drugs.

I hope my colleagues will read the article "Pentagon Expands Use of European Drugs" by Allen M. Smythe which appeared in the June 25, 1962, issue of the Washington Star. I ask unanimous consent to insert it at this point in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., June 25, 1962]

Pentagon Expands Use of European Drugs

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Foreign purchases of drugs for American military use is being expanded by the Pentagon, the biggest customer of the drug industry.

The expansion is being done by the new Defense Supply Agency, which has been designated by Defense Secretary McNamara as the sole buyer of all defense medical supplies, taking over that function from the Navy.

The purchases run into many tens of millions of dollars a year.

Since December 1959 the Pentagon has paid $5,306,000 on 25 contracts to Italian, Swedish, and Danish drug firms. The domestic price would have been $12,804,000. The prices ranged from one-half to less than one-eighth of U.S. bids.

DSA officials say the high identical bids of U.S. patented and produced drugs justify their buying overseas. Domestic producers have been offered royalties of 10 percent of their costs. The Comptroller General has upheld this policy. It was pointed out that the issuance of a patent does not guarantee a monopoly. Its validity and infringement must be proved.

WOULD GO TO COURT

Title 28, United States Code, section 1498, states the "sole remedy to patent holders against Federal purchases is reasonable compensation." The Pentagon has offered to go to the Court of Claims in a friendly suit to certify any claims. No drug company has accepted the challenge as this would mean revealing exact costs.

Tetracycline, an antibiotic, was bought in Italy for $5.61 per 100 tablets when it was sold by American firms to U.S. hospitals for around $30. The price charged by Carlo Erba, Milan, is now $2.92.

The Milan firm buys its raw material from LePetit, a French firm licensed by Charles Pfizer Co. to make and sell this drug in Europe. Erba is reported to be partly owned by American Home Products Corp.

Meprobamate, a tranquilizer, is now bought in Stockholm, Sweden, from A. S. Kabi for $2.07 per 500 tablets. Wholesale prices quoted the Pentagon, from U.S. firms are around $17. An equivalent amount bought in U.S. cutrate drugstores would cost $39.50. Miltown is the trade name of the drug made by Carter Products. Equanil is the trade name used by Wyeth Laboratories.

WHOLESALE PRICES HIGHER

A year ago, nitrofuranton cost $5.50 per bottle of 100 tablets from Italy. Subsequent orders reduced the price to $2.95. Wholesale prices here are several times higher.

The drug sulfadiazine costs only $4.50 per 1,000 tablets when bought in Denmark.

Protests by drug firms against oversea buying of their patented formulas have made little impression on Pentagon purchasing agents.

American drug officials stress their need of adequate funds for profits and future research.

Senator Hruska Testifies for Local Service for Smaller Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at a recent hearing before the Civil Aeronautics Board in connection with its "use it or lose it" investigation of Frontier Airlines, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] appeared before the Board to discuss significant questions of national policy which are involved in the rapid discontinuance of service by local service air carriers in many sections of the country.

While many of the Senator's comments understandably are related to the effect on Nebraska of the "use it or lose it" policy, his development of the issues of policy which are involved is of much more general interest and significance.

I therefore recommend the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska to the other Members of the Senate as a sound and thoughtful analysis of the problem of air service to our smaller cities, and ask unanimous consent that the Senator's statement be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Roman Hruska Before the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Matter of Frontier Airlines, Inc.; "Use It or Lose It" Investigation, Docket 12078, Washington, D.C., July 20, 1962

DISCUSS PRINCIPLE—NOT RECORD

I appreciate the opportunity to address you this morning in this important proceeding. I am not here to discuss the record in the case. The parties are represented by able counsel who have that function.

This case raises important questions of national policy and interpretation of congressional intent in the statutory directives of the Federal Aviation Act. As a member of the U.S. Senate, I feel a responsibility to set before you briefly my views on some of the important principles involved in this and other similar cases with which you will be faced in the near future.

CONGRESS ESTABLISHED THE CAB TO DEVELOP AIR TRANSPORTATION

In 1938 Congress determined that it was in the national interest to regulate this new and dynamic air transportation industry. Congress established the Civil Aeronautics Board and directed it to foster and develop air transportation to serve the basic needs of this country, its commerce and its people.

NEEDED SERVICE IS SUBSIDIZED

Congress determined that air transportation service which was necessary should be supported by direct Federal subsidy payments. We have spent hundreds of millions of subsidy dollars developing the domestic trunkline industry and our international carriers.

No one will dispute that we would not today have a trunkline transportation system, such as we do have, providing immeasurable public benefits, were it not for the hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidy contributed to its support. We would not have flag carriers, which have for years dominated the skies in international commercial air carriage, were it not for the hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal subsidy spent on this service.

It is the policy and the will of the Congress that subsidy money be spent to foster and develop a sound local air transportation system. In large measure, the subsidy money being spent on local air transportation today is the money which was spent for the trunklines, since many of the local service points were transferred from trunklines to local service carriers.

In addition, it is the will and intention of the Congress that the benefits of air transportation be extended across this entire Nation. The Congress recognizes, and we know, that much of the local air transportation is not and will not be self-supporting. But we have made the judgment that the best interests of the United States as a whole require a strong national local air transportation system and we are willing to appropriate the money required for this objective.

"USE IT OR LOSE IT" POLICY

To prune from the local transportation system those points at which there is no real public need for air transportation service, the Board has enunciated what it calls the use it or lose it policy. This policy, as I understand it, contains certain mathematical indexes, five enplanements a day and seven passengers a mile which will guide the Board in determining whether a reevaluation of the public convenience and necessity of continued air service is indicated.

It is my understanding that these mathematical standards are not arbitrary and inflexible criteria for determining whether air service should be continued.

The public interest is not measured by mathematical standards. The public convenience and necessity, which is the standard set by the Congress for application by the Board, cannot be translated into arbitrary levels of traffic generation. We did not create this Board, and approve the nomination of its members, to have the statute interpreted in such a mechanical fashion. We expect, and I know we will receive, the application of the deepest thought and the soundest judgment to the complex basic and underlying problems presented by the question: Does the national interest require continuation of the air service at issue?

"USE IT OR LOSE IT" HURTS THE MIDWEST AND SOUTH WORST

I have examined the most recent air traffic reports of the passengers enplaned at points subject to the "use it or lose it" policy. I find the following:

1. Of 544 cities certificated for local air service 123 are generating less than 5 passengers a day.

2. Of these 123 cities which are not meeting the "use it or lose it" enplanement standard 99 are exclusively served by the local service air carrier.

3. The cities subject to loss of air service are concentrated in the midwestern part of the United States. Of the 123 cities generacting less than 5 passengers a day 92 are served by Frontier, Central, Lake Central, North Central, Ozark, Trans-Texas, and West Coast.

4. Of these 92 midwestern cities subject to decertification of local air service under the "use it or lose it" policy 79, or 82 percent, are exclusively served by the local service carrier.

In other words, gentlemen, over one-fifth of all cities served by local service carriers are not meeting the five-per-day enplanement standard of the "use it or lose it" policy. Three-quarters of the cities not meeting the standard, 92 cities, are in the Midwest. And of these 92 cities not meeting the enplanement standard, over 80 percent are exclusively served by the local service carrier.

The seriousness of the possible loss of an air transportation system to these regions, and to the country as a whole, cannot be underestimated. This area of the country is characterized by long distances and generally inadequate surface transportation. Air transportation is the only form of transportation which provides a modern and useful transportation service to this section of the country.

Also, this section of the country does not have large populations. The local service carriers serving the eastern and western coasts of this country have very few cities generating less than 5 passengers a day (Allegheny, 2 out of 37 cities; Pacific, 1 out of 23 cities; Bonanza, 3 out of 19 cities). The main reason for this is that they serve substantial population centers. Indeed, a local service city in the East may have a population of several hundred thousand (e.g., Bridgeport, Conn.). In relative, and and also absolute terms, the populations in the Midwest part of the country are much smaller.

But because the cities in the Midwest have smaller populations than those on the east coast and on the west coast, does this mean that they are to be penalized and deprived of the only modern transportation facility they have? I say to you gentlemen, that a policy of this Board, be it called use it or lose it or any other name, which leads to the result of dismantling a basic transportation service to the discrimination of a vital and vast region of the United States, is not a sound policy—it is not in the national interest.

EXAMINER'S DECISION LEAVES NEBRASKA WITHOUT A MODERN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

I am especially concerned, of course, that a rigid application of the mechanical standards will destroy the air transportation system of Nebraska.

I have reviewed the initial decision of the examiner in this case. I am shocked to find this: If the recommendations of the examiner are adopted, there will be less transportation service in Nebraska than there was one-quarter of a century ago.

Twenty-five years ago there were two trunkline air carriers serving a total of seven points in Nebraska. We had rail transportation in large quantity crossing the State.

If the examiner's recommendations are adopted, only five of the seven points served 25 years ago will continue to be served. The air service will be by a local service carrier instead of a trunkline. In the intervening period, rail passenger service in Nebraska has seriously deteriorated. It is accurate to state that if the examiner's recommendations are adopted, large areas of Nebraska will be virtually deprived of a modern public transportation service.

I do not believe that Congress committed the regulation of air transportation to this Board to have the transportation system of the State of Nebraska virtually destroyed. Moreover, what you do in Nebraska will control what you do in the rest of the Midwest. We stand in danger of losing the basic public passenger transportation service in broad areas of our Nation.

NEBRASKA'S RELIANCE ON AIR TRANSPORTATION HAS INCREASED

This Board found in 1958, in the Seven States case, that Nebraska's transportation services were seriously inadequate. Let me tell you that since that investigation was concluded, the transportation service in Nebraska has seriously deteriorated.

What has happened is this: In reliance, in part, on the fact that air transportation had been certificated for Nebraska, rail passenger service was withdrawn. There is no rail passenger service at all in the entire northern half of Nebraska.

It is also accurate to state that there is virtually no local rail passenger service in all of Nebraska. The rail passenger trains crossing our State are scheduled to serve the terminals beyond our State's borders. As a result, Nebraskans often must arise at 3 o'clock in the morning to go down to the station and get on a train that is not designed to provide them with local service, but rather is scheduled for the needs of the passengers moving through Nebraska.

NEBRASKA IS IMPORTANT TO THE NATION

If this Board adopts the recommendations of its examiner, it will virtually strike the State of Nebraska out of the 20th century. Transportation is the foundation of economic strength. Air transportation is the only modern public transportation facility available to Nebraska and to large areas of the Midwest. It is the basic public transportation service.

This country cannot afford to lose the economic strength of any of its constituent States. Nebraska, moreover, is an important State in the national picture.

We are growing economically. Nebraskans are wealthier today and are producing more wealth and more goods than they were 10 years ago. Moreover, the economy of Nebraska, which has historically been agricultural, is now to a substantial measure, converting to industry. As this Board knows, we have an important national policy of decentralizing industry. It is in the national interest to move industry from the highly concentrated and vulnerable centers to other areas of the country. This trend, plus the energy and vitality of the Nebraskans themselves, is increasing the industrial development of our State, and accordingly the importance of air transportation.

Nebraska is also important to the national defense effort. The headquarters of SAC are at Omaha. The Sioux Ordnance Depot is located at Sidney, and I am advised there is an important Minuteman missile construction program which will start within the next few months and be centered in the western Nebraska-eastern Wyoming area. To consider withdrawing commercial air service at Sidney at this time strikes me as unwise.

THE MIDWEST AND THE SOUTH ARE SIMILARLY AFFECTED

When it is said that the examiner's decision in the instant case will leave Nebraska without a modern public transportation service; when it is said that Nebraska's reliance on air transportation has increased since 1958 and that Nebraska's survival as a segment of the economy is important to the Nation, all of these things apply also to other States in the Middle West and South in which there are located the 123 cities which are certificated for local air service and which are generating less than five passengers a day.

We all know what the situation is in agriculture in those areas. Far too often we hear the argument, so unwelcome to our ears, that there are too many farmers engaged in raising farm stuffs. What shall be done with them? What shall be done with them if we will remove from that same area one of the most important elements in its survival at all, namely, a transportation system. Certainly transportation by air is highly vital to a successful program of establishing and developing industrial activity. Retention of air service involves more than convenience. It is even more than necessity. It is a matter of plain survival.

Plainly, this area cannot be just written off. It cannot be told to go on its way and left to its own resources.

Such a fate is clearly negatived by the declaration of congressional and national policy as found in the statutes which apply to your own Board.

After all, section 102, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which was originally enacted 20 years earlier, reads, in part, as follows:

"In the exercise and performance of its powers and duties under this Act, the Board shall consider the following, among other things, as being in the public interest, and in accordance with the public convenience and necessity: (a) The encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense."

Title IV of the act, section 401(d) reads, in part, as you know: "The Board shall issue a certificate * * * if it finds * * * that such transportation is required by public convenience and necessity."

The act, section 406(b) under the title of "Ratemaking Elements" for transportation of mail reads, in part, as follows:

"In fixing and determining fair and reasonable rates * * * the Board shall take into consideration, among other factors, * * * (3) the need of such air carrier for compensation for the transportation of mail sufficient to insure the performance of such service, and, together with all other revenue of the carrier to enable such air carrier under honest, economical and efficient management to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense."

This act is still the law of the land. Perhaps from time to time we may encounter those who differ with its wisdom; from time to time we may hear from individual Members of the Congress or of the executive department some expression of dissatisfaction or need of amendment, but notwithstanding all these things, the act, including those excerpts just set forth, is still the law of the land.

When reference is made to "encouragement and development" of an air transport system properly adapted to the present and future needs of domestic commerce of the United States, that means the commerce of the entire Nation. It is this concept to which the Board's consideration is directed by section 102. When section 401(d) says that a certificate should be issued if there is a finding of public convenience and necessity which means that this shall be done on a national basis.

When section 406(b) provides for determining of rates which will enable an air carrier to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, it means the national commerce and not commerce in any selective or discriminatory sense.

Appropriations for the subsidies which go toward attaining these ends are still available. When they are provided each year, the Congress thereby reaffirms the national policy as reflected in the statutes to which reference has been made.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE ON TRANSPORTATION

All of us as political realists are aware that a message from the Chief Executive of our Nation on any subject is entitled to much respect and consideration. Naturally this Board and the Congress has scrutinized with great care the following language contained on page 7 of the President's message: "The Appropriations Committees have requested the Civil Aeronautics Board to prepare a schedule for the termination of these operating subsidies. I endorse this position and seek the extension of this principle. I am asking the Board to develop by June 30, 1963, a step-by-step program, with specific annual targets, to assure sharp reduction of operating subsidies to all other domestic airlines as well, within periods to be established by the Board for each type of service or carrier. Rigorous enforcement of the Board's use-it-or-lose-it policy and further development of the class rate subsidy plan which the Board initiated in January 1961 with the cooperation of the local service carriers would clearly facilitate this objective. The development of single airports to serve adjacent cities, or regional airports, is also clearly necessary if these subsidies are to be eliminated and if the Federal Government and local communities are to meet the Nation's needs for adequate airports and air navigation facilities without excessive and unjustifiable costs."

Within limitations these pronouncements are entitled to the greatest of respect and should furnish much guidance. There are limitations inasmuch as no Presidential enunciation can arbitrarily set aside entirely any express legislative action. I have confidence that the Congress upon proper request from the Executive will seriously consider and very likely enact such recommendations as will be needed to implement the pronouncements cited above, insofar as that may be done in harmony with practicality.

However, the granting of Frontier Airlines' request and the request of the State of Nebraska for 1 additional year of certificated activity is not inconsistent with the Presidential message quoted above.

That message does not call for a complete termination of subsidies; it does not call for a precipitate action of "sudden death." It does not call for attainment of its objectives forthwith. All of these things are clear when we read such language as "step by step program" of development by June 30, 1963; "with specific annual targets;" and again "to assure sharp reduction" of subsidies within periods to be established by the Board.

Not even "rigorous enforcement of the Board's use-it-or-lose-it policy" means instantaneous elimination of subsidies.

The fair intendment of the passage cited above will embrace without any violence the requested 1-year extension in Nebraska to enable proof of compliance with use-it-or-lose-it criteria. I need only mention these items: that the request embraces a 50-percent cut in subsidies formerly paid; that no objection is registered against clear-cut cases of individual communities which have not and cannot comply with the policy's minimum criteria.

Further, to deny the request would be wasteful, indeed, with over a $1.5 million investment in airports, with about $2 million having been paid in subsidies since 1958, plus additional amounts for navigational aids and miscellaneous items. The expenditure of an additional one-half million under these conditions in the strong and persuasive case made by the applicants is not only justified but in my judgment dictated as a wise course of action, as an effort to recoup what has been expended and to fulfill the objectives of the Aviation Act.

SUMMARY

If Nebraska's request is denied in this instance, then perforce the seal of doom will have been placed upon similar air traffic in States in which are located the 123 cities with local air service generating less than 5 passengers a day. Not all of those cities should retain such service. That is not contended for. In fact the State of Nebraska does not call for 100-percent retention. But neither should all be deprived of service. Every effort should be made to retain as many as possible, consistent with good business judgment based on the legislative objectives at hand.

On a long-range legislative basis in the Congress, there is at least one probable result which might flow from too drastic and too summary an elimination of airline subsidies:

If the standards applied to reduce and eventually eliminate subsidies are too severely imposed there could conceivably result legislative action to more definitely set out conditions making mandatory the issuance of certificates. Such a course would be highly regrettable, and very likely possessed of little if any logic. Yet in a world of politics possessed of a great deal of realism one can envision such a course of action.

It is submitted, therefore, that a cold mathematical application of a "use it or lose it" policy should not be imposed; that equities should be recognized; that good management should be given the top priority of which it is deserving, and that an opportunity be given by this Board's action for converting the investment already made in aviation in Nebraska and other similarly situated States into a true and productive national resource.

Kennedy, the Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of July 25, 1962:

KENNEDY, THE POLITICIAN

Mr. Kennedy is now talking frankly partisan language about his stalled domestic legislative program. He blames the Republicans for his lack of success. There was a long series of statements to this effect in his latest press conference.

Mr. Kennedy respects both logic and objectivity but in this case he seems to be taking leave of both. Why should he blame members of the opposition party for predictably voting against bills with which they traditionally disagree? He could more logically blame the voters. The voters gave him an insufficient number of Democrats who agree.

And how can he shrug his shoulders so fatalistically about the conservative Democrats while pointing such an accusing finger at the Republicans? Where is consistency?

Mr. Kennedy also argues that because Republicans oppose his program they are for inaction. He is for action. But in many cases enough Republicans agree with the broad aims of Kennedy domestic bills to pass them, if they had been drafted with more attention to the national need and less to Democratic politics and power.

But his frankly partisan approach to most of the major domestic bills provoked a frankly partisan answer. He knew that the conservative Democrats would vote with the opposition. Logic would suggest that his strategy was at fault, and not either the conservative Democrats or the Republicans. He misjudged the election returns.

This is all the more curious because at the start of his second year in the White House the President told reporters he was going to follow an entirely different strategy. He recognized the need for emphasizing national needs and deemphasizing party politics.

A few weeks thereafter he proposed a Department of Urban Affairs in a highly political manner. For whatever reason, perhaps a rising political self-confidence, his approach to Congress radically changed. With this more recent approach Mr. Kennedy created his own frustration.

He has now explicitly described his plan for the coming congressional campaign. To the degree that it can be separated from recrimination over the past, it is a partial return to logic again. The President is tackling the real cause of his difficulty in the narrow decision of the voters. "The areas I'll be campaigning in are seats * * * where there will be a very clear choice between Republicans who oppose these programs and Democrats who support them. That's where I am going to go."

The voters will be there waiting. It remains to be seen whether they will consciously choose to base their vote on what kind of Congress they want to give Mr. Kennedy. (Many of them probably didn't, last time.) But they have this opportunity now and they should use it.

Meanwhile it is curious that Mr. Kennedy should be gauche about allocating blame for his plight, when he is supposed to excel at the political arts. It could be that he misjudges the future voting as well as the past. He may find that the same actions on his part which drove the moderate votes in Congress into opposition will cause the voters in November to prefer more conservative candidates.

Launching of the Nuclear Submarine "Haddo" SS(N)604

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was given the honor of making a few remarks at the launching of the nuclear submarine *Haddo* SS(N)604 at Camden, N.J., on Saturday, August 18.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks on that occasion printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE NUCLEAR SUBMARINE "HADDO" SS(N)604, NEW YORK SHIPBUILDING CORP., AT CAMDEN, N.J., ON SATURDAY, AUGUST 18, 1962

Five years ago the United States led the world in nuclear submarines. Today we no longer have a nuclear submarine monopoly. The Soviet Navy's commander in chief recently stated that atomic submarines are now the backbone of the Soviet Fleet. I think we have learned that Soviet claims of technical achievement cannot be dismissed as hollow boasts. The feat achieved by their cosmonauts this past week is dramatic proof of their excellence in science and technology.

The Soviets have developed a family of nuclear submarines to fulfill many important naval missions. They include the capability of long-range missile attack on the United States and antisubmarine warfare against our submarines and against our surface fleet.

While this country is now ahead in nuclear submarines, both in quantity and quality, we know that Moscow is giving a high priority to overtaking us at the earliest possible date. The Soviets have made remarkable progress in a relatively short period of time. They have bypassed the usual long research and development period and have plunged deeply into a production line effort.

The Soviet submarine threat confronts this Nation with a defense task as formidable as any facing us. While outer space presents future perils, the danger from underwater space is clear, present, and immediate. Failure to solve the problems of antisubmarine warfare will make vulnerable our surface and subsurface fleets, as well as the heartland of the United States.

Nuclear submarines have a capability in antisubmarine warfare not possessed by conventional submarines. We now know that one of the best ways to hunt down and kill a submarine is with a nuclear submarine. This is especially true against enemy nuclear submarines, which are immune to most other search and attack techniques. The *Haddo*, and the other ships like it, will play a major role in meeting the growing Soviet atomic submarine threat. We should give higher priority to the attack submarines and turn out more than are now planned for.

The ship that we launch today is inseparable from the skilled naval personnel that will operate it. Indeed, the Soviets have a long way to go to master the rigorous training requirements for the men who man their submarines. Building submarines is not enough—we must continue to maintain the high standards of excellence in training and in operating that have been the special distinction of this program.

District of Columbia Should Have a School System Second to None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a statement made August 3, 1962, by Leo Goodman, secretary-treasurer of Labor's Committee for Better Schools in the Nation's Capital to the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate District of Columbia Committee.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF LEO GOODMAN, SECRETARY-TREASURER, LABOR'S COMMITTEE FOR BETTER SCHOOLS IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL, TO THE FISCAL AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. SENATE, AUGUST 3, 1962

There is every reason why the District of Columbia should have a school system second to none. The Capital City of the richest Nation on earth should be a symbol to the world of the extent to which American democracy is committed to the education of each and every individual to the fullest of his capacity. The fact that recent figures show the District of Columbia to have a higher per capita income than any of the 50 States lends added weight to the conclusion that the schools of the District should be models for the rest of the Nation and even the rest of the world to follow.

When we compare what should be with what actually exists, the resulting picture is a shame to the entire United States. More than 40 percent of the school buildings presently in use in Washington are more than 50 years old. There are children actually attending classes in this city in school buildings that were constructed when Ulysses Grant was President of the United States and when Washington was the Capital of a Nation of 37 States.

Teachers' salaries in Washington are so low that it is a constant battle to find qualified teachers who will accept appointments in our schools, and it is impossible to hold those teachers who are employed. Nearly 15 percent of the teachers in the District schools leave each year, one of the highest turnover rates of any school system in the Nation. It has been possible to replace them only by the expedient of hiring temporary teachers who are not properly qualified to teach. A third of the teachers in Washington's schools have been hired on this emergency basis.

Even with the use of temporary teachers, it has still not been possible to meet the real need in the District, and the result has been unbelievable overcrowding of the classrooms. In 1961–62 there were more than 1,000 classes in the junior and senior high schools of the District in which there were more than 40 students enrolled. Educators differ somewhat on the best size for a class, but few responsible educators would regard more than 25 students to the classroom as proper in an ideal school system.

Considerable attention has been paid recently to the dilapidated and obsolete textbooks being used in Washington's schools. Little progress has been made in replacing those books which are unfit for further use either because of their condition or their content. And what progress has been possible has been more than negated by sharply increased enrollments which have necessitated further prolonged use of the outdated texts.

Libraries are inadequate in some schools, nonexistent in others. One hundred and forty-five additional librarians are needed to provide one librarian for each junior and senior high school and one for each elementary school of more than 500 students.

More than 200 additional specialized services personnel are needed to bring the counseling staff up to anything like minimal standards. Washington schools have a dropout rate of over 50 percent and this is a part of the price we pay for the inadequate counseling facilities now existing.

Labor's Committee for Better Schools in the Nation's Capital is heartened to notice that there has been a growing awareness of the school problem in the District of Columbia. Not only in Washington, but throughout the Nation we have found an encouraging response to our efforts to improve the standard of education here in the Nation's Capital.

We are, therefore, especially glad to find the District Commissioners, the Board of Education, and Members of Congress giving serious consideration to the matter of teachers' salaries in the District of Columbia.

The heart of any school system is its classroom teachers. Splendid buildings and expensive equipment will not in themselves teach anything. But a great teacher can make learning a memorable experience even in a dilapidated classroom.

Teaching at its best is an underpaid profession. Although the economic condition of teachers has improved somewhat in recent years, the average teacher, with at least 4 years of college training, is still paid little better than the average factory worker.

But if teachers as a group are badly paid, it is nevertheless true that Washington teachers are even worse off financially than their counterparts in other cities of similar size. The minimum starting salary for teachers in Washington is $4,800.

The maximum salary for a teacher in the District schools is $7,848. To qualify for this a teacher must have 30 hours past a master's degree and at least 13 years' teaching experience. There are few large city school systems which attempt to operate with so low a maximum.

But minimums and maximums do not tell the whole story of how well off teachers are financially. Although the salary scale provides for a maximum of $7,848, only 328 of Washington's 4,700 teachers have reached this maximum, and 45 percent of the teachers in the District earn less than $6,000 a year.

Labor's Committee for Better Schools in the Nation's Capital believes that teachers deserve to be treated better than that. But we also are concerned by the fact that the salary schedules in the District are so low as to make it immeasurably difficult to obtain and to hold good teachers. Teachers gravitate toward the better paying suburban school systems, they take jobs in private industry, or they find employment with the Federal Government.

Labor's Committee for Better Schools in the Nation's Capital believes that we need a larger commitment to education in Washington. We need to raise teachers' salaries enough to attract the most able and imaginative people to teach in our schools. We need to reconstruct the physical facilities of our schools—the buildings, the classrooms, the playgrounds, the libraries. We need to replace obsolete textbooks and equipment in order to utilize to the fullest the dramatic new advances that have taken place in teaching methods during recent years. We need to establish a counseling system that can help turn the tide of the staggering number of students who drop out of school before graduating.

We cannot accomplish these goals by doing each year a little bit better than we did the year before. Time has caught up with us, and we can only accomplish our goals by a powerful determination to make the school system of the Nation's Capital a source of pride to the entire democratic world.

Evening Star Article Salutes Mrs. Joe Bottum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am pleased to call attention of the Congress to an article in the August 20 issue of the Washington Evening Star saluting the wife of South Dakota's Senator Joe Bottum for her work in the Red Cross. Mrs. Bottum has long been a leader in community affairs in her hometown of Rapid City, S. Dak. It is good to observe that she is continuing her interest in good causes here in our Nation's Capital.

I ask unanimous consent that the article about Mrs. Joe Bottum appear in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Blood Donation Marks Arrival of Senator's Wife

The current Red Cross blood supply shortage emergency call brought forth immediate response from a new arrival in the Nation's Capital, Mrs. Joe Bottum.

Mrs. Bottum is the wife of the new Senator from South Dakota. She arrived by car over the past weekend and is staying at the Coronet Hotel on Capitol Hill with her husband.

Having served as a Gray Lady and volunteer with the Rapid City, S. Dak., chapter for the last 17 years, Mrs. Bottum could not resist the plea of the American Red Cross Washington regional blood center for blood donors. She took time out from her packed schedule during her first few days in Washington to visit the headquarters in the District of Columbia chapter at 2025 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Her hometown of Rapid City does not have a blood center, but is served by a mobile unit and Mrs. Bottum has worked with the unit when it has visited her city. While at the center, she took the opportunity to get a firsthand picture of the activities of the local chapter, hoping to pick up new ideas to take back to Rapid City. She will drive back to South Dakota at the end of the month following the luncheon that will be given by several hundred Washington friends in honor of the new Senator and his attractive wife on August 27.

A TEACHER

Mrs. Bottum became a South Dakotan via the state of matrimony. A native of Litchfield, Minn., she met her husband shortly after her graduation from Winona State Teachers College. She had just begun her first teaching assignment at the Longfellow School in St. Paul and he had just started with a law firm following his graduation from the University of South Dakota. She continued teaching physical education for the first 5 years of their marriage. Golf and swimming were her personal choice for recreation. While she does not play any musical instruments, she has an appreciation for music and particularly her husband's talent for piano and organ (he played the saxophone in an orchestra while in college) and they enjoy the winter concert series together in Rapid City.

An avid gardener, she also finds time for knitting, bridge, cooking, and church work. She is active in Circle One at the First Congregational Church in Rapid City and is proud that her group, was able to furnish the organ for their new church through means of a talent program. While Mrs. Bottum is not a native of the State, her piano-playing, politically conservative lawyer-husband's family settled in the Dakotas in the days when it was still a territory.

"The Senator's mother," Mrs. Bottum relates, "was the first schoolteacher in the area where they settled near Aberdeen."

In mentioning that they are not newcomers to the field of politics, Mrs. Bottum reminisces that the Senator was "elected State's attorney in 1932 and from 1937 to 1943 he served as director of taxation for South Dakota." He was elected Lieutenant Governor in 1960 and was serving in that capacity when the Republican State central committee selected him as the Republican candidate for Senator from South Dakota. Immediately following this, Gov. Archie Gubbrud appointed Mr. Bottum to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Francis Case which runs until January.

The Bottums have one daughter, Mary Jo, aged 22, who was married a year ago to Arthur G. Bruce, Jr., whose family live in Hot Springs, S. Dak. The are now living in Priest River, Idaho, where Mr. Bruce is a teacher. Mary Jo also studied for the teaching profession at Yankton College and Spearfish Teachers College, both in South Dakota.

HOPES TO HELP

As a Gray Lady, Mrs. Bottum has heard of the Senate Ladies Red Cross Production and Supply Unit which meets each Tuesday in the Old Senate Office Building while Congress is in session and hopes to have the opportunity of working with them.

Pacemaker Heart Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has recently released additional information on its internal planted heart Pacemaker, which was first developed in a Veterans' Administration hospital at Buffalo, N.Y. I am sure Members will find the latest information of interest.

Pacemaker Heart Operation

How medical advances made by the Veterans' Administration saved the life of a doctor behind the Iron Curtain is told by a VA doctor just returned from the Soviet Union.

An internal planted heart Pacemaker, developed and first used in a patient by Dr. William Chardack, of the Buffalo, N.Y., VA hospital, was implanted in the chest of a Czechoslovak physician in Prague, July 5, 1962, by Dr. Timothy Takaro, a specialist of the Oteen, N.C., VA hospital surgical service.

The device delivers a series of continuous electrical shocks that keep the heart beating at a normal rate in persons with complete heart block. Batteries are good for 5 years, and easily replaced.

Dr. Takaro was in Moscow, U.S.S.R., as a writing scientist on a 3-month United States-U.S.S.R. exchange fellowship. He was working at the Scientific Research Institute for Surgical Apparatus and Instruments in the Soviet Union. He had carried one of Dr. Chardack's Pacemakers with him as an incidental part of his demonstrations in the exchange of medical knowledge under the fellowship.

The story begins in 1960 when Dr. Jan Dufek, a specialist in internal medicine at a hospital near Prague, suffered partial heart block. He wrote to doctors in the United States, who sent him drugs for treating his heart condition.

In January 1962, Dr. Dufek suffered heart failure and complete heart block which so slowed his heart rate that he became an invalid. He had read of the development of the heart Pacemaker in the U.S. Veterans' Administration through American medical journals.

He wrote Dr. Chardack, who got in touch with VA officials in Washington, D.C., and, through the U.S. Department of State, with Dr. Takaro in Moscow.

Dr. Takaro said Dr. Dufek's operation was a success and that he will be able to return to his practice, which includes as patients high officials of the Politburo in Prague.

The fellowship on which Dr. Takaro went to Moscow is administered by the National Heart Institute for U.S. Public Health Service, under the 1959 exchange agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

The Iron Curtain countries have their own external Pacemaker, Dr. Takaro said, but he did not see doctors in these countries using it. He said they were using an American external Pacemaker instead and that they have no wholly implantable internal Pacemaker.

He said this is a field in which American medicine definitely is ahead of work by colleagues in the Iron Curtain countries.

Dr. Takaro is a specialist in thoracic surgery and is known for his research in use of surgical stapling devices for blood vessels and lungs. He has developed a device especially for stapling tiny blood vessels, work preparatory to transplanting from human to human tissues and entire organs such as the heart. Doctors are confident this will be possible eventually.

Dr. Takaro said he saw no medical breakthroughs in the field of tissue and organ transplants while he was in the Soviet Union.

Roundup of Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was privileged this weekend in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations to discuss the outlook for dairy farm legislation in Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF CHIPPEWA FALLS, RANKING REPUBLICAN, U.S. SENATE, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS, AUGUST 17, 1962

As Congress plows its way through a heavy logjam of legislation toward adjournment, let's review the current legislative outlook in agriculture.

Regrettably, the prospect for a cure-all legislation in agriculture—particularly for improving prices in dairying—is extremely dim.

Earlier this session, the House of Representatives passed a general farm bill. The provisions—with some moderate changes—extended existing programs for feed, grains and wheat. Also, it recommended liberalizing farm credit, expanding research for industrial uses of farm commodities, and revised land use programs.

Significantly, the House-passed bill did contain a provision for direct payments to dairy farmers for voluntarily participating in a production control program. The Senate Agriculture Committee, however, in a bill reported to the Senate, omitted this provision for dairying.

Overall, there are a great many controversial provisions in the bill, many of which were contained in a measure defeated earlier in the Senate.

Consequently, the outlook, at best, is problematical.

In Congress, however, there are several other pieces of legislation of interest to agriculture.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

First, let's take a look at the national school lunch program under which lunches are served to over 14 million students in Wisconsin and across the Nation.

Over the years, this has proved: (1) A constructive outlet for surplus farm and other commodities; (2) a stimulus to healthy schoolchildren. As in the past, this program will be carried forward.

A bill to modify the program, however, is also pending which would: Change the formula for apportioning funds among States—basing it upon the number of lunches served, instead of the number of students; allow 1 year for transition to the new formula; and provide special assistance to schools in needy areas to help them serve free school lunches.

This bill has passed the House of Representatives. Currently, it is pending before the Senate Agriculture Committee.

STRENGTHENING AGRICULTURE EXTENSION SERVICE

Reportedly, the prospects also are favorable for the passage of legislation to strengthen the extension service.

A House-passed version now pending before the Senate Agriculture Committee would: Improve the formula for apportioning funds for, and thereby strengthening, the Agriculture Extension Service; authorize States in acquiring property, supplies, and services (including excess Federal property) to utilize additional services and facilities of the Federal Government; and provide for quarterly, instead of semiannual, payment of extension funds to States.

Other legislation of interest includes: (1) Funds for the special milk program under which about 2.7 billion half pints of milk are served in an estimated 87,500 schools, nonprofit child care centers, summer camps, and small institutions devoted to children's health and well-being; (2) a proposal to assist States in providing additional facilities for research at State agricultural experimental stations; and (3) a measure to authorize closer Federal-State cooperation in enforcement of laws and regulations relating to control or eradication of plant and animal diseases or pests.

In a session-end buildup of legislation, it is not, of course, possible to predict with certainty the outcome of this, or other, legislation.

Economic Countdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, being aware of the vital contributions which have been made by the scientific brains and institutions of the Boston area I read with great interest the series of articles published in the Boston Globe in July 1962 by science writer, Ian Menzies, and Washington correspondent, Wilfrid Rodgers.

These two writers, who have won several national as well as New England awards as well as being former Nieman fellows in journalism at Harvard University, have clearly shown the contributions made by Greater Boston institutions such as MIT and Harvard to the Nation's space effort as well as science and education in general.

Further, they have shown the contributions made by the space age industries of Greater Boston to this age of science.

The fact that they show that this vital industry, not only essential to the area's economy but the Nation's space effort, is suffering from governmental contract neglect disturbs me immensely.

From the reaction of industrial and legislative leaders in the Boston area I feel these suspicions are well grounded and should be corrected.

I feel as do the writers that the Boston area seeks no favors; simply fair recognition.

Menzies and Rodgers not only discuss governmental contract figures in Massachusetts, and especially as regards National Aeronautics and Space Administration contracts, but review national statistics and the problems resulting from a changing distribution of population.

The implications behind these articles are worthy of reading by all, reflecting as they do the changing social patterns of this Nation brought about by the age of science and the effects that the rising proportion of Government contracts in the area of research and development are having on private industry, especially on a regional basis.

The articles follow:

[Five articles on economic countdown which appeared in the Boston Globe, July 15 through 19, 1952]

ECONOMIC COUNTDOWN I—SPACE $$ ORBIT SKIPS BAY STATE; NASA GIVES WEST 50 PERCENT; NEW ENGLAND GETS 0.5 PERCENT

(Greater Boston is facing an economic-political squeeze which is endangering its leadership in science-based industries and its future economic growth. Despite its brains, its universities, its modern industrial-technical complex, its skilled labor force, it is receiving only a minuscule share of the huge expenditures for space development. In the series which begins today Boston's fight to prosper in the scientific age will be analyzed.)

(By Ian Menzies)

Greater Boston's economic future lies in space.

With our science-based industries we have a passport to the moon and planets. But we lack the financial visa.

Boston and New England needs a healthy slice of the space dollar for continued economic growth.

Our present cut is picayune.

The organization with the money to spend today is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

NASA is in charge of the Nation's space effort. Its goals and budget have the blessing of President Kennedy and most of Congress.

NASA will spend almost $4 billion this year for the peaceful exploration of space and the race to the moon.

Of this amount almost $2.5 billion will go out in contracts to private industry; some to universities.

Within 5 years NASA's annual budget is expected to reach $10 billion. This is a gargantuan sum.

But only $15 million of the $2.5 billion which NASA intends to give out in contracts tihs year has come to the six New England States thus far.

Yet New England helped pioneer the space age. It is one of the four major research and development areas in the Nation.

We're getting only a half of 1 percent of NASA contracts, compared to almost 50 percent for California.

Yet New England is home for 10,500,000 people, 6 percent of the Nation's population.

It boasts 68,000 scientists and engineers, approximately 8 percent of the national total.

Greater Boston alone has 32,000 engineers and scientists—more than 1 percent of the Greater Boston population and 3 percent of the total labor force.

This is a professional community. New England, according to the Boston Chamber of Commerce, has a higher proportion of highly educated, highly trained scientific and engineering personnel than any other section of the country.

And Greater Boston with only 1.1 percent of the Nation's population, turns out more than 7 percent of the Nation's college graduates.

But despite Greater Boston's science-based industry, its disproportionate number of scientists and engineers compared to the rest of the country, and its contributions to national education, it is losing out in the fight for the space dollar.

Greater Boston's strength is research and development, formed by its universities and its more than 400 science-based industries.

What is research and development?

It is the scientific pursuit of new knowledge or the application of existing knowledge to new uses.

For instance: Research reveals that a tiny piece of metal the size of a pinhead can do what a large vacuum tube did before. Transistors and diodes result. They make possible smaller radios, TV sets, and computers.

And this is the type of equipment one needs to venture into space where size and weight have to be minimized.

This is the type of research and development (development of new products as opposed to production of standard products) that Boston with its science-based firms has been doing.

In the past the Government utilized profit-making industry only for production engineering and the manufacture of final products like guns and military vehicles—not for science-based research and development.

The traditional large manufacturers which did this work were the automotive, machinery, shipbuilding, steel, and oil industries.

Government work was only a small part of the primary civilian business of these industries. For instance, in 1958 in the older auto industry, military sales only amounted to 5 percent for General Motors; 15 percent for Chrysler.

But in the current scientific age, the older industries have declined in prominence as regards advanced equipment. Newer research and development-oriented industries have come to the fore, such as those dealing in aircraft, rockets, electronics, and atomic energy.

In 1958 the military sales in the current aircraft industry amounted to 67 percent for Beech Aircraft and 99.2 percent for the Martin Co.

Greater Boston's strength is electronics and the bulk of the money for electronic research and development today comes from the Government.

Here are the Government agencies and what they will spend on research and development this fiscal year—80 percent of which will go in contracts to private industry or universities.

Department of Defense ($7 billion); the National Aeronautics and Space Administration ($2½ billion); the Atomic Energy Commission ($1½ billion); Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ($680 million); Department of Agriculture ($171 million); National Science Foundation ($164 million), and other agencies such as Interior and Commerce, a further $395 million.

Altogether this totals approximately $12½ billion, of which industry will receive some $9½ billion in contracts.

These billions are hard to grasp but the area which doesn't get a share will know the difference with rising unemployment, plant closings and cutbacks, mergers, and shakedowns with consequent effects on consumer sales.

The big problem facing New England right now is that of the $2½ billion which NASA will hand out in contracts this year.

This area is only receiving $15 million or about one-hundredth of the amount that California is receiving and considerably less than Texas with its $120 million Apollo moon shot center.

We do much better with the Department of Defense and if we received an equivalent slice from NASA things would be rosier.

Of the $7 billion the Department of Defense will spend on research and development (which includes the Air Force, Navy, Army, etc.) Massachusetts will receive about 5.7 percent of the total or roughly $400 million.

New England's 5.7 percent compares to New York's 12.9 percent; California's 41.34 percent (nearly half the $7 billion) and Colorado's 4.87 percent.

It can be seen that though Massachusetts is receiving 5.7 percent of the Department of Defense research and development dollar it is receiving only half of 1 percent of the equivalent NASA dollar—$400 million from DOD; $12 million from NASA.

What about Texas, which got the Apollo moon center?

Texas is doing better than Massachusetts both from NASA and the Department of Defense.

Research and development is only a part of what the Department of Defense hands out in contracts to industry. There are also production contracts.

Both together add up to a spectacular total of $22 billion.

Massachusetts position appears low when all forms of contracts are considered.

Of total Department of Defense contracts Massachusetts receives 4.8 percent (about $1 billion in contracts); Texas 5.1 percent; New York 12 percent and, leading the parade as usual, California with 24 percent.

Now that Texas has secured the moon center its share of NASA contracts will go up, probably to about 5 percent of the total. It will keep going up.

Massachusetts as things stand has nothing to boost it from its present slice—a tiny half of 1 percent.

For our continued economic growth we need a greater percentage of NASA contracts and have to hold on to our present percentage of Department of Defense contracts.

The latter job may not be easy. Roswell Gilpatric, Deputy Defense Secretary, is concerned that Michigan is, for instance, getting less in contracts than Massachusetts.

All regions, or the least forceful, may lose some of their contract percentages to beef up the old production-type industrial centers referred to earlier, in the interests of political expediency.

This is Massachusetts share of the Department of Defense research and development dollar: 5.7 percent of $7 billion; but this is Massachusetts share of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's space dollar: one-half percent of $2.4 billion.

Economic Countdown II—New England Has the Brains, but West Grabs "Space Gold"

(Both California and Texas with growing population and electronic industries are squeezing Boston and New England's pioneering position in the space age. This second article in a series points out the growing threat to our science-based industries and economy.)

(By Ian Menzies)

It's hard to get a good thing. Sometimes it's even harder to hold on to it.

Greater Boston helped pioneer the Nation into the dazzling space age.

Over the past 15 years more than 400 science-based industries have sprung up in former cow pastures or put new life into old intown buildings.

These glamorous industries have provided jobs for some 60,000 persons in Greater Boston alone, spreading a half-million dollars in payroll wages throughout the community annually.

But today there are some long faces along the dazzling semicircle of Route 128; there is worried talk in the board rooms of some intown plants.

Says Dr. Charles A. Coolidge, Jr., vice president of C. & K. Components, Watertown; "We just lost two contracts totaling just $750,000 to California firms.

"Those people in California are getting all the business."

E. Douglas Reddan, president of Infrared Industries of Waltham, is being forced to move his corporate headquaters to California "because most of the business is out there."

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND JOBS IN NEW ENGLAND

Three firms who were planning to build plants here—Bendix Aviation, Melpar and Dawson Electronics—have changed their minds. The allocation of the Apollo "moon shot" to Houston, Tex., caused the switch.

Greater Boston is facing a new moment of truth.

And so is New England, as much of Greater Boston's electronic strength pinwheels out to Worcester, western Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine and Vermont.

In New England the best estimates show some 200,000 persons employed in science-based industries involving an annual payroll of more than $1 billion.

If one counts industries working partly in this area, like Fore River and Portsmouth shipyards, and Pratt & Whitney and Electric Boat in Connecticut, the figures double.

"We're not in trouble yet," said one Boston industrialist, "but we will be if the present trend continues."

TWELVE BILLION DOLLARS THIS YEAR

The trend referred to is a diminishing number of contracts.

It is not that there aren't contracts around. There are, but as Coolidge and Reddan indicate they are not coming to Greater Boston.

The prize eluding New England's vital science-based industries is a healthier slice of the biggest growth dollar circulating around the Nation today and for years to come.

This is the dollar spawned from the scientific revolution which is not only changing our industries, but our population centers, our cities, our educational system and our entire society.

And this is a Federal dollar. For instance, the Government will spend over $12 billion dollars on research and development alone this year. Eighty percent of that $12 billion—$9½ billion—will be poured into private industry.

Just 20 years ago the sum being spent by the Government on research and development was a relatively no account $100 million.

Greater Boston is one of four great research and development areas in the Nation. The others are Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Greater New York.

But other areas are challenging—parts of Texas, Florida, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland.

A NEW REVOLUTION

Today the population and industrial growth is West and South, to California, Texas, and Florida, California will soon overshadow the old leader—New York State—with a bigger population and larger congressional delegation.

All across the Nation massive power plays are going on behind the scenes as regions, States and cities fight for recognition and future economic dominance, for science-based economic maturity and stability which will assure them growth over the next 100 years.

This battle is a repetition of the industrial revolution of 100 years ago which sparked the rise of cities such as Detroit, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Cleveland.

Boston and New England are in the middle of this squeeze play right now.

Today, unlike yesterday, the key is brains, not iron deposits or natural waterways. But brains are easily transportable. They can be assembled in deserts, as has been done at White Sands and Los Alamos, N. Mex., and cities and towns grow up around them.

But brains, if possible, like to percolate close to an academic atmosphere where they can be refreshed, replenished and acclaimed.

Greater Boston is without peer in this respect.

It was because of our universities—particularly MIT and Harvard—that Greater Boston got its fast start in the age of science.

The great electronic advances made at Harvard and MIT during World War II (such as the radiation laboratory) spilled over when space followed.

NEW ENGLAND NEEDS MATURITY

To insure the peace the Government had now to spend money on defense projects such as the DEW and SAGE early warning systems.

A good number of the scientists and engineers who developed the techniques which helped us outengineer and outthink the enemy went into business for themselves or joined newly created research institutions.

By 1945–52 the science-based industries with the exotic names were beginning to spring up on the former cow pastures of Route 128.

Established outside firms, realizing they had to be close to the men forging the new technology and working on the basic science which would result in further development, set up shop in Greater Boston.

But as Gen. James McCormack, vice president of MIT stated recently, "The pioneering stage is over now; we should be entering maturity."

The Greater Boston science-based complex, with a few individual exceptions, has not matured yet.

In the main it is still a heterogeneous grouping of relatively small companies (from 200 to 500 employees) making everything from pinhead-size diodes to giant radar antennas. Exceptions are Raytheon (43,000 employees and $200 million payroll), and to some extent Avco in Wilmington.

BIG FIRMS GET BIGGER

But on this whole this is a component center. It makes parts for large systems. Apart from the exceptions we don't make hardware plus innards but rather parts of highly intricate "nervous systems."

It is the race for space which more than anything has shown up our weakness—a crash program.

Big contracts today go to the big firms which have the capability to do the entire job, to supervise and administer the work of an entire system, like the Boeings, Martins, and North Americans.

These companies give out the subcontracts to smaller component firms. If the firms are close to them the chances are they'll get the contracts.

The day has passed when big contractors had to come to Greater Boston.

The man with the money today is James Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

NASA, which only sprang into being 3 years ago, will give out $2.4 billion in contracts this year.

TEAMWORK NOW A MUST

Webb gave the Apollo moon project to Houston, Tex. This was the first publicly recognized warning that Greater Boston might be in trouble.

When Boston civic and industrial delegations saw Webb and asked, "How about us?" he replied: "Only areas with big capabilities have any chance of success."

Greater Boston, carrying much of New England along with it, is now trying to mend its fences.

To win the power play now in progress required a city or region to marshal all its resources and present them in the most glittering fashion.

To do this requires a united effort by universities, industries, chambers of commerce, and politicians, backed by public interest.

Failure to assemble these strengths into a neat, attractive powerful package has spelled trouble for Boston and New England in the past and will again unless corrected.

Brains and pioneering effort are not enough.

ECONOMIC COUNTDOWN III—HUB FORMS SUPER TEAM TO FIGHT FOR SPACE JOBS

(Greater Boston needs a greater share of the space dollar in order to grow. This third article in a series points out that in seeking such a share we are asking no favors, considering our brains, industries, universities and research institutions.)

(By Ian Menzies)

Greater Boston isn't asking any favors in seeking a larger share of the Nation's space dollar.

The brains are still here, and given a choice they'll stay here.

The science-based industries are here—more than 400 in Greater Boston alone—and it is their retention and growth that is of concern.

The universities are here; no institution overshadows MIT or Harvard and our many other colleges and universities are growing in national statute each year.

The skilled technicians are here. Of the 12,000 technicians-engineers graduated annually across the Nation, Boston alone produces 1,000 or 12 percent.

Massachusetts with only 2 percent of the Nation's population graduates annually 5 percent of the engineers with bachelor's degrees, 9 percent of those with master's degrees and 12 percent of those with doctorates.

We have more scientists and engineers in relation to total State population than any other State in the Nation.

All three of the Nation's presidential science advisers—Drs. Killian, Kistiakowsky and Wiesner—have come from here, two from MIT and one from Harvard.

Scores of our professors have served on Department of Defense committees and still do. Dr. Vannevar Bush, honorary chairman of the MIT Corp., successfully developed the Nation's technological effort in World War II.

Former Boston professors dominate the New Frontier or serve on leave of absence.

Technological institutes abound in this area.

There is the so-called Bedford complex, directed by the Air Force and in part by MIT.

It comprises Hanscom Field, home of the Air Force Electronic Systems Division, one of five major divisions of the Air Force.

Hanscom also houses the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, embracing the largest concentration of geophysicists to be found anywhere in the world.

There is MIT's Lincoln Laboratory. There is Mitre Corp. in Lexington, an offshoot of Lincoln, thought a separate entity.

This complex alone adds up to 10,000 people, more than 2,000 of them scientists and engineers.

(Now that the Air Force has the right to have its own men-in-space project, separate from NASA, Air Force oriented Boston may benefit.)

There is the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command at Natick, which just completed a new $2 million radiation laboratory.

There is the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, expanding its laboratories at this moment.

There are Boston's outstanding hospitals, each with research departments working in basic biology, chemistry, and physics, research very relevant to manned space travel.

There is the Springfield Armory and the Watertown Arsenal; the Boston and Fore River shipyards. There are Naval Research installations in Rhode Island and New London, Conn.

There is the Telstar world communications station built by American Telephone at Andover, Maine. There is a Navy long-distance, low-frequency radio communications center which assures communication with submarines far from base, at Cutler, Maine.

On top of this there is a depth of testing capability, so necessary in space science, in our industrial concerns, at Avco in Wilmington, in Sylvania's Waltham and Needham plants; at Raytheon's many facilities, as Associated Testing Laboratories in Burlington.

FACILITIES GROW

We have MIT's nuclear reactor for experimental work, a cyclotron and the most powerful electron accelerator in the world, run jointly by Harvard and MIT.

We will shortly have one of the most modern computers available at MIT's new industrial center in Cambridge where IBM is to occupy a new facility.

The largest magnet and magnetic research laboratory in the world is being built in Cambridge.

Harvard Medical School has been given $2½ million by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to build a New England primate center to help throw light on man's diseases.

Another three-quarters of a million from the Guggenheim Foundation has gone to Harvard School of Public Health to set up a center for the study of aerospace health and safety.

One would think that NASA could ill afford to pass up such a complex to place its space dollar.

But thus far it has only become involved to the tune of $15 million, though it has $2½ billion to spend.

Can we ignore NASA, seeing we have all these other facilities?

No.

Unfortunately, burgeoning universities and other tax-free institutions will not provide tax money except through the more limited and confiscatory real estate and personal taxes paid by its faculty and employees—two types of taxes bearing a rather uneven load already.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SPURS FIGHT

In addition, industrial growth offers more service and maintenance jobs, needed for full employment.

The flaw to all this, in NASA's book at least, is that Boston and New England has not a large enough firm capable of having a whole system tossed into its lap.

Raytheon does handle large Defense Department contracts, including the making of hardware and in fact does much of its own component work, but James Webb, head of NASA, has not referred to Raytheon.

A strong effort is being made by the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce to provide a company which in effect could bid for these large prime systems contracts and coordinate the efforts of the many smaller firms in the Boston area.

The capability is here; the organization is lacking.

NASA of course could have presented this area with the organization as it did Houston, Tex., by locating the $120 million Apollo moonshot center here.

NASA has just announced that it plans to open a northeastern operation office here in the near future, staffed initially by about

8 persons, which it may eventually increase to 25 or 30.

This, says the NASA announcement, is to handle the $15 million worth of contracts in the six New England States; the same $15 million that looks so puny against NASA's $2½ billion in contract money of which California is getting $1½ billion.

The immediate answer for Greater Boston is to battle for its share.

And to be ready to grasp for new opportunities which our science-based industries, properly organized and politically supported, can bring to New England in the years ahead.

ECONOMIC COUNTDOWN IV—SPACE JOB BID BY SALTONSTALL; KENNEDY ALSO SHOWS CONCERN OVER STATE'S SATELLITE ROLE

(Political problems involved in contract negotiations are discussed, in this fourth article of a series on Boston's space-age economic future, by the Globe's Washington correspondent.)

(By Wilfrid Rodgers)

WASHINGTON.—Speaking of Massachusetts future in the space program, there is a growing determination in some quarters here not only to pick the Bay State's brains but also its pockets.

At stake is not only big money but the future for what has become an economic rebirth of the Bay State and all New England.

Industries in other States are seeking to lure away the best scientists in Massachusetts.

Currently Massachusetts does little about it.

Massachusetts firms have been approached.

In well-couched language, hints have been passed that by relocating elsewhere they could get a larger share of contracts under the moon and space projects and other Government contracts.

Republican Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has become so alarmed at what he believes to be attempts by NASA to drain off top engineers and scientists from Greater Boston that he wrote a letter to Administrator James E. Webb protesting such recruiting.

SALTONSTALL said in his letter to Webb:

"From our point of view in Massachusetts, our future lies in electronics and new industries. So we are very sensitive to any efforts to take away from Massachusetts the people who can be of most benefit to employing people and helping give new jobs to our citizens."

SALTONSTALL also told Webb that he would rather see NASA work subcontracted in the Bay State rather than have the agency recruit bright young engineers to work elsewhere.

SALTONSTALL's office says it is also checking on reports of veiled offers of lucrative Government contracts if some Bay State industries would relocate new plants in other sections of the country.

It is known also that President Kennedy has become concerned because the Bay State isn't playing a larger role in the space program.

He has informed Webb that he hopes the Bay State "could make more contributions to the space program."

A few generations ago the revival of the New England economy would have been attributed to "Yankee ingenuity." Today it is called brains, research and development.

Its loss is threatened because of a lack of what also was once considered a New England trait—"horse trading."

The fact is that every time the Bay Staters get into a political set-to with their colleagues from the South, the Bay Staters invariably come out second best.

The Massachusetts economic future is tied closely to the Federal Government and the politics that make it tick.

Best example is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's moon lab site.

Massachusetts thought it had a chance for this project—a project on which $45 billion will be spent to get a man on the moon.

The Bay State had everything going for it to land this project—except the political know-how.

BIG TRY TOO LATE

Ironically enough, it wasn't the Massachusetts politicians who were lacking—most were not even consulted, until after the site had been won by the boys from Texas.

The Bay State business community—recognizing the importance of this project—rolled up its sleeves and used all its brains and ingenuity to put together a presentation to show one and all why the moon lab should be located in Massachusetts.

Trouble was that the same thing happened to the moon lab as happened to the textile industry.

It had gone South before the Bay State even knew it.

One southerner, flushed with victory, had this to say about the Bay State's attempts to get the moon lab:

"Those boys from Massachusetts are real good guys. But just as in baseball, good guys always finish last in this political arena."

How could a State that has produced the two most powerful men in Government—President Kennedy and Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, blow such an opportunity?

Easy. The Bay State still doesn't recognize or won't recognize that national politics is the lifeblood of its economy.

Both the President and Speaker MCCORMACK—together with the rest of the Massachusetts delegation were condemned after the moon lab was lost.

But were they consulted and impressed with the importance of the project by someone they would listen to before the horse was stolen?

One Bay State Congressman was consulted on the project the day the State was to make its presentation to NASA.

He knew then that the Bay State didn't have a chance but didn't have the heart to tell the home folks.

Southern politicians, because of the one-party system in that section of the Nation, have an edge over Bay Staters.

Because choice committee assignments are won through seniority, the southerners seek out and win the seats on the committees that are of prime importance to them.

They see to it that they control the appointments of heads of important agencies.

And if anyone tries to thwart their appointments, they let it be known that their members of the Appropriations Committee or Ways and Means might hold up money for important projects—such as the moon project.

Massachusetts, on the other hand, elects its officials under the two-party system. And once having elected, as a State, it tends to disregard them.

OTHERS HIRE PROS

When in desperation it needs help from a Congressman, the State, and particularly business groups, tend to use the same methods—and often the same people—it used a generation ago to secure what it needs.

At best it gets a sympathetic ear and no action.

Other States—with the two-party system—fare better. They see to it that they hire political pros to get what they want.

These people are called by many names including that of lobbyist. But they are also called successful.

Where Massachusetts would tend to assign someone this job who knows a politician, these States appoint someone who knows politics.

These pros are able to go to a Congressman or Senator and tell him what the State wants. They have worked out the political details in advance.

They see to it that no labor-business tussle will crop up to give the Congressman involved a chance to "sit out" the battle.

They also spell out to the politicians the need of the project and the consequences he faces if he doesn't produce.

Are there such pros available?

One claimed that Massachusetts—with a native in the White House and in the Speaker's chair—represents a lobbyist's dream.

But will Massachusetts take advantage of it?

ECONOMIC COUNTDOWN V—NEW ENGLAND WAKING UP

(This final article on the economic future of Boston's science-based industries emphasizes why the area must fight for a fair share of the space dollar, and how this can be done.)

(By Ian Menzies)

New England must be prepared to make an all-out fight for a big space laboratory or space contract from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

It must also seek a part of the Air Force man-in-space project, newly authorized.

WHY NEW ENGLAND MUST FIGHT

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, headed by Dr. Earl P. Stevenson, retired chairman of Arthur D. Little, Inc., has made the first move.

A detailed statistical brochure on Greater Boston's educational, industrial, land, and manpower facilities, as well as its transportation, communication, and recreational facilities has been drawn up.

Visits have been made to Washington to discuss prospects with James Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

For the first time some real effort is being made to integrate and utilize New England's quite strategically located congressional delegation to beef up the region's legitimate request for fair contract consideration.

Webb has indicated that only areas where some big organization is prepared to bid for and administer a large contract will have any hope of success.

The Boston chamber group is seeking to set up or interest one company in carrying the administrative ball for the many small companies in this area.

Other areas, such as Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Chicago are pouring money into similar plans and some of these areas are blessed with an ingredient missing in Boston for many a year—industrial entrepeneurs such as Mellon in Pittsburgh.

Although there is little sense in beating a dead horse, it is of some interest and perhaps still useful to examine how New England has wound up in its present somewhat precarious position.

As has been made clear, many of Boston's new science-based industries resulted from Government research originally undertaken at Harvard and MIT.

FIRMS PLANNED AHEAD

When the stage was reached when production became feasible a company was formed, often by the university researcher, and these companies stayed close to the universities which spawned the ideas in the first place.

In the same way some well-established companies moved in with research and development branches in order to keep pace with the new industrial science.

In California the pattern was different. The big airframe companies couldn't move during the transition period from a strictly wartime economy to the new era in the late forties.

But they built up and readjusted their scientific-technical staffs (often paying them for doing nothing) and planned to jump in when the big rocket-space contracts came along.

Their capabilities were well known and having made staff readjustments they received the fat prime contracts. But now the small companies began to gravitate toward them.

Globe business columnist Peter Greenough reports that Infrared Industries of Waltham had just moved its corporate headquarters to California because its president, E. Douglas Reddan, says, "Most of the business is out there."

Reddan is leaving for California soon.

Dr. Charles A. Coolidge, Jr., vice president of C. & K. Components, told Greenough his company had just lost two contracts totaling $750,000 to California firms.

"These people in California are getting all the business," he says, and statistics bear him out.

Several things might have happened in Massachusetts to offset this inevitable shakeout toward the big Government-favored firms.

NO LACK OF ABILITY

One or both of our two largest companies, Sylvania or Raytheon, could have mushroomed into even larger giants than they are today. Or General Electric might have sought to concentrate its space effort in Massachusetts, or Avco, which moved in more recently, might have broadened its effort in this State.

It's true that heavy production facilities are needed to provide companies which can build five-story-high rockets or large capsules but a coordinated effort might have made this possible.

We often forget that Wyman Gordon in Worcester possesses the largest forging press in the free world and outstanding metal working equipment. And there are plenty of test equipment centers.

Only the corporate bodies of these firms can answer why the cooperative bid was not made.

Avco made a strong bid to secure the Mercury capsule project and had it done so the entire New England picture might be different today.

One wonders if these companies got the support they needed from all quarters of the State—banks, legislature, universities, labor, congressional delegations, civic groups, newspapers.

Then again, something else could have happened. MIT could have set up a laboratory which in effect would have done the coordinating for the area.

There are some who feel this may still happen.

California Institute of Technology (Cal Tech) did this for the Government. It set up and manages Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) for NASA. JPL contracts out a large volume of industrial work in California.

EDUCATION FIRST

MIT, concerned about compromising its education function, turned down this idea. It was even reluctant to set up Lincoln Laboratory and later Mitre Corp. for the Air Force.

It hesitated for almost a year before agreeing to take on the Apollo moonshot navigation project at its instrumentation laboratory and only agreed to do this for NASA if it would not be expected to do a large amount of industrial management work.

There are some who may say MIT let us down, but it should be remembered that industry has opposed private universities "getting into our field" and MIT rightly was entitled to consider the danger of comprising its prime purpose—education.

The precedent for setting up a company to coordinate work—the current Boston idea—can be instanced by the Sandia Corp.

This company was organized by Western Electric in 1949 to do the systems engineering job in the gap which existed between the Los Alamos Laboratory (Atomic Energy Commission) and industry. Sandia made extensive use of small businesses.

It is possible that a corporation like Mitre could have been set up here by NASA to do the correlating and administrative job but none of these events occurred, which leaves our industrial science-based future in the balance.

One very encouraging sign, however, though not a solution to the industrial coordination problem which must be resolved if New England's economy is to grow in the years ahead with the new Federal dollar, is NASA's interest in education.

Webb is extremely interested in supporting education financially.

What interests him is MIT's present program to construct five graduate centers with the $66 million now being raised by the second century fund—currently $9 million short of its goal.

The five centers include (1) earth sciences, now building; (2) materials science, to start this fall; (3) life sciences, also to start this fall; (4) aeronautics and astronautics, no date set and (5) communications center, also no construction date.

NASA LOOKS AHEAD

No. 4, which might well be called the Center for Space Science and Engineering, particularly attracts Webb. He would be prepared to filter NASA finances, academic-oriented projects into the center getting out graduates and ideas which NASA needs in the future.

It might well be that the academic part of the Apollo project, now being carried out by MIT's instrumentation laboratory, as well as other instrumentation laboratory projects, would form the core of this center.

Taken one step further the instrumentation laboratory itself might become the focal point of the new center.

If NASA and other Government agencies supplied research money for these new MIT centers, then we might see a repeat of the industrial fallout from the original MIT radiation laboratory—new industries which we don't even visualize yet.

But the most important thing at this time is to capture one of the big new NASA projects or laboratories through consolidated effort, and not to shy away from thinking along lines of fabrication as well as nervous systems.

National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to grant a Federal charter to the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements, generally referred to as the NCRP. The Joint Committee held hearings on June 4–7 of this year on "Radiation Standards, Including Fallout," and some witnesses indicated the desirability of establishing the NCRP as an independent nonprofit corporation under a Federal charter.

I realize that it is late in the session and that the Judiciary Committee may not be able to give consideration to this matter during the present session of Congress. However, I am introducing the bill now in order to permit time to obtain comments from various interested persons in Government agencies, including the Public Health Service and the Atomic Energy Commission, on this bill.

The GI Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the House rejected last week a Senate-approved plan to reinstate GI life insurance to a potential 16 million veterans of World War II and Korea, and voted instead to limit reopening rights to a possible 1,800,000 service-disabled veterans ineligible for private insurance plans.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my extreme disapproval of the House's action, not because I feel that service-disabled veterans should be denied this life insurance, but rather because I feel that all World War II and Korean war veterans, who courageously fought to preserve those things which we cherish, should equally be eligible for such insurance.

In its original form, H.R. 12333 reopens national service life insurance—for a maximum of $10,000—for 1 year from the date of enactment. The bill covers all individuals—excepting certain Philippine veterans and persons on active duty—who served between October 8, 1940, and December 31, 1956, regardless of whether or not they had insurance at any time during their service. The insurance is entirely limited to permanent plans—ordinary life, 20-pay life, 30-pay life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, and endowment at age 65. No term insurance is provided. Medical examinations, where required, will be at the expense of the applicant. The administrative expenses of this program will be borne by all policyholders. There will be an initial administrative outlay to the Veterans' Administration estimated at $7,716,700 for the first year. However, this is merely a bookkeeping transaction involving no cost to the Government, inasmuch as the bill provides that funds so appropriated shall be repaid to the Treasury by collection of the administrative expenses from the policyholders.

The need for enactment of the original H.R. 12333 is clear. Because of youth and the inexperience which often accompanies youth, many of our veterans did not take advantage of the GI life insurance plan when they were eligible. Still others because of the high rate of unemployment were without jobs, and consequently had to cancel their insurance policies. It was with these men in mind that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs favorably reported H.R. 12333, and it was with these men in mind that the four major veterans' organizations—American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, and Veterans of Foreign Wars supported the idea inherent in this legislation. But these are just the men who were forgotten when the House voted 124 to 87 to limit reopening rights to service-disabled veterans ineligible for private insurance plans.

I can only concur with J. S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, when he said, "the whole subject has been carefully studied and reevaluated, and I have concluded that the withdrawal in 1951 of the privilege theretofore granted to millions of World War II veterans to secure insurance—many of whom had not yet determined their insurance needs—may well have caused hardship or unwise decision in many instances. I believe, therefore, that an extension of this privilege, for a limited period, to veterans who were previously eligible for insurance by reason of service to their country is appropriate," and hope that the Senate will remedy the House's action by passing H.R. 12333 in its original form.

Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, 1962, I devoted a newsletter to the reasons why I believe a tax cut affecting both personal and corporate income should be initiated.

I have had a great deal of mail, both pro and con, and believe that both sides of an issue as important as this should be fully aired. I am submitting for the RECORD both my newsletter and a letter from a constituent, Mr. F. D. Dysinger, of Round Pond, Maine, in disagreement with my views.

TAX CUTS—CONGRESSMAN STAN TUPPER REPORTS

Although we have recently experienced a slight economic recovery, our country now seems to be on an economic plateau which is reminiscent of that which occurred before the downturn of July 1957. This listlessness and declining rate of growth have led most economists to conclude that we are headed for a recession. Unusual agreement has been reached between business, labor, and economists to the effect that the best stimulus to our sagging economy would be a tax cut—soon. It is generally recommended that this cut be substantial and that it affect both corporate and personal income.

Several factors cause me to favor a reduction in taxes so that a positive influence will be exerted on business activity, earnings, and employment. Recent figures reveal that personal income in June was just barely higher than May; that hours worked per week by factory employees declined both in May and June; that total retail sales dropped from May (and in May sales were lower than in April); and now we learn that our gross national product for the current year is much lower than predicted. If taxable income should decline, the resulting drop in Federal tax receipts will lead to a much greater budgetary deficit than we already expect.

Advantages to a tax cut seem to far outweigh the disadvantages. If personal income taxes are cut now, there would be increased purchasing power which could stimulate the economy by greater expenditures in goods and services. Investment would be stimulated as sales and production capacity is challenged. A rising level of economic activity should generate greater tax revenues, so that the fiscal deficit incurred by tax reduction would be partially offset by taxation on increased profits. I too believe that the cut should be substantial so that the gap between what the economy can produce and the public can buy will be closed.

Although there seems to be general agreement on cutting taxes, the desired mechanism for the cut is another matter. In other words, how much to cut and how to spread the cut among individuals and corporations will be matters of controversy as the hearings progress.

A tax cut now would seem to be practical. This does not rule out a sensible tax reform measure next year which will help cure rather than palliate our diseased economy.

ROUND POND, MAINE,
August 2, 1962.

Congressman STANLEY R. TUPPER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TUPPER: May I, as a steadfast Republican, voice a mild criticism of your tax views as expressed in May Craig's article, "TUPPER Urges Tax Cut and Substantial One, Too," in today's Press Herald?

It seems to me that there is no evidence of a lack of purchasing power. On the contrary, retail sales are good, savings bank deposits are up, installment purchase loans are down. The figures on unemployment, as given by the President yesterday, indicate an improvement in employment. Very frankly speaking, I think that is "lack of purchasing power" theory is a rationalization advanced by the labor union leaders simply because they would like to have the taxes of lower income persons lowered, and is wholly unjustified by the facts.

I personally believe that the taxes on people with high incomes is unjust and confiscatory. Probably, also these high taxes have gone past the point of diminishing returns, and are an actual cause of unemployment. Nevertheless, I do not believe that these unjust taxes should be lowered at this time, because I do not think they are the prime cause of the present economic unrest. If we are to deal with taxes at this time, our sole purpose should be to act with the purpose of staving off a recession. In my opinion, if a tax cut is needed at all, and I am not sure that one is needed, it should be confined to a reduction of about 7 percentage points in the corporation income tax. We might hope that such a reduction would stimulate business to such an extent that the loss of revenue would be small.

However there is something else that should be said. I believe firmly that a large part of the stock market decline is due to a lack of confidence in the administration. The powers that be in Washington are too subservient to the labor union political machine. They espouse silly policies like reducing taxes on business to stimulate the economy, while, at the same time advocating programs like medicare which would add to the cost of doing business as much as would be saved by a tax reduction. Too much thought is given to actions likely to get the votes of various blocs, instead of looking to the public welfare. The President seems determined to increase the centralization of government, and to lean toward collectivism which certainly increases patronage and the power of the President, but, in practice seems to be extremely inefficient and costly. Worst of all, the President seems to have an obsession for asking for powers that no other President has ever been given. Do you wonder that businessmen are lacking in confidence? Some of the decisions of our Supreme Court tend to scare the average businessman, too. In short, there is more to the slump in the stock market than just taxes. What this country needs is not "a good 5-cent cigar." It needs a good dose of molasses and commonsense.

Very truly yours,

F. D. DYSINGER.

Hospital Fund Cash Is Still Being Spent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John J. Ford:

[From the Navy Times, Aug. 4, 1962]

HOSPITAL FUND CASH IS STILL BEING SPENT

(By John J. Ford)

Since the questionable legal status of the old naval hospital fund was first brought up two issues ago I have been able to obtain more details of its history—including the fact that money from the defunct fund was spent as late as March of this year. Patients who enjoy the new therapeutic swimming pool at San Diego Naval Hospital can thank the Navy hospital fund even though the fund was abolished in 1943.

Here, chronologically, is something of the history of this fund:

On July 16, 1798, Congress enacted a law setting up the Marine hospital fund for sick and disabled merchant seamen. They started contributing 20 cents a month on September 1 of that year. A year later the Navy and Marine Corps were brought under the law and each officer and enlisted man, active and retired, started contributing 20 cents a month as of September 1, 1799. Those contributions continued unchanged until 1943.

The 20-cent deductions were made by the pay officers and sent quarterly to the auditor of the Navy who credited them to the hospital fund.

A separate fund for the Navy and Marines was established by the act of February 26, 1811. It was given an appropriation of $50,000 out of $73,288.38 in the combined fund. The 1811 act designated the Secretaries of Navy, War, and Treasury as the "Commissioners of Navy Hospitals." The act provided for purchase of sites and building of hospitals, all money to come from the fund. For 20 years nothing much was done in the way of building hospitals and it was later found that much of it was used for illegal purposes, including for pay of Navy men.

The 1811 act also provided the following: For every man in a naval hospital the value of one ration per day was charged against the "Provisions, Navy" appropriation and credited to the naval hospital fund. When men receiving Navy pensions were undergoing treatment in Navy hospitals, their pensions were paid into the hospital fund. All fines imposed by courts-martial were to be paid into the hospital fund.

In 1832 the fund finally had enough money to finance what it had been set up for 20 years before. The Navy Secretary was made sole trustee. Congress appropriated, on July 10, 1832, specific sums out of the fund for the building of hospitals at or near the Navy yards of Charleston, Mass., Brooklyn, N.Y., and Pensacola, Fla., and directed the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the work. Congress also authorized construction of the naval asylum (now the naval home) at Philadelphia in that year and took part of the money from the naval hospital fund.

It is a nice legal question whether the sites of these hospitals were Government owned or were assets of the trust.

A law passed on March 3, 1855, took 10 acres of the land belonging to the naval hospital at Chelsea, Mass., and set it aside for a merchant marine hospital for the Boston and Charleston areas. A law passed June 12, 1858, directed the value of the land—$50,000—should be placed in the credit of the naval hospital fund. Thus it would seem the Congress recognized the assets of these hospitals belonged to the fund and not to the Government generally. Again in 1890, when Congress sold land belonging to a naval hospital to the city of Brooklyn, N.Y., the value of the land—$92,000—was credited to the hospital fund.

The record is not clear as to whether the fund paid all the cost of construction. It would appear that Congress at times made extra appropriations to help complete several hospitals. But it is known that at least three hospitals—those at Portsmouth, N.H., Chelsea, Mass. and Newport, R.I.—were paid for entirely by the naval hospital fund. They cost a total of $847,000 and were considered models of good hospital construction when built. Their value has appreciated to many times their original cost by now.

An act approved May 4, 1878, provided the first annual appropriation—$50,000—from Congress to help support the naval hospital fund. From 1878 to 1908 Congress appropriated some money, in varying amounts, to the fund every year. This practice stopped in 1908.

On June 7, 1900, Congress passed a law that added all forfeitures of money from deserters to the hospital fund.

In 1913, in an appropriation bill rider, the Congress said no hospital could be built or extensions to hospital buildings made unless first authorized by Congress. But the fund swelled during World War I because of the large number of men in service and some of it was used to help with construction projects. By 1943, when Congress abolished the fund, the money was being used solely for operation and maintenance expenses.

How much the fund provided over the years for construction of extensions and additions to hospitals and for repairs and other building projects, is not known, but it ran into the millions. During the time it was in existence the fund was spent for all manner of things, including support of patients in civilian hospitals at home and abroad.

Congress abolished the fund in 1943 at the Navy's request to simplify accounting. The bill as sent to Congress would have continued the contribution on an annual basis—$2.40—and Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, pointed out that the fund would have taken in many millions because of the large number of men in the service during World War II. But Congress stopped the contribution and abolished the fund. As pointed out before, no detailed accounting of the assets of the trust was ever made.

In 1934 a Navy doctor, Lt. Comdr. Paul E. McDonnold, died and left his estate, including some real property, to the Navy Hospital Fund. In 1959, the Government got around to disposing of the property. The Navy Comptroller thought the money from the sale had to go directly into the surplus fund of the Treasury and the Navy had no control of it. The Chief of BuDocks and the Chief of Naval Personnel felt the trust had failed and the matter should be turned over to the Justice Department to see who could do what with the money.

The Navy Judge Advocate General said they were all wrong and the money had to be spent for the purpose the doctor intended. In his decision the JAG said, "neither departmental inaction nor abolition by Congress of the fund has operated to deprive the Secretary of the Navy, as trustee, of any power of disposition he had * * * I perceive no basis for concluding that the action of Congress in 1943 negated the authority of the Secretary to liquidate the real property involved."

In March of this year, $22,650 of the doctor's bequest was given to the San Diego Naval Hospital for a therapeutic swimming pool. Money from the bequest was also given to the Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Hospital ($1,800) and the St. Albans, Long Island, Naval Hospital ($2,500) in March.

The question remains as to whether the abolition of the fund and the subsequent enactment of Public Law 569 of the 84th Congress, which made hospital care for retired servicemen a privilege instead of a right has taken away a right Navy men had by contributing to the fund.

In the letter to the Speaker of the House on May 1, 1943, that asked for the fund to be abolished, the then Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox wrote, "The proposed legislation would change no existing rights to hospitalization."

It may be argued that no specific law was on the book which said retired men had a right to hospitalization but certainly there was an implied contract. The U.S. Government would not have continued to take contributions from men after retirement if it did not expect to furnish them care. Certainly the Government incurred a moral obligation to provide hospitalization.

For those who contributed to the fund and particularly those who were already retired when contributing how much of a right and how little of a privilege they have is still in doubt. One officer did ask for a ruling on his right to hospitalization. He asked specifically if a retired man who contributed to the Naval Hospital Fund has been deprived of his right to hospitalization by Public Law 569. The Judge Advocate General of the Navy, in an opinion written in February of this year, said the question "must be answered in the negative." In other words, the man hasn't been denied any of his rights.

But at some time in the future if a Navy hospital has to turn away one of the ever-growing list of retirees there could be an interesting court test of right and privileges.

Joseph E. Rhea, Sr., Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and comrade, Joseph E. Rhea, Sr., circulation—suburban, of the Chicago's American, was given a surprise party on his 80th birthday, on August 3, 1962, by the ladies and gentlemen of the Chicago Circulation Department. There were over 100 persons in attendance. A large cake, decorated with "RHEA–80–National Aide de Camp—Veterans of W.W.–1, Inc." was presented to him, along with a large, handsome, 50-star American Chicago-Tribune flag, boxed in red, white, and blue; also a Moroccan-leather pocket secretary.

He was invited the day before, as a surprise. His dear wife and his son, Joseph E. Rhea, Jr., executive vice president of the Segerdahl-Halford Printing Co., Inc., Chicago, were present. He thanked those in attendance, profusely, with deep gratitude. His work among veterans groups marks him as a true patriot and a real American.

We of the Illinois delegation are proud to add our birthday greetings to those of his many friends, to one who has always served others in their troubles and needs.

Pennsylvania Leads Nation in Rehabilitation Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, over a hundred thousand disabled persons were made employable by public aid in the year which ended June 30, 1962. Pennsylvania led the Nation by rehabilitating over 9,000 persons, or 45 percent more than in the preceding year. New York ranks second with over 7,000, and Georgia was third with over 6,000.

I have attached the report contained in the New York Times of August 19 and this very important and interesting subject for all the Members to read.

Pennsylvania Leads Nation in Rehabilitation Record: 102,396 Disabled Made Employable by Public Aid in Year Ended June 30

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Last Tuesday vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped in the United States passed a historic milestone.

On that day President Kennedy announced that for the first time 100,000 disabled Americans had been rehabilitated into employment in a single year under the public program of vocational rehabilitation.

President Kennedy made the announcement when he greeted Edward A. Friskie, Boswell, Pa., at the White House. Mr. Friskie was selected to represent those who had been rehabilitated.

A former sewing machine operator and mechanic, Mr. Friskie, 36 years old, had been disabled in an automobile accident in 1954.

For 7 years he did not work and with his wife and two children lived off public assistance and a veteran's pension for a non-service-connected disability.

The Pennsylvania Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation provided him with extensive surgery, prosthetic appliances and a 4-year college education. Since last September, he has been teaching history in the Shanksville High School near Johnstown.

REPORT BY DIRECTOR

At the meeting, Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, reported to the President that 102,396 disabled persons had been rehabilitated into employment under the State-Federal program during the fiscal year ended June 30.

This was 11 percent more than a year before. The year was the seventh in succession in which a record was established.

Of these 102,396 persons, some 16,700 had been receiving public assistance prior to rehabilitation at the rate of $18 million a year. The cost of their rehabilitation was $17 million.

The group is expected to contribute about 150 million man-hours of work each year to the Nation's productive effort. More than 4,500 of the group, like Mr. Friskie, have entered short-supply professional occupations such as teaching, engineering, medicine, and related health activities.

The group as a whole was earning $47 million a year prior to rehabilitation. They are now earning $205 million a year.

Each will pay $10 a year in Federal income taxes alone for each dollar invested in his rehabilitation.

Pennsylvania led the Nation last year by rehabilitating 9,060 persons, or 45 percent more than in the preceding year. The previous high was set by New York in 1961, with 6,447 rehabilitants.

NEW YORK RANKS SECOND

New York ranked second in the latest year with 7,008, and Georgia was third with 6,105.

It should be noted that in New York, many disabled persons receive services through State agencies that are frequently provided in many other States by the Federal vocational rehabilitation agency.

Vocational rehabilitation is one of the Nation's oldest grant-in-aid programs, dating back to Woodrow Wilson's administration in 1920. It was made a permanent program when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act in 1935. It has traditionally had bipartisan support in the Congress.

In 1954, following the report of a special committee headed by Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp, of New York, the Eisenhower administration recommended and the Congress enacted legislation aimed at increasing the number of persons aided from the 1954 level of 55,825 a year to 200,000.

This program, which has also had strong support from the Kennedy administration, was based on a four-pronged attack on the problems of disability and dependency: (1) Use of increased State and Federal funds for rehabilitation services; (2) recruitment and training of additional numbers of professional rehabilitation workers; (3) establishment of increasing numbers of rehabilitation and workshop facilities; (4) application of new knowledge and techniques which have resulted from increased research.

LEGISLATION FOR EXPANSION

Legislation that would further expand vocational rehabilitation services is before the Congress now.

This legislation (H.R. 12070) would, among other things, establish an expansion fund to assist in initiating projects that are expected to lead to increased services, including grants of $5 million a year for more rehabilitation facilities and workshops. The latter are particularly needed.

The bill would also authorize the States to provide vocational rehabilitation to a disabled person for 6 months while his potentials are being evaluated.

Regulations now permit provision of services only if there is a reasonable chance that the disabled individual can be made employable through such services.

MEASURE IN COMMITTEE

This legislation, which was introduced by Representative ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Democrat, of Connecticut, has received favorable consideration by the House Committee on Education and Labor but is tied up in the House Committee on Rules.

Senate leaders are confident the bill would receive speedy Senate approval if it were passed by the House.

The strong legislative support given by the Congress to vocational rehabilitation during the last 7 years has been a major factor in the achievement of rehabilitating 100,000 disabled persons in a year. This same support must continue if we are to achieve the national objective of double that number of persons served each year.

In his televised report to the Nation last Monday, President Kennedy, in speaking of the Nation's economy, said, "I believe it's important that this country sail, and not lie still in the harbor. Great opportunities lie before us."

The same could be said of our national opportunities and responsibilities in increasing rehabilitation services for the handicapped.

Big Steel and Big Labor: A Contrast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the York, Pa., Dispatch, Saturday, August 18, 1962. It is factual, written in language all can understand, and requires no further comments:

BIG STEEL AND BIG LABOR: A CONTRAST

Months ago, when the New York electricians won a reduction in the workweek from 30 to 25 hours, the Dispatch forecast the action was likely to be felt throughout the American labor movement.

This prediction may soon materialize.

Meeting in Chicago, leaders of the AFL-CIO just voted to set up a task force to assist locals in bargaining for a 35-hour workweek, a reduction from the customary 40-hour week.

AFL-CIO President George Meany called the shorter workweek a "national necessity." By reducing the number of hours worked, labor hopes to create more jobs.

In the light of past performance, one might have expected President Kennedy to blow his top upon hearing labor's announcement. He didn't.

And so far as anyone knows, FBI agents have not routed any labor leaders from their sleep in the dead of night.

Nor have any SOB's been found in the ranks of labor, which traditionally backs Democratic candidates for office.

These things we point out in the interest of economic stability.

If President Kennedy wants to gain the confidence of business, he must act with equal vigor against any whom he considers to be rocking the Nation's economic boat.

To get the jobs he talks about, Kennedy must have the confidence of business. Industrialists must be assured a fair return on their risk capital.

Creating jobs by trimming work hours and not pay is a neat theory. But where's the money coming from to pay the newly employed?

With business already investing overseas because of the profit squeeze in America, labor's latest demand and the White House silence are not likely to inspire the flow of risk capital into stateside enterprises.

Expenses Up, Income Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent article appearing in the August 15, 1962, edition of the Santa Paula Daily Chronicle, entitled "Expenses Up, Income Down."

[From the Santa Paula (Calif.) Daily Chronicle Aug. 15, 1962]

EXPENSES UP, INCOME DOWN

Few will disagree with President Kennedy's statement Monday that Federal taxes are too high, restrictive to business expansion and progress and taking too much from individuals. Next year, he said, the administration will urge on Congress legislation designed to reduce personal and corporate income taxes.

That's good news, although Mr. Kennedy will have been in office 2 years when his tax reducing suggestions are submitted to Congress. Where are the 1960 campaign promises of economy? It would seem that a prudent policy would indicate a cut in expenses if tax income is cut.

We have read the President's address on the state of the economy, looking particularly for references to reduction in Federal expenditures. As one might expect, he approached Government expense cuts quite casually. He did say that Secretary of Defense McNamara had estimated a $3 billion saving in coming economy moves, and on other departments "all requests for funds are going to be very sharply judged in this office."

This reads fine. But the President also made some high-sounding remarks, we recall, last fall when he sent a memo to all Federal Department heads requesting reduced expenditures for the 1962-63 fiscal year, and specifically in numbers of personnel. What followed was far from any budget balancing objectives. Civilian Federal employment continues to rise more than 7,000 persons a month. And we ended the last fiscal year on June 30 with a deficit of some $7 billion. This year's deficit will exceed that figure, fiscal authorities say, with estimates up to $12 billion in the red. So, we have to take what Mr. Kennedy says with a grain of salt when he talks about governmental economy.

There is only one answer to lower tax revenues and expanding Federal budgets. That is inflation. Inflation means the dollar buys less. Unless, and until, income and revenue are in balance we continue on a path of capital confiscation through the process of inflation.

We got a little mixed up with his charts which were shown on television. But guess it was intended that way. The President talked about the gross national product being up 10 percent, industrial production up 16 percent, and references were made to disposable incomes, and so on. Our confusion was cleared up somewhat when on later analysis we found that industrial production, for instance, represented a 5-year period, while other charts were either 5-year reports, or where better impressions could be made the figures were for an 18-month period.

All in all it was a good political speech. Mr. Kennedy pledged his administration would safeguard our Nation's economy and assured us that "employment, income,

> profits, construction and investment must all move up more quickly." We were even told that the present Congress was a good one but if they would enact some of his legislative proposals it would be better.
>
> Of course, we don't want to stand still in our economy. But let's not forget the Democrats were in control of Congress long before Mr. Kennedy made the White House his residence. Looking back, there was more constructive legislation and congressional action when President Eisenhower, a Republican, was Chief Executive.
>
> The Democratic-controlled House and Senate have demonstrated that they do not have complete confidence in their leader. Mr. Kennedy's record as Senator does not inspire his former colleagues to endorse his every suggestion.

William G. Simpson Inducted as Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend the induction ceremonies of the recently appointed William G. Simpson, of Kenilworth, Ill., as the Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration, for the newly established SBA Management and Research Assistance Unit, by SBA Administrator John E. Horne.

With appropriate remarks, Administrator Horne gave a résumé of the duties of the office and the exceptional qualifications of the appointee—Mr. William G. Simpson:

> Establishment of a separate operating unit for management and research assistance, headed by a Deputy Administrator, should help us to expand our activities in the vitally important area of management and research assistance.
>
> It is a well recognized fact that management is often the deciding factor between business success or business failure. We plan to start now to develop a long-range program which, in cooperation with Federal and State agencies, and with business and trade organizations, can make a substantial and permanent contribution to the future welfare of American Small Business.
>
> Establishment of a separate SBA Management and Research Assistance Unit is necessitated by the substantially increased responsibilities placed upon the Deputy Administrator for Procurement and Technical Assistance, Mr. Irving Maness, and upon the facilities of his office, as a result of the growing demands made by me upon his experience in the overall operation of the agency. These made it desirable that our management and research assistance program be administered as a separate function.

The five major programs in the fields of management and research assistance are:

First. Management publications—most of them are made available without charge—a series of nine types of publications, prepared primarily by experts in private industry, and covering a wide range of topics.

Second. Administrative management courses cosponsored by SBA with leading educational institutions and distributive education systems, conducted during evening hours, with nominal tuition fees.

Third. Management conferences, usually 1-day meetings, cosponsored by SBA with chambers of commerce, trade associations, and educational institutions.

Fourth. Individual management counseling by personal interview, telephone conversation or correspondence.

Fifth. Management research studies into management problems of general or special interest to small businesses, with results widely disseminated to the small business community.

Mr. Simpson was born in Chicago, August 5, 1923. He was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, as an engineer, class of 1946, and was awarded graduate degrees in marketing and accounting at the University of Chicago and the University of Illinois.

Since 1954, Mr. Simpson has operated his own business counseling firm in Chicago, specializing in the areas of business reorganization, diversification programs, new product searches and corporate finance. Most of his clients were owners and operators of small businesses.

For 4 years, 1950–54, Mr. Simpson was a consultant in the Chicago office of Booz, Allen & Hamilton, advising clients, both governmental and commercial, in areas of organization, procedures, economic planinng, and finance.

During his service in the U.S. Army, Mr. Simpson served in Honolulu, Hawaii, and later as Chief of the Office of Mobilization Planning, Chemical Corps, Chicago.

The new SBA Deputy Administrator for Management and Research Assistance is a member of the West Point Alumni Association, the Economic Club of Chicago, the Illinois Society of Certified Public Accountants, the Chicago Athletic Club, and the Lay Advisory Boards of St. Bernard's Hospital and St. Vincent's Home—both of Chicago.

Mr. Simpson is married to the charming former Marilyn Meyer, who was present with their two children, Penny 6, and David 3. The Simpson family now resides at 139 Abingdon Avenue, Kenilworth, Ill.

We, the members of the Illinois congressional delegation, compliment the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, in the selection of such a distinguished and talented Illinoisan in this field who, we are certain, will reflect credit on the administration and merit the confidence of the public in this special service.

A Positive Act Against Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House a news item from the Wayne Eagle which is published in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

It tells of a positive act against juvenile delinquency by Herman Esselman, a man with the courage of his convictions. The news item follows:

> Herman Esselman, proprietor of the Valley Snack Shop in the Valley Ridge shopping center of Valley Road and Preakness Avenue, has discontinued sale of all magazines, a primary item in his stock of trade. Esselman, who for many years ran Excel Dairy on Valley Road, was aroused when wholesale magazine vendors refused to allow him to select the magazines and journals for his shelves. He wanted no part of certain magazines aimed at attracting the dimes and quarters of youth because he felt they were off color, with little or nothing of literary value.
>
> Yet, says Esselman, the wholesalers demanded that he carry such trash if he wanted to trade in the better magazines for both youth and adults. That did it, says the likable snack shop operator. Every magazine, good and bad, was removed from the racks. "I have children of my own," he said. "Since I felt they were unfit for them, my conscience certainly wouldn't rest easy if I sold the trash to children of my friends and patrons."

No Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the following analysis of the President's recent speech to the Nation on the economy was made by the Stamford, Conn., Advocate. It is so trenchant and to the point that I offer it for the RECORD as the clearest reaction to the speech that I have seen.

> NO TAX CUT
>
> President Kennedy, whose TV appearances are usually of top caliber, was not a dynamic young leader last evening. Whether this was due to a lack of determination as to the purpose of the talk or to a lack of familiarity with it was difficult to tell. So lacking was the technical excellence that we have come to expect from our personally attractive leader that he sometimes seemed surprised as the words rolled up from the teleprompter. It is more likely, however, that President Kennedy had not been able to resolve the purpose of the speech and the compromise was uneasy.
>
> The announced purpose was to inform the Nation as to its economic condition. In this Mr. Kennedy was thoroughly confusing. Using carefully selected items and dates he pointed out that our economy now was at a high point. He then said we had to do something to get it rolling again; that we had already done more than had ever been done before in 18 months; that we didn't need tax cuts; that we would have them on January 1; that we might need them sooner. Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, summed up by suggesting that the President was saying, "Everything is just great and it is going to be worse."
>
> If all this was not confusing enough, the President outlined the economic stimulants that had been enacted by the administration and the musts that were needed to stall off a recession until January 1. He called

off a list, not of economic stimulants, but of social welfare programs. These were programs which, far from being stimulants, were depressive because they are responsible in no small part for the tremendous tax burden everyone now admits is handicapping our economic growth.

The President through much of his talk seemed to be making an appeal for political support instead of talking economics. Certainly he couldn't believe that the program he was outlining was a boon to the economy. He virtually admitted this by pointing out that Congress refused to follow him on tax cuts so he would follow Congress.

The talk for no apparent reason included those thinly veiled threats to the business community which invested money abroad. The President is unaware or ignores the economic fact that these investments bring in in dividends more than is taken out each year. They are an advantage in our balance trade.

It was unfortunate that the President did not reach a decision whether to give an economic or a political speech. The combination was completely confusing and might lead some worried citizens to lose faith in the economic acumen of our intelligent, vigorous, and dynamic young leader.

Confused Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent article appearing in the August 16, 1962, edition of the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Confused Farmers."

The article follows:

Confused Farmers: They Mete Out Justice Under Highly Complex U.S. Farm Program—Local Committees Fine Peers, Though Uncle Sam's Rules Frequently Are Unclear—A Closeup of One County

(By William Carley)

Visalia, Calif.—A new kind of justice flourishes here in fertile Tulare County—and in other farming areas from coast to coast.

It's administered by farmers, rather than by trained judges and representative jurors. The farmers sit in judgment of their fellow farmers in such cases as these:

Farmer Jones installs an irrigation pipe and asks the Federal Government to partially reimburse him, even though his pipe doesn't quite meet specifications for such aid. How much, if anything, is he entitled to?

Farmer Brown makes an honest error and plants more cotton than allowed him by Government allotment. Is he to be fined? How much?

Farmer Green deliberately exceeds his allotted cotton acreage. How is he to be dealt with?

In each case, three local farmers, elected as a "county committee" by other farmers in the area decided what should be done. Around the country, 3,000 such committees sit in 3,000 different counties. Last year they fined fellow farmers $8.7 million (the Department of Agriculture isn't sure just how many individual farmers were on the receiving end of these penalties). But these committees are armed with a carrot as well as a stick. They distribute thousands of allotments on crops ranging from wheat and cotton to peanuts. Also under a dozen different programs, they parcel out price supports, crop loans and soil conservation aid. All together, last year they dispersed about $2.9 billion of help.

A KEY ROLE

These Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees, to give them their formal title, play a key role in aiding the Federal Government in its efforts to make its vast and complex farm program actually work. And many would defend this system as an admirable attempt to entrust grass roots control of these programs to the people most familiar with the local scene—farmers residing in the area.

Theory and practice don't always coincide, of course. And while no one could fairly expect perfection from such machinery, the Billie Sol Estes case, of recent fame, did turn up this particularly unsettling incident:

County committeemen in Texas approved 3,000 acres of allegedly illegal cotton allotments for Mr. Estes. After one of them admitted being among the legion who accepted gratuities from Billie Sol, he was stripped of his committee post. Indeed, Agriculture Secretary Freeman was sufficiently disturbed to order a reevaluation of the whole committee system. A report on how it might be improved is due Mr. Freeman next month.

In the meantime, some insight into the system, as it works in practice, can be gained by visiting Tulare County, in the southern half of California's bountiful San Joaquin Valley. With much of its 5,000 square miles irrigated from rivers coursing out of the nearby Sierra Nevada Mountains. Tulare County has for years ranked among the richest agricultural counties in the Nation. The county's cotton, grapes, oranges, cattle and other products sold for over $322 million last year; cotton alone brought in better than $50 million.

Cotton is a particularly profitable crop in Tulare; a rule of thumb is that an acre yields about two bales of cotton. This means the farmer stands to make $150 to $175 an acre on cotton against only $40 to $50 an acre on grain crops.

But without a cotton allotment, cotton profits are usually more than wiped out by the Government penalties. When assessing land for collateral, an appraisal officer for the Bank of America in Tulare generally adds $400 to $500 for every acre of allotment, so valuable is the Government's green light to plant cotton.

IN FARAWAY WASHINGTON

Tulare's cotton allotment program, like any other county's, has its start in faraway Washington, D.C. The program seems quite simple; the national cotton allotment is set by Secretary Freeman. This year the allotment is 18,101,714 acres.

Once set, the national acreage allotment is successively parceled out (mainly on the basis of acres planted in previous years), to State committees of farmers, to the county committees, and finally, to the farms themselves. This year Tulare farms got a total of 160,311 acres of allotment, and each farmer got a letter from his local committee stating his exact share.

What seems simple turns out to be complicated in practice, both for the farmers and for their committees who are supposed to see that the rules are followed.

The committeemen don't tackle their administrative chores unarmed, of course. The Agriculture Department provides them with guidance—copious amounts of it. A mass of material rains down on these farmers in the form of fine-print, single-spaced "bulletins" and "handbooks." Unfortunately, the material is legalistic in nature and, often enough, so is the language. It takes 750 words, for instance, to define a farm under the law—and another 700 to explain how to apply the definition.

Consider, "Cotton MQ Bulletin 1, Handbook 5–CN (Revision 3)," a literary work which runs to 13,000 or 14,000 words. Many a farmer must puzzle over this paragraph:

"722.2. Definitions. As used in 722.1 to 722.51 and in all forms and documents in connection therewith, unless the context or subject matter otherwise requires, the following terms shall have the following meanings and the masculine shall include the feminine and neuter genders and the singular shall include the plural number."

Paul Hamilton, short, silver-haired office manager for the Tulare County committee and an old farmer himself, points to shelves stacked with 8 feet 4½ inches of such material on cotton and similar programs, and says resignedly:

"That's what we've got to work with."

If the reading is heavy going, so too is some of the manual work required to administer the farm laws. Once you choose to restrict the acreage a man can put in cotton, you must send someone around to count the number of acres he's actually planted, a seemingly simple task which runs into all kinds of snags.

Some farmers fail to plant their cotton in easy-to-measure rectangles; they follow a zigzag pattern, instead. Sometimes, in irrigated fields the lay of the land dictates odd planting patterns. It is not unknown, however, for a particularly shrewd farmer to make his cotton difficult to measure deliberately—in the hope he can get away with a bit of overplanting.

Each summer a crop of fresh-checked college students are turned loose on the countryside in Tulare County to count the cotton acres, as temporary employees of the committee. They get into dreadful tangles. Last year, they toted up their figures and reported 1,300 farms were overplanted. When 255 farmers asked for remeasurement—errors in measuring turned up on 172 of the farms.

Ron Campbell, a county committee staffman, offers an explanation for the confusion: "Engineering students do very well, but those liberal arts students." His voice trails off and he shrugs his shoulders in despair.

If college kids get confused, so do their elders. Mel Adams, a Tulare farmer, is facing a penalty of about $16,000 because he misread a regulation.

Mr. Adams set out to plant his cotton in extrawide rows to get more sunlight on his cotton. Federal rules are designed to compensate a farmer for such planting by allowing him to spread his allotment over more acres than he'd be allotted normally. Though he has a bachelor's degree in economics from the University of California, and has been farming cotton for 30 years, Mr. Adams came a cropper. Listen to his sad tale:

"Before I planted, I checked it very thoroughly. I had the manager of the cotton gin here look at it, and he said it was OK; and I called the county committee office, and the girl there said OK. So I planted about 315 acres of cotton, with the rows just 76 inches apart."

But it wasn't OK; the rows should have been at least 96 inches apart. Because the 76-inch space doesn't qualify him for extra acreage, Mr. Adams is considered planted beyond his 223-acre allotment by some 92 acres. He'll be penalized some $16,000.

Some farmers, such as Mr. Adams, may accidentally violate one or more of Uncle Sam's myriad regulations. But some other farmers do so deliberately, the experience in Tulare County suggests.

Recently a student measuring cotton in Tulare went out on a farm with an 8-acre allotment and found 8 acres of cotton. The farmer assured him that was all the cotton he had planted. But on his way out, the boy was approached by neighbors. They suggested he go down and look in the farmer's vineyard.

"GET OUT OF THERE"

"The farmer came running down yelling for the boy to get out of there," says Mr. Hamilton, the committee office manager. But it was too late. The boy saw that the old farmer had ripped out 4 acres of vines right near the middle of the vineyard, and hidden away in there, he had planted 4 extra acres of cotton.

When Mr. Hamilton went out to check the next day, the farmer had already plowed the hidden cotton under, he reports.

Trying to ferret out violations, whether deliberate or unintentional, is but one of many chores the county committee performs. Who are these committeemen and how are they chosen?

To answer the second question first, the committees are elected in this fashion: Farmers over the country every year elect three men from their locality to a "community committee." The man polling the most votes becomes chairman. Then the chairmen of all the community committees in the county—14 of them in the case of Tulare County—get together and in turn elect a 3-man county committee.

Democratic as this process seems, it's questionable how many farmers participate in these elections. In Tulare County, it's estimated only 1 in 10 farmers bothers to vote for his community committeemen.

There's other evidence that interest is less than fervid. In the case of one community committee in Tulare County, one of the three committeemen, when first approached said he wasn't certain just who was chairman. Later he said sheepishly: "I asked my wife who was chairman and she told me, 'You dang fool, you're chairman. You get stuff in the mail that says you are.' So I guess I am."

Perhaps the best way to get acquainted with the county committeemen, and the problems they wrestle with, is to sit in on a committee meeting held on a recent Thursday afternoon at the Tulare County agriculture office in Visalia.

AROUND A LONG TABLE

Gathered around a long table in the office's conference room are Office Manager Hamilton, a secretary and the three-man committee: Chairman Charles Slaughter, Milburn Rogers and Raymond Wooley. The men are all in sport shirts, khaki pants and work boots.

When a visitor, talking with committeemen about any legal training they may have had, asks if any have passed the bar, he draws this response from 70-year-old Mr. Wooley:

"Never passed any bar intentionally." In a more serious vein, he says: "I've only finished ninth grade, and the other committeemen have a year or two of college. But we don't need a college degree for this job. What's needed is farming experience, and we all have years of that."

All also have served in various local civic capacities: Mr. Wooley is former president of the Rotary Club in his community; Mr. Rogers was a PTA president last year; Mr. Slaughter is on the board of the cotton gin co-op in his area.

Opening the meeting, Mr. Hamilton announces:

"First request on the agenda is from Martin Michaelis."

Mr. Michaelis, who has just put in an irrigation pipeline on his farm, used a small trench digger to avoid piling dirt on nearby plants. As a result, part of the pipeline isn't 18 inches deep as required to qualify the project for a soil conservation subsidy

"Can we approve part of the line, but not all of it?" asks Mr. Hamilton.

"Ha," says Mr. Rogers, swinging his booted feet up on top of the conference table. "That's like being half pregnant."

WORKING IT OUT

"Where's the pipeline?" Mr. Slaughter asks Mr. Hamilton.

"In an orchard."

"Well, that 18-inch rule is just to protect the pipe from heavy equipment, and he isn't going to have any heavy equipment in an orchard; he'd damage the tree roots. Does not that regulation say the pipe has to be 18 inches except when local conditions do not permit?"

"Yes," says Mr. Hamilton.

"Then let's put it under that local conditions paragraph," suggests Mr. Slaughter. He adds in a firm voice: "Approved."

The others nod. Mr. Michaelis will get his subsidy.

Another case involves cotton allotments for Wayne Murray and Andy Wheat, whose farms are separated by a river. Recently the curving river was straightened, causing Mr. Murray to claim 9 more acres of land, with 3 more acres allotment, on his side of the river. Mr. Wheat, however, also claims the land and the allotment, and the case is going to court. But meanwhile, both farmers have planted cotton under the disputed 3 acres of allotment.

Should neither one, or both, be allowed to use the 3-acre allotment?

Says Mr. Slaughter, "We'll let Wheat plant under his regular allotment, which includes the 3 acres. And we'll let Murray go as 'unknowingly overplanted' this year so he won't be penalized for the 3 acres."

IN FAVOR OF THE FARMER

Some county committeemen, when they don't understand the regulations, have been known to assume they're in favor of the farmer. Consider the case of L. H. Bendoski and Dr. Arthur Carlson who, improperly although apparently unintentionally, switched 100 acres of cotton allotment for 3 years in Tulare County.

Late in 1957 Mr. Bendoski wanted an additional allotment, but he couldn't buy or rent one; this is illegal. However, since cotton allotments are made to farms (not to the farmers themselves), he bought Dr. Carlson's nearby 320 acres which carried a 100-acre allotment. He was entitled to the allotment along with the 320 acres.

The county committee approved the transfer of allotment, but to make sure the allotment alone wasn't traded and the land turned back to Dr. Carlson, Mr. Bendoski had to promise to actually farm the land himself.

Nevertheless, from 1958 to 1960 Dr. Carlson farmed the land. The violation was accidentally discovered late in 1960 and both men were penalized.

But why didn't Jackson Phillips, county committeeman in 1958, spot the violation long before? Mr. Phillips farmed right across the road from Dr. Carlson's 320 acres for years, and he saw the doctor's men farming the 320 acres in 1958, when Mr. Bendoski was supposed to be farming the land.

In a hearing held earlier this year, Mr. Phillips testified that he thought Mr. Bendoski had leased the land back to Dr. Carlson, but he didn't seem sure this constituted a violation. His confusion is readily understandable; in some cases a leaseback is permissible, in some cases it's not, and it sometimes comes down to splitting hairs to determine which is which, an agriculture official concedes.

AN ASSUMPTION WAS MADE

In any event, Mr. Phillips apparently just assumed that a lease was permissible and so didn't even bother to investigate. Asked an incredulous Government attorney at the hearing:

"Although you yourself suspected there might be a leaseback agreement, as you stated, you made no further inquiries, or didn't investigate that any further?"

Mr. Phillips: "No, I don't believe we did at the time."

In at least one case a county committee staff member did not make any bland assumptions about the rules; he just evaded them. Joe Short, office manager for the Pinal County Committee in Arizona, sold cotton allotments, some of which didn't even exist, for some $20 an acre between 1954 and 1957. Mr. Short's scheme worked this way:

Through a clerical error, Panol Farmer Julian Woodruff got a duplicate allotment of about 74 acres. Mr. Woodruff's wife informed Mr. Short, but instead of voiding the duplicate, as is normally done, Mr. Short transferred it to an abandoned farm, listed as farm 595. He then invented a farmer whom he named, "W. R. Burns."

For about $20 an acre, Mr. Short leased "Mr. Burns' " farm, and its cotton allotment, to a real live Pinal farmer, Rex Neely. He also made up some six additional acres of allotment out of thin air and sold them to Mr. Neely. By 1957 Mr. Short had collected some $4,780 this way.

But someone tipped off Agriculture Department officials. Following an investigation, Mr. Short was tried and convicted of accepting bribes and making false record entries. He was sentenced to 6 months in jail and placed on 5 years' probation. Mr. Neely was found guilty of bribing Mr. Short and was fined $1,000.

Comparing Recoveries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, since the President's review of the Nation's economy last week, many of us have pointed out that a number of important facts were omitted from that report. One of these is the fact that the economy has failed to rebound as strongly in the last year as it did after previous business recessions.

The Buffalo Evening News presented an analysis of this business lag in its editorial columns of August 15, 1962, and I request unanimous consent to have the editorial "Comparing Recoveries," printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of all concerned.

The article follows:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Aug. 15, 1962]

COMPARING RECOVERIES

In his no-tax-cut speech President Kennedy pointed rather proudly to six charts labeled "Indicators of Recovery." These showed varying rates of increase in the last 18 months for production, incomes, profits, etc.

What the charts did not show, though, is how this recovery compares with those following the three other post-World War II recessions. Yet this is the whole story—the lagging pace of this recovery—that has provoked all the concern among economists and all the clamor for tax reductin to spur the economy's growth.

Here, as nearly as we can calculate them, are the approximate comparisons Mr. Kennedy did not give—showing how the six figures he used (first column) compare with the recovery pace during the similar 15- to 18-month periods following the 1958, 1954, and 1949 recessions:

[Percent]

	1961–62	1958–59	1954–55	1949–50
Gross national product (up)	10	12	11	16
Unemployment rate (down)	23	34	43	66
Wages and salaries (up)	10	10	10	15
Industrial products (up)	16	26	13	34
Disposable personal income (up)	8	8	9	14
Corporate profits before taxes (up)	26	63	33	82

Thus, the recovery of the last 18 months, while entitling the President to point to economic gains since he took office, has been slower when measured against any one of his indicators than the average pace following the last three recessions. Nothing there to boast about.

The charts used in this speech, in short, were geared to a political timetable, not to any economic yardstick.

Politically, this administration (having only presided over a slow-gaited recovery phase of the business cycle) is naturally interested in comparing where we are now with where we were when it came in. But to every economist—including this administration's top economic advisers—the only really significant comparisons are between the pace of this recovery and that of previous recoveries.

And this comparison, as the President well knows, gives more cause for concern than satisfaction. For "the fact of the matter is that there's been a slowdown in our growth * * * really since the beginning of 1957." And this problem his administration is thus far no closer to solving than was its predecessor.

Have Navy Retireds Been Deprived of Hospital Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John J. Ford:

HAVE NAVY RETIREDS BEEN DEPRIVED OF HOSPITAL RIGHTS?

(By John J. Ford)

The question of adequate medical care for retired military men has gotten increasing attention of late. It will get increased attention in the coming years as the retired rolls swell. Some 362,000 will be on the rolls in fiscal 1963, an increase of 48,000 over the present year. By 1979, over 1 million will be on the retired list. Medical care for these people is getting attention from two sources, those who want to assure that they get care and those who don't want the Government to pay for it. So far, the latter group appears to be ahead.

The House Appropriations Committee has told Defense not to plan on retired people in building new hospitals and Defense has, accordingly, reduced the capacity of planned hospitals. Retired people are eligible for care in military hospitals on a space-available basis. With Defense's new approach and with steadily increasing size of the retired group, it won't be long before very little space is available.

In the case of the Long Beach naval hospital, the Senate cut to 350 beds the 500-bed structure asked by Defense. While nobody is saying so publicly, the real fight over size was due to the belief that only part of the request was really needed for active duty people and that the rest of the beds would be used for retired personnel.

Early this year, Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, pointed out that before 1943, Navy people contributed 20 cents a month to a hospital fund and because of this they always believed they would receive hospital care when retired. They should get it, HÉBERT says. Many retired Navy men will also tell you, often in rather bitter tones, that they were also led to believe their contribution would assure care after retirement.

I would like to use this fund idea, in this and succeeding columns, to propose a possible solution to the vexing problem of care for the aging military man.

But first, let's look into the history of this hospital fund, which was surely one of the most enduring laws on the books, and which leaves some very interesting and unanswered questions about the rights of retired Navy men to hospital care. The fund grew out of a law passed in 1799 by the third session of the fifth Congress that authorized the Secretary of the Navy to deduct 20 cents a month from the pay of each officer, seaman, and marine and give it to the Treasury for a special hospital fund. The law amended a 1798 law providing hospital care for merchant seamen.

An act of 1811 amended the 1799 law to provide a separate fund for the Navy and allow using it for building hospitals. It set up a Commission on Hospitals to select sites and required the fund to provide permanent asylum for "disabled and decrepit Navy officers, seamen, and marines." The law also provided that all fines from courts-martial and all money forfeited by deserters were to be paid into the fund.

The problem had been that Navy men were cared for in civilian hospitals and the service had no control of the quality of care or of the men. Of $73,000 in the fund in 1811, $55,000 was contributed by Navy men and marines. Of this $50,000 was taken out to start the Navy fund. The rest was left in a merchant seaman's fund.

There was some trouble in the early years when it was found the funds were illegally used for other purposes—including pay of personnel. But it was straightened out, the Secretary of the Navy replaced the Hospital Commissioners as sole trustee of the fund and in July 1832 Congress appropriated money from the fund—not from the U.S. Treasury—to build hospitals at Brooklyn, N.Y., Pensacola, Fla., and Boston, and the Naval Home in Philadelphia.

An interesting thing about the fund is that the contribution was always 20 cents. Back in the days when a sailor made a cool $9 a month, that was a healthy sum. All Navy men, active and retired, contributed and all retired men got care at Navy facilities.

On several occasions Congress took actions that clearly recognized the assets belonged to the trust. For example, when the land of the old Brooklyn hospital was sold in 1890 for $92,000, the money was credited to the fund.

The naval hospitals at Chelsea, Mass., Portsmouth, N.H., and Newport, R.I., were built with money from the fund. Not a penny of Government money went into their original construction. Over the years the fund provided over $2 million for construction at various hospitals.

There were half a million dollars in the fund when Congress voted to abolish it in 1943. The law, Public Law 73 of the 78th Congress, abolished only the fund. It provided the money was to be put in the General Treasury of the United States.

But it did not liquidate the assets of the trust. There is no legislation which especially relieves the Secretary of the Navy of his responsibilities for the trust. There is even a Navy Judge Advocate General's opinion of March 1959 which said that neither Navy Department inactivity or any action of Congress has deprived the Secretary of the Navy of his powers for running the trust. There is no record of the Government legally taking over assets of the trust.

You could even start a nice legal argument as to whether the trust still owns some Navy hospitals.

Though it has never been made public, there is even a JAG opinion which says nothing in the law operates to deprive a Navy man who had contributed to the fund of his rights under the trust. Presumably, that would mean he still has a right to hospital care.

But the Congress, through its appropriation action, has said retired men don't have a right to care—only a privilege. A privilege to be granted if space is available.

It is not inconceivable that some day a retired Navy man who had contributed to the fund and who was denied care in a Navy hospital might go to court to find out just what his rights are.

It is interesting to find that during the hearings in 1943, committee members foresaw what might happen. Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, then chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, repeatedly questioned whether men would be as well taken care of when hospital costs were met by direct appropriations. Of a fleet reservist, he said, "he has acquired his right by his contribution."

The Navy asked the fund be abolished at that time to simplify accounting. Deducting 20 cents a month from every man's pay was burdensome, particularly in the combat zone. The bill as sent to Congress would have taken an annual deduction of $2.40 to be paid directly to the Treasury by the Navy. This, it was discovered, had been added by the Budget Bureau. The committee cut it out on the grounds Navy men shouldn't have to pay for things Army men get free.

In presenting the bill Rear Adm. L. Sheldon, Jr., Marine Corps, said this: "We had thought at first we would ask to have it done away with for the duration of the war, and then, after further thought on that, the Surgeon General decided we could trust the Congress to give us the money * * * and that it would not be necessary to go back to this tax." The Surgeon General, it seems, was too trusting in one respect.

Representative George Bates (father of the WILLIAM BATES who is now a member of the Armed Services Committee) wanted the $500,000 in the fund at that time to go to Navy relief or some other fund for Navy people: "This is the naval personnel's money and I would go so far as to have the money turned over to a proper relief organization in the Navy for their own use and benefit."

Representative Mel Maas told him it was a worthy objective but "you'll never pass the bill that way." Maas, who later went on active duty as a brigadier general in the Marines and who refused to stop working even though it meant the loss of his sight, led the movement in the subcommittee to approve the bill abolishing the fund. His main point was that the contribution was an arbitrary checkage against Navy men and Marines while the Army got care without such contributions. It was he who moved to amend the bill by striking out the Budget Bureau's $2.40 a year clause. He pointed out that Army dependents used to get care at minimum cost while Navy families did not.

Representative Patrick H. Drewry, Democrat, of Virginia, was against abolishing the contribution: "It strikes me this is a kind of insurance that the men are getting for themselves by paying this small amount, * * * It is perfectly right if the man doesn't mind doing it and if it gives better hospitalization."

I will refer to the curious history of this fund again next week to propose something that might insure better hospitalization for all service retired people and a return of rights to these Navy men. But to keep the thinking caps on, think of the fund that could be built up with 20 cents a month or a bit more from each person on the ever-growing retired rolls and reflect how many would have objected to $2.40 a year contribution to assure medical care after retirement.

Another congressional development: Senate Judiciary subcommittee staff members have been touring bases in Europe in connection with their probe of how servicemen's constitutional rights are protected. The group is hoping to have a report ready before the end of this session. It will probably recommend some changes in the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Rochester Courier, the Rochester Observer, and Newmarket News, Rochester, N.H., of April 26, 1962, "Perversion of Advertising."

The editorial discusses the testimony Mr. Michael Daroff, president of Botany Industries, gave recently before the Senate committee considering quality stabilization legislation.

Mr. Daroff has been in the business of manufacturing nationally advertised brands of men's clothing for 40 years. He estimates he has spent more than $40 million in advertising to promote his brand name, the business of his 2,700 independent dealers, and to protect the consumer.

Mr. Daroff urges passage of the quality stabilization legislation because consumers "need the protection of the quality stabilization bill which would give the trademark owner the right to deny the use of his trademark to those retailers using deceptive and dishonest practices upon unwary customers."

Mr. Daroff, whose outstanding experience qualifies him to speak with authority on this important subject, is joined by the clothing industry at large and many other American manufacturers in urging passage of this very much needed legislation.

The editorial follows:

[From the Rochester (N.H.) Courier, the Rochester Observer and Newmarket News, Apr. 26, 1962]

PERVERSION OF ADVERTISING

"Who steals my purse, steals trash," wrote Shakespeare some time ago. "But he that filches from me my good name, robs me of that which not enriches him, and makes me poor indeed.".

Which is roughly what Michael Daroff, president of Botany Industries and manufacturer of two nationally-advertised brands of men's clothing, told the Senate Commerce Subcommittee that is currently pondering a bill to protect hard-won public good will from retail gyp artists.

Mr. Daroff has been in the business 40 years, began producing brand-name clothing 21 years ago and now makes over a million units a year. Since then, he estimates, he has spent more than $40 million in advertising to promote his brand name, the business of his 2700 independent dealers and protect the consumer. The latter, he says, is confused by the current "revolution in retailing," is at the mercy of many "sharp operators." He needs the protection of the quality stabilization bill "which would give the trademark owner the right to deny the use of his trademark to those retailers using deceptive and dishonest practices upon unwary customers."

In his testimony, Mr. Daroff cited the case of a discounter who advertised one of his brands at "an extremely cut-rate price." A clothing expert whom he sent out to "shop" this bargain reported 150 of the nationally branded suits priced as "bait" for the gullible and 700 cheap suits with an unknown label at the same price. On asking about the shoddy suits, the shopper was told they, too, "were made by the 'Botany 500' firm. They just put a different label on them."

Unless the quality stabilization bill is passed, declared the witness, his firm cannot protect its brand names and the small businessmen throughout the country who are its dealers from such unprincipled operators. Nor can a brand-name manufacturer protect his public if that name is permitted to be used as a decoy to attract customers who are then switched to cheap, poor quality unidentified clothing. The net result, he said, can only be higher prices, not lower.

We suspect Mr. Daroff's sentiments are shared not only by the clothing industry at large, but by American manufacturers in general—and certainly by all reputable retailers. And we, the customers, join in applauding him when he says:

"We are old-fashioned enough to believe that we can never go broke by giving the consumer as much as he pays for and a little bit more. We are not trying to be noble or generous. We simply know this is good business."

So, we would think, is that quality stabilization bill.

Mr. Speaker, a significant clarification of the discounter's interest in the quality stabilization bill has been made possible by Earl Lifshey in his widely read column of August 10 in Home Furnishings Daily. Mr. Lifshey quotes D. Buddy Goldman, vice president of the nationally known Todd's Discount Stores of Washington, D.C., who says the quality stabilization bill is in the best interest of the retailer—including the discounter—and the consumer.

Mr. Goldman's frank comments serve to correct a basic misconception regarding the quality stabilization bill. This bill is not directed against any class of reseller, but is directed specifically at unfair practices, regardless of who commits them.

Mr. Goldman further makes abundantly clear that the quality stabilization bill is completely harmonious with our free competitive enterprise system. Mr. Goldman says that if a manufacturer believes it can successfully merchandise its products and compete with others on a resale price maintenance basis, why shouldn't it have the right to do business that way?

When the quality stabilization law is enacted, the brand name manufacturer will have a choice to take risks in marketing his products by specifying certain conditions governing the use of his trademark. The manufacturer can either use the law or forget it. And both the consumer and the reseller will similarly have complete freedom of choice under a quality stabilization law.

The complete text of Mr. Lifshey's recent column follows:

[From the Home Furnishings Daily, Aug. 10, 1962]

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

WASHINGTON.—When a man bites dog, that's news, as we say in the trade. And when a well-known discounter says he believes in price maintenance—but not for the reasons usually attributed to discounters—that is news too. Or at least it sounds like it.

"I sincerely believe a manufacturer of branded merchandise should have the right to establish and maintain the retail selling price on his merchandise if he so desires," D. "Buddy" Goldman, vice president of Todd's Discount Stores, here, told me. "And you can quote me on that. Yes, I'm in favor of the quality stabilization (or so-called Madden or Harris) bill now before Congress. And I'm not saying that because I'm thinking of established list prices that discounters can cut. I just think a manufacturer should have as much freedom of choice as anyone else."

Coming from such a spokesman those words take on added interest. Todd's, it will be recalled, has been doing battle for some time now with the FTC on the much-publicized matter of using list prices, and now has its case on appeal to the full Commission. If it loses, it plans to take its case to the courts. Meanwhile, it enjoys the questionable distinction of being almost the only retailer in this area to continue the use of manufacturer's list prices in its advertising.

"Where a manufacturer wants to maintain his prices and he has the right to do so we respect that right," the Todd official explained. Prices on Corning glassware are maintained in the firm's Maryland stores where there are fair trade laws, but in the District of Columbia stores, where there is no such law, prices are cut, he said. "It's our right to do that if we want to. Of course, if there were a law here we'd respect it just as we do in Maryland."

The absence of such a law, he continued, has hurt not only manufacturers and retailers but the consumers as well. "Let me give you a good example—the Sunbeam hair dryer. If I'm not mistaken, Sunbeam originated the hooded hair dryer; it's a very good item but we haven't carried it for about a year and a half now and we don't intend to.

"Why? We can't afford to; it's been footballed to death so that there's no longer any money in it. Yet people keep coming in to ask for it and no doubt it's costing Sunbeam money to create that demand. But we can't accommodate the people who want it. Either they have to accept something else—which they might not feel is as good—or go elsewhere. If Sunbeam believes it can successfully merchandise its products and compete with others on a price maintenance basis, why shouldn't it have the right or choice to do business that way?"

Well, that's what the man said.

Resolutions of Zionist Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rerord, I include the following resolutions adopted at the recent national convention of the Zionist Organization of America in Washington, D.C. These resolutions commend themselves as thoughtful and realistic guidelines to promote Middle Eastern peace in the national interest of the United States. They deserve the attention and study of the Congress:

RESOLUTIONS ON U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

We note with appreciation the eloquent words of the President of the United States in his warmly worded message to this convention: "This Nation, from the time of President Woodrow Wilson, has established and continued a tradition of friendship with Israel because we are committed to all free societies that seek a way to peace and honor, individual right. We seek peace and prosperity for all of the Middle East, firm in our belief that a new spirit of comity in that important part of the world would serve the highest aspiration and interest of all nations." We urge upon our Government resolute and consistent measures to promote these ends and thus counter the mounting dangers to the peace of the world inherent in the threat of a new conflagration in the Middle East.

1. Policy of belligerency maintained by the Arab States is a continued threat to the goals of peace striven for by the United States and the free world. This policy of Arab belligerency expresses itself in boycott and threats of warfare against Israel. In recent months this culminated in Syrian acts of aggression on Israel's northern border which forced Israel to resort to measures of self-defense. We deeply deplore the action of the U.N. Security Council on censuring Israel for what was an act of self-defense as a grave miscarriage of justice and regret that the U.S. representative supported that resolution.

2. We note with growing concern the continued threats of the Arab countries to renew full-scale hostilities, threats escalated through the stepped-up flow of modern arms to the Arab countries, and in particular to Egypt, supplied by the Soviet Union. This flow of arms threatens to create an imbalance in the Middle East, which might be an open invitation to the renewal of hostilities and thereby constitute a grave threat to peace.

3. The spirit of comity in the Middle East, which we support, demands ever-increased economic development of the area. This economic development, however, has been retarded by the increased resources devoted to armaments. The armament burden borne by the Middle East countries constitutes a heavy liability on the economy of those nations, depressing the standards of living of the peoples of the entire region. We therefore urge upon our Government continued generous and farsighted aid to the region, taking into account that such aid should not contribute to the military buildup of those states threatening the stability of the entire Middle East.

4. American economic aid has made a major contribution to the progress and well-being of the State of Israel. Israel has demonstrated that it can make the most effective use of this aid, helping it to achieve a standard to fill the rising expectations of its growing population. We urge our Government to continue this policy.

5. The Arab refugees are being exploited by the Arab leaders in order to exert pressure on Israel. We are convinced that this issue should be squarely faced by our Government * * *.

6. Being convinced that peace and stability of the Middle East can only be achieved through the abandonment of the attitude and hostility maintained by the Arab governments in the Middle East, we regret that U.S. representatives found it necessary to oppose the resolution sponsored by 16 small nations during the 16th U.N. General Assembly advocating direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab nations. In this connection we recall the words of President Kennedy at the 63d Annual Convention of the ZOA in New York on August 25, 1960: "I propose to waste no time in taking the initiative" (in speaking of direct negotiations). We call upon our Government to press for the settlement of the Arab-Israel dispute peacefully through direct negotiations, even as the United States stands for this same approach in all issues of international conflict.

The Zionist Organization of America, deeply convinced that peace to the Middle East can only come through agreement and not by force, wholeheartedly endorses the recent declaration by Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, by a substantial majority of their numbers, from which we quote: "We believe that the issues which divide Israel and the Arab States must be resolved in the spirit and the service of peace. This can be done only after leaders of Israel and the Arab nations agree to meet honorably in recognition of the mutual right to free existence in peace. There is no effective alternative."

In this spirit we urge upon our Government the practical application of these principles through a dynamic and unequivocable policy designed to promote the constructive pursuits of peace and the strengthening of freedom.

Embottled Fidel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, of necessity we maintain a close surveillance of the situation in Cuba and examine the prospects whereby the Cuban people might be freed from their present Communist government. The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial appearing last Friday, August 17, reported on some recent developments within the country. I believe their comments are of such a penetrating nature that they should be called to the attention of the Members of Congress. I therefore insert the editorial entitled "Embottled Fidel" in the Record.

The editorial follows:

EMBOTTLED FIDEL

The word from Havana is that Fidel Castro is drinking more and more heavily. What particularly worries his colleagues, it seems, is that the drunker he gets, the longer he insists on performing before the television cameras. There is nobody who dares to shut him off the air.

We can understand the frustration of a man whose rash promises of plenty have turned into a nightmare of shortages. Nearly everything that the Cuban needs is rationed or unavailable, and now even the sugar crop—Cuba's only significant source of foreign exchange—has proved to be only two-thirds of its normal size—thanks to the "natural calamities" which seem to occur whenever a country tries to socialize its farms.

To fulfill their barter commitments to Russia and have any sugar left to sell elsewhere, Cubans will have to get along on next to no sugar themselves—and this means no rum. Fortunately Castro can still obtain the rum with which to drown his sorrows. Most Cubans may, if they wish, sit up all night, vicariously satisfying their thirst by watching their leader perform on television, and reflecting on the great and noble achievements of socialism.

The Federal-Aid Roadbuilding Program in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years, Massachusetts has been the subject of a considerable amount of unfavorable publicity concerning its Federal-aid roadbuilding program.

At this time it is pleasant for me to call to the attention of my colleagues that currently and for sometime the Federal-aid roadbuilding program in the Bay State, under the capable and constructive direction of the department of public works commissioner, Jack Ricciardi, has been operating under new rules and procedures to eliminate waste and inefficiency, and to give the motorist more for his gasoline tax dollar.

It is a testimonial to the abilities of Jack Ricciardi that the roadbuilding program is progressing in such a manner that the Bay State is now only the fourth State down in the national average in getting its interstate work under construction.

Among the certain reforms and innovations that have been instituted or expanded by Jack Ricciardi during the past 2 years and have resulted in Massachusetts interstate roadbuilding program making great progress and obtaining commendation—have been:

Right-of-way: The review appraiser's section has been established in the right-of-way division to provide additional complete review of all appraisals submitted and to establish a damage figure acceptable to the Bureau of Public Roads.

The standard department appraisal report form has been drastically revised to comply with the latest requirements of the bureau of public works. New sheets covering lists of comparable sales and analysis of comparable sales have been added to the standard appraisal form to satisfy the Bureau of Public Roads documentation requirements.

A member of the right-of-way office staff has been delegated to act as liaison between the right-of-way division, the department of public works voucher and accounting section, and the bureau of public works division audit office.

Waterways division: In the past, consultant contracts were open-end contracts, so-called, which meant a contract was written with an authorization for a certain amount, and if there were need of an additional allotment, a report would be presented to the board for approval and the amount of the contract would be increased by the amount of the approved allotment. Under the present system all consultant contracts now contain a statement, as follows

> The total payment under all items of this contract shall not exceed the sum of $———.

This results in a more positive check of funds expended for consulting services.

In the past, division personnel previously investigated and reported as to the lowest responsible bidder on waterways construction contracts. Under the present system, this function has been transferred to the highway contract engineer, in order to coordinate and prevent duplications of work by the highway and waterways sections.

In the past, the accounting and finance functions of the waterways were handled by a section of the division. Under the present system, the accounting functions and records of the division are under the supervision of the supervisor of the fiscal management of the department.

Designs and construction: The department now requires consultant design engineers to carry a professional services liability insurance that shall indemnify and save harmless the Commonwealth, its officers, agents and employees from claims, suits, actions, damages, and costs of every name and description resulting from errors and omissions in the work performed by them.

The department has revised the method of computation and payment on consultant design engineer contracts based on a predetermined table of unit prices in lieu of actual construction bids.

Written certification is now required of contractors verifying that the work for which they are being paid on semimonthly pay estimates has in fact been done.

All project personnel are now required to keep diaries over and over the diary kept by the resident engineer for check-and-balance purposes. These diaries must be initialed by the construction engineer in the district.

Location and survey: The department, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads and the U.S. Geological Survey, has now in operation a statewide mapping for the inventory of sources of construction material.

Employing photogrammetry, the department introduced a new method of preparing plans of highways as built.

Traverse notebooks used by survey parties have been redesigned so that traverse information can be readily transferred to punchcards for electric computer calculations.

Traffic: For years this department had used automatic traffic counters to determine information required by the bureau of public works. The dissemination of this information on the tape into useful form was a long and tedious process. Last year, 40 electronic-type devices on which the information is recorded on a punch tape was put into operation. Now, information which formerly took days of manual labor can be obtained automatically in minutes.

Previous to 1961, exit numbers on limited access highways consisted of a distinct number for each exit. In cases such as full cloverleafs, for instance, there would be two numbers at the same interchange, that is a separate number for each respective exit ramp. In 1962, a new system was put into effect in which a single number was assigned to each interchange. In the case of a full interchange, such as a cloverleaf, the letters "N," "S," "E," or "W" were added after the number to indicate the direction in which the motorist would be traveling upon reaching the connecting roadway. At intersections, such as diamond interchanges, and those in which ramps were missing in certain quadrants, the cardinal direction letter would be omitted. The value of this new type of marking is that the respective interchanges are numbered consecutively and that a motorist knows immediately by the designation of the exit whether that particular exist is to the north, south, east, or west and wherever he sees an exit so marked he can presume that there is another exist for the opposite direction. He can also presume that in the absence of a cardinal direction letter there is only one point of exit at this particular interchange. This particular method of exist marking was developed entirely by this department and has received considerable widespread favorable comments.

Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy To Take Possession of Naval Oil Shale Reserves

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need to debate the merits of this resolution. I only want to make one observation. Even though this particular source of natural gas is to be developed by the Federal Government, the Committee on Rules was assured the distribution of it is to a non-Federal responsibility. It is to be by a non-Federal distributing corporation. The record is to be made abundantly clear that we are not establishing a precedent for engaging the Department of Defense in developing this natural resource or any other similar source of energy.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Too Many Drug and Pill Racketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. B. Snyder, editor and publisher of the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune calls on the Congress to act in this session on legislation to protect the health of millions from the "goof pill" menace.

The editorial follows:

HAPPY PILLS AREN'T ENOUGH

The tragic story of thalidomide, which has been indicted for causing deformities in thousands of infants, concerns more than the issue of better regulation of new drugs.

The need for tighter control over testing procedures appears clear. Thalidomide has dramatized the situation and, unless Congress gets even further bogged down, some sort of a law dealing with it should be enacted in this session.

But the whole matter raises the fundamental question of why so many modern men—or more particularly, women—seem to have become so dependent upon pills to help them face the strains of living.

Undoubtedly the new transquilizers have been a major medical discovery. They are becoming an increasingly valuable adjunct in the treatment of mental illnesses.

But their eager acceptance by average, "normal" persons who gobble them up by the billions each year, may constitute for some a flight from reality not dissimilar to that of the alcoholic.

A psychiatrist, Dr. Don D. Jackson of Stanford University's Palto Alto Medical Research Foundation, recently warned that the current emphasis on "happy pills" in the treatment of mental illnesses is misleading the public into thinking that a pill will one day cure any type of mental or emotional trouble.

He fears it may "discourage the public from facing the unpleasant facts about the administration and treatment of mental disorders."

The "unpleasant" facts are that, while body chemistry is involved in mental illnesses, these disorders arise from human relationships and are best treated by "simple human measures."

Jackson draws an analogy between headaches and aspirin. While no one denies that aspirin relieves headaches, the ailment is almost often the result of stressful social situations.

"All of us," he says, "are only too eager to deny an effect on our children and others around us. * * * It is small wonder that parents are intrigued by heredity and chemical explanations of their child's emotional problems."

The same thing can possibly be said of the sometimes vexing give-and-take of ordinary living, the clash of personalities, the burden of responsibilities each of us carries, or the psychological disturbances that come with pregnancy—and the sale of tranquilizers and barbituates. We are looking for an easy way out of our problems. Sometimes the easy way is the worst way.

Meanwhile, Congress should give quick and careful thought to the new test regulations proposed by HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze, and to President Kennedy's request. There is argument over other matters concerning the drug industry, but there should be none over the simple issue of human safety. The Public should be assured that any drug permitted on the market is safe as well as effective.

Captive Nations Week Points to a Special House Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, as we all well know, the 1962 Captive Nations Week was observed by Americans throughout the country. This annual occasion provided our people the opportunity to rethink our foreign policy directions and goals with special stress placed on the two dozen captive nations in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. At the numerous rallies held across the Nation strong support was manifested for a strong, uncompromising stand on West Berlin, for determined opposition to the admission of Red China into the U.N., and for the establishment of a cold war apparatus to cope with the challenges of Moscow and Peiping in every quarter of the world.

In adidtion to these and other themes, Mr. Speaker, there was the major theme of creating a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The week, as such, has passed, but the actionism it generated has pointed to the necessity for such a committee in our legislative body. Surely the basic value and strategic importance of all the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union warrant a special committee—one that would systematically and seriously examine all the captive nations; one that would enlighten our own people about this prime and formidable weapon of freedom in the cold war; one that would steadily focus the attention of our people and those in other parts of the free world.

We know all too well that no existing committee in the House is capable of undertaking this heavy task. The time, the planning, and the resources demanded by this necessary task would far exceed the normal requirements of any subcommittee that may temporarily concern itself with this all-important subject. I am certain that this fact will be established presently.

Mr. Speaker, we still have time in this session of Congress to pass a resolution calling for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The Rules Committee has delayed action on this measure far too long. Many of our Members, including myself, have wondered why that committee has not at least voted on the measure.

In the months ahead, quite a number of us shall have to account to our constituents, and I know that questions bearing on this matter will have to be answered. This long delay in the Rules Committee has been inexcusable. I now call again upon its membership to consider and vote on the resolution proposing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Concerning the 1962 Captive Nations Week, and this whole issue, I submit the following interesting material to be appended to my remarks: First. The "Proclamation of the Week" by Mayor Chester Kowal of the city of Buffalo; second, Buffalo's program of events on Captive Nations Week Observance; third, two Buffalo Evening News accounts for July 17 and July 18 on the participation of the Honorable William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, in the celebration; fourth, the program of the Ukrainian Student Association of Greater Buffalo on Captive Nations Week; and fifth, excerpts from a paper prepared by Dr. Lev. E. Dobiansky, of Georgetown University, which appeared in the World issue of April 17, 1962, under the caption, "Captive Nations Policy Cleavages Are Detailed."

The material follows:

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF BUFFALO, OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

Whereas western civilization has been called to man the ramparts of liberty, freedom, human rights, and the dignity of man as events of our times warn us that we are locked in a life and death struggle with the organized forces of aetheistic communism; and

Whereas the struggle in which we are engaged will decide the issue whether the nations and peoples of the world shall be free or whether they shall be condemned to a life of tyranny under imperial Russian communism; and

Whereas the aspirations for freedom and national independence held by the peoples of captive Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Albania, and others, serve as a powerful brake on the aggressive actions of Moscow and makes these captive peoples proven allies of the United States; and

Whereas we serve the cause of peace and freedom when we demonstrate our support for the just aspirations of the peoples in all the captive nations; Now, therefore,

I, Chester Kowal, mayor of the city of Buffalo, do proclaim July 15 through 22, 1962, to be Captive Nations Week and urge the people of our city to observe this week with prayers, religious observations, and public ceremonies which demonstrate support for the just aspirations of the peoples of all the captive nations.

CHESTER KOWAL,
Mayor of Buffalo.

THE CITY OF BUFFALO OFFICIALLY SALUTES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE, JULY 15 THROUGH 22, 1962, PROGRAM OF EVENTS

MESSAGE FROM THE MAYOR

Western civilization has been called to man the ramparts of liberty, freedom, human rights and the dignity of man as events of our times warn us that we are locked in a life-and-death struggle with organized tyranny on the march.

The struggle in which we are engaged has been forced upon us by an enemy dedicated to the destruction everywhere of free institutions, self-government, and the administration of justice. There is no escape from this conflict which now reaches into every home and places a heavy hand upon the life of every citizen of our beloved country. We are faced with the alternative of winning this conflict or bit by bit submitting to an enemy who already holds one-third of the world in human bondage. Our self-declared enemy permits us no other choice but total victory for freedom's cause or total surrender of our American heritage. Imperial and atheistic Russian communism has declared itself as the avowed enemy of all free men.

In this conflict the weapons of war are primarily political and secondarily military. In both arsenals the United States holds a decisive superiority. Should we fail to make maximum use of all weapons in our political arsenal, we will be compelled to fall back upon the use of all the weapons in our military arsenal. We are, therefore, morally bound to employ, fully and wisely, all the weapons in our political arsenal so that we may avoid employment of the terrible weapons in our military arsenal.

The aspirations of the hundreds of millions of non-Russian peoples in the captive nations behind the Russian imperial curtain form the most potent weapon in the political arsenal of the free world. This finding of fact was made by the Congress of the United States in the enactment of Public Law 86–90.

Specifically, the Congress made a finding that "the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace." Our goal has been and remains, a peaceful world in which justice permeates the affairs of all nations and all mankind. In pursuit of this goal we have millions of active allies behind the Russian imperial curtain who share with us the great political and moral ideals which are the hallmark of western civilization.

The official observance of Captive Nations Week provides an opportunity for the citizens of our city to express their concern for the plight of the people in the captive nations, to strengthen our alliance with them, and to advance the cause of a just peace. Large numbers of our citizens take pride in their historic connections with many of the captive nations and it is natural that they should express a special concern for the relatives and friends who anxiously await their emancipation from godless communism. But the cause of the captive nations is the cause of all our citizens because it involves the future of human freedom and the destiny of our Nation.

CHESTER KOWAL,
Mayor.

HIGHLIGHTS OF EVENTS

Sunday, July 15: Prayers and religious observances in churches of the city.

1:30 p.m.: Cavalcade of cars to form at Main and Delavan; marching units, Main at Tupper; proceed to city hall.

3 p.m.: Civic opening of Captive Nations Week, McKinley Monument in front of city hall. (1) Presentation of colors; (2) national anthem; (3) invocation, Rev. Laszlo Kovacs; (4) placing of captive nations flags; (5) reading of proclamation by Mayor Kowal; (6) address, Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Congressman, 41st District of New York; (7) choral presentation; (8) benediction, Rev. Stephen Divald, S.P., Ph. D.

Wednesday, July 18, 12 noon: Civic Luncheon sponsored by the Kiwanis Club, of Buffalo Inc., Hotel Statler Hilton; tickets $2.50 (for reservations telephone TL–2–3399); speaker, Hon. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, Congressman, 10th District of Pennsylvania.

Sunday, July 22, 8 p.m.: Festival of nations, Albright Art Gallery; Buffalo Civic Orchestra under the direction of Jan Wolanek; a pageant of songs and dances of the captive nations; Speaker, Hon. Chester Kowal, Mayor of Buffalo.

All events are open to the public. No admission charge will be made except for the civic luncheon on Wednesday, July 18, at the Statler Hilton Hotel.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Honorary chairman: Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo.
Chairman: Dr. Edward M. O'Connor.
Executive secretary: David N. Getman.
Grand marshal: Arthur J. Vater.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Angel Bezeff, Macedonian Patriotic Organization.

Walter V. Chopyk, United Anti-Communist Action Committee.

James A. Cummings, commander, Erie County Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Bernhard Epermanis, Latvians of Buffalo and Vicinity.

Hon. Chester C. Gorski, president, Common Council.

Stephen Gredelj, Croatian Societies.

William Havas, Hungarian Churches and Societies of Greater Buffalo.

Olev Jarver, Estonian Club of Buffalo.

Dr. John M. Juhasz, Actio Hungarica.

Albert C. Killian, commissioner of parks.

A. O'Neill Kline, Kiwanis Club of Buffalo.

Jorend Levakoff, Bulgarian National Committee.

Alex Marashi, United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York.

Felix Mindy, Polish organizations.

Dr. Chris Mladenoff, Bulgarian National Front.

Henry J. Osinski, president, Central Council of Polish Organizations.

Lets Paluca, Albanian Independence Committee.

Nestar Procyk, M.D., Ukrainian Congress Committee.

Clement Sakas, Lithuanian Club of Buffalo.

Jivko Shumenoff, Macedonian Freedom Action.

Harvey I. Skuse, commander, Erie County American Legion.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 17, 1962]

Foe of Communist Colonialism Civic Luncheon Speaker

A veteran fighter against Soviet colonialism will be the speaker at a civic luncheon at noon tomorrow in the Statler Hilton, marking the midpoint in an 8-day observance of Captive Nations Week.

Representative William W. Scranton, of North Abington, Pa., will address the luncheon sponsored by the Kiwanis Club. City and county leaders will join the program.

Mr. Scranton, a charter member of the National Captive Nations Committee, has led a movement in Congress to establish a permanent House Committee on Captive Nations.

FESTIVAL OF NATIONS SUNDAY

Now a Republican candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Scranton has urged establishment of the committee so that "the Soviet Union might once and for all be branded as the most extensive colonial power in the world."

The final event of the Captive Nations Week will be a festival of nations program at 8 Sunday evening at Albright Art Gallery. Groups in costume will present songs and dances of their native countries.

Music will be by the Buffalo Civic Orchestra under the direction of Jan Wolanek. Mayor Kowal will speak.

The Most Reverend Joseph A. Burke, bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Buffalo, issued a statement noting the Captive Nations Week observance.

BIRTHRIGHT IS CITED

He declared that it "provides an opportunity for all to reflect upon the blessings of religious and political liberty which flow from the firm reliance on divine providence by our Founding Fathers and which are the birthright of every American."

A special prayer was written by the Right Reverend Lauriston L. Scaife, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of western New York, asking:

"Hold constantly before those who are denied the privileges of their birthright, the vision of a day, and soon may it come, when the dreaded powers of darkness and the forces of destruction become subject to Thy reign of righteousness."

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 18, 1962]

Do More To Destroy Soviet Yoke, Representative Scranton Asks—Captive Nations Week Speaker Proposes That a Special House Unit Be Created

Representative William W. Scranton today urged the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations and said that such an agency is "a strong arm which is not being used in the ideological war against communism."

The Congressman, a charter member of the National Captive Nations Committee, said Americans are not doing nearly enough to combat Russian propaganda.

Representative Scranton addressed the luncheon meeting in the Statler Hilton sponsored by the Kiwanis Club at the midweek point in the third annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

MANY ARE ENSLAVED

"I wonder if you appreciate what a powerful weapon Captive Nations Week puts in the hands of free mankind," he said. "Each year the observances have grown in strength and impact.

"Speeches made here and in many other parts of the United States and statements made in Congress all remind Americans that millions of people, once free, are now under the domination of the international Communist conspiracy.

"Freedom does not exist in a vacuum and our own liberties remain in jeopardy when people elsewhere are deprived of their right to choose their own governments, are prevented from worshiping in the churches and temples of their choice, are forbidden even to choose what kind of work they will do."

REACH MANY LANDS

"But our words carry far beyond our shores. They reach people in Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China and other subjugated nations.

"We assure them that we know of their plight and are awaiting the day when they shall rejoin the family of free nations."

The Congressman, in a second recommendation, asked that the United States reaffirm its opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

He also urged that the Voice of America expand its broadcasts to the non-Russian peoples inside the Soviet Union.

RECEIVES AN AWARD

"We must have, absolutely," Representative Scranton said, "a firm policy in resisting every pressure they (the Communists) undertake. Mr. Khrushchev said he will bury us. Every aid we give the people of the captive nations is a spadeful of earth to bury him."

The Congressman commended Buffalo for its interest in the captive nations observances and said that few cities are as devoted as is Buffalo to this cause.

Mayor Kowal, on behalf of the Citizens Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week, presented Representative Scranton the third annual Freedoms Award.

THANKFUL FOR SUPPORT

The award, in the form of a plaque is inscribed with the words: "In recognition of his enlightened and courageous advocacy of the captive nations cause and support given to their struggles for freedom and national independence 1962 Freedom Award."

Representative Scranton was introduced by Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, special projects director at Canisius College and chairman of the citizens committee.

Robert Sanborn is president of the Kiwanis Club.

Captive Nations Week—Annual Conference, July 14–15, 1962, Buffalo, N.Y.

(Federation of Ukrainian Student Organizations of America, Inc., (SUSTA); Cultural Affairs Commission; and Ukrainian Student Association of Greater Buffalo, N.Y.)

PROGRAM

Saturday, July 14, 1962

11:00-12:30—First session (official opening):

Invocation: Very Rev. N. Wojakowskyj.

Opening of the conference: Tadey Tarnawsky (University of Buffalo), president of Y.C.T. Buffalo, chairman of Cultural Afairs—SUSTA.

Presentation of guests: Zenon Deputat (Buffalo State Teachers Colleges), chairman organization affair, Y.C.T. Buffalo.

Remarks of the Honorable Chester Kowal, Mayor of the City of Buffalo.

Background of Public Law 86–90 (Captive Nations Week): Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, director of special projects at Canisius College.

"The contribution of Ukrainian students to the liberation struggle of nations held captive by Russia": Dr. Nestor Procyk.

Benediction: Very Rev. T. Krestiuk.

12:30–14:00: Intermission.

14:00–16:30—Second session:

"The question of forming a permanent congressional committee on the Captive Nations": Michael Pikas (University of Buffalo), chairman of Cultural Affairs Y.C.T. Buffalo.

The participation of the Ukrainian student in the commemoration of "The Captive Nations Week": Bohdan Futej (Western Reserve University), second vice president, SUSTA.

The question of holding an International Student Congress concerning "The Captive Nations Week": Walter D. Prybyla (Syracuse University), president of SUSTA.

Discussion: Resolutions.

16:30–21:00—Intermission, SUSTA executive board meeting.

21:00–02:00—Dance, arranger Ihor Chuma (Drexel Institute of Technology), first vice president, SUSTA, orchestra, "Serenade."

Sunday, July 15, 1962

8:00—Mass in local churches.

10:00–14:00—Excursion to Niagara Falls.

14:30–16:00—Participation in the commemoration of "The Captive Nations Week" at city hall.

16:00–??—Farewells.

[From the World, Apr. 17, 1962.]

Captive Nations Policy Cleavages Are Detailed

(Note.—One of the clearest cleavages in the developing administration foreign policy and that of many of its critics is over the question of liberation (making the freedom of the captive nations a policy goal). Here, in excerpts from a paper prepared for an upcoming report by the House Republican Policy Committee, Dr. Lev Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University (training ground for many Foreign Service officers) and chairman of the National Capitive Nations Committee, speaks forcefully for a new version of a liberation policy. He calls it, "A Win Policy of Emancipation.")

The lack of an imaginative, positive and winning policy continues to be our blight. The Kennedy policy of patched-up containment is exceedingly vulnerable. Superficial literary glitter cannot hide the acute limitations of this policy. A rash of miniature Koreas is already making its appearance. (On the basis of personal exchanges with

Kennedy in 1953–55 I am convinced that he still has no grasp of the elements of the liberation policy. His conception of the U.S.S.R. is wanting, indeed.)

Kennedy's statements on the U.S.S.R and captive nations generally make easy targets for critical and always constructive review From his inaugural message in 1961 to the present, his statements can be taken to account for inconsistency, omission, frequent lack of principle and, at times, sheer naivete.

It is an open secret that the President resisted for weeks the issuance of a Captive Nations Week Proclamation in 1961. We expect the same this year.

"EMANCIPATION" PREFERABLE USAGE

The essence of a win policy of emancipation is the same as that of the previous policy of liberation. However, because the unfortunate presentation of the latter led many to believe that liberation means the involvement of American troops in captive areas—much after the fashion of liberating areas in World War II—"emancipation" is a preferable usage. The term suggests a long-term struggle with final determination in the realm of competitive ideas and wills. The policy necessarily presupposes all the elements of containment—strong military power, allied free world undertakings, brisk economic development and the like—but it goes beyond the confines of containment by transporting the cold war to the terrain of the captive world, with emphasis placed on the Soviet Union itself.

Both the expression and the implementation of the policy would place Moscow under the constant pressure of its own theoretic affirmations regarding the status of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.; they would on this basis provide political leverage to the nationalist forces in the U.S.S.R. and deepen the insecurities of colonial Moscow within its own immediate camp.

The usual, unthinking reaction that this will lead to a hot war, is a reaction founded on a usual unfamiliarity with the relations and developments between Moscow and the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. It is a reaction produced by short or no memories of outstanding cleavages between the two in the past 40 years. Despite all its propaganda on scientific, economic, and other achievements, Moscow is in no position to wage a successful hot war so long as captive nations within and outside the U.S.S.R. have a sustained hope for eventual freedom. It will progressively be in less of such a position as this hope is steadily and positively developed among the nations and peoples about the power center, in the U.S.S.R. itself, and on theoretic and propaganda grounds proffered by Moscow itself.

Farm Wife States Her Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the story of the farmer has been told many times, but one of the warmest and most descriptive is found in an editorial in the Winona Daily News, August 9, 1962. For the benefit of our colleagues, I wish to insert the article into the RECORD:

MILAN FARM WIFE STATES HER CASE

Mrs. George A. Burns, Milan, Minn., farm wife, is just an ordinary person, she says. But she's no ordinary writer. In a letter sent recently to Gov. Elmer L. Andersen, she vigorously voices her views:

"I don't know about the rest of you farmers, but I am getting fed up with the way we are blamed for doing a good job. Every time we pick up a paper or a magazine, hear a radio or TV broadcast, we are told that the farmers are creating a terrible problem for the country. I think it is time for us farmers to start telling our country how lucky it is that we are doing a good job.

"It is ridiculous that we have allowed our wonderful talent for producing food to be turned into a criminal act. We farmers actually have guilt complexes because we are superior artists in our profession. Instead, we should be proud of it. The whole country should be proud of it. We have increased our productivity many times more than any other business in this country in the last 10 years. And it is productivity that creates wealth and progress. I think the country should set up statues in every town honoring the farmers.

"Can you think of anything better in this world than a thick, juicy steak and flaky potatoes, hot buttered rolls and apple pie? And how would you like it if you couldn't get a meal like that? Now I don't care whether the statue is a farmer mounted on a tractor or a steer with a baked potato on its back, but I think it is time that this country starts appreciating its good fortune in having talented farmers instead of cutting them to bits with sharp words.

"Agriculture used to be called the backbone of this country, but in recent years, it has slipped south a little. Of course, we farmers have been sitting back on our tractors and letting ourselves be pelted from all sides instead of telling our story. And I mean our real story, not the distorted one that makes popular reading. Our wonderful astronauts are honored for their great courage and bravery. And if you don't think it takes bravery to be a farmer these days, you aren't a farmer.

"We farmers have earned the right to hold our heads high and tell our attackers to go eat a big steak. These same attackers never stop to wonder, out loud or in print, what would happen to the price of food if we farmers weren't efficient.

"If I sound as though I think our farmers are practically Einsteins, it's because I think they are. If you don't agree, take a look at the Russian farmers. Russia, with her supposed superiority in scientific advancements, isn't in the same league with us when it comes to farming. I say that our farmers aren't a problem; they're a blessing.

"I know how much hard work, mental and physical, it takes to be a good farmer these days, and I am very proud to be a farmer. So, to all the farmers in this country, I salute you."

To all of which we say, "Amen."

A Dedicated Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, after many years of devoted service to our Government, the Honorable Harry J. Anslinger has tendered his resignation to the President because he has reached the mandatory retirement age.

It is a pleasure for me to take time today to call to the attention of my colleagues the wonderful record Mr. Anslinger compiled as U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics. No other man has held this position since this branch of the Government was formed in 1930. Therefore, there were no guidelines for Mr. Anslinger to follow when he accepted this difficult assignment. It was up to him to use his own initiative in devising a system for fighting the menace of illegal drug traffic in our country. That he has performed his duties admirably is a matter of record.

It was through Commissioner Anslinger's efforts that the serious dangers of drug addiction were forcibly brought to the attention of those who might easily fall prey to peddlers of narcotics, especially our young people.

Mr. Anslinger's keen insight into the many ramifications of this problem and his broad knowledge of the medical aspects of drug addiction, coupled with his extensive experience in law enforcement, have won him international recognition.

By strongly enforcing the narcotics laws, Mr. Anslinger is directly responsible for the decrease in new addicts reported to the Bureau in recent years. It is also gratifying to note that the potency of heroin sold illegally has decreased so sharply that addiction has generally become less severe and addicts can be withdrawn from the use of this drug in 10 to 14 days of hospital treatment. This, too, was accomplished by enforcement of law.

For his efforts in suppressing illicit traffic in drugs, which have exacted a terrific toll of human suffering, misery, and crime, Mr. Anslinger merits our most heartfelt thanks and we can truthfully say, "Well done, my good and faithful servant."

In accepting Mr. Anslinger's resignation with regret, President Kennedy asked him to remain as U.S. representative on the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs. We hope he will do this so that we can continue to have the benefit of his experience and advice in coping with this dangerous problem.

Commissioner Anslinger's retirement will deprive our Government of one of its most dedicated public servants, but we in the Congress of the United States extend to him our very best wishes for a long and happy life in the years ahead.

U.S. Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune hits the mark for an improvement in our foreign relations:

UNITED STATES SHOULD PAY THE BILL

The announced reasons for the U.S. ambassadorial switch in Paris are probably not the only ones, and perhaps not the chief ones. That's nothing unusual in the world of diplomacy.

But it also is quite likely that Gen. James M. Gavin is relinquishing the Ambassador's office to Charles E. Bohlen in part because the cost of the job was too much for his private means. And although the post is high in prestige, it is likely that Bohlen is rather unhappy about taking it. Bohlen is like Gavin in not being a man of personal wealth.

Gavin has been in Paris for about a year. One estimate is that his venture into diplomacy has cost him about $25,000 more than he has received in salary and expense allowances.

The story is the same with the Embassy in London, and to a lesser extent with some other foreign posts. The situation practically bars career diplomats from these assignments; the President must hope that, among the wealthy men who want the jobs, he can find amateur diplomats who can handle them in able fashion. They are sensitive outposts, and they ought to be filled by highly qualified men.

When there is a Charles de Gaulle to be dealt with, for example, the President should be able to name the best diplomat for handling the assignment, not merely the best among the wealthy prospects.

It's all well and good to talk of sacrifice for the Nation's sake, but this is another matter. A man can't pay out what he doesn't have. Further, there's not much that can be done about reducing expenses of the embassies. Certain things are required if the United States is to be represented in a proper and effective manner. The American people would want the bill paid by their Government, and Congress should provide for it.

As for Bohlen, we should be thankful that he is willing to draw upon his limited means in order to accept this important assignment from the Chief Executive.

Independence of Gabon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Gabon, Leon M'Ba and His Excellency the Ambassador of Gabon to the United States, Jules Mbah, on the occasion of the second anniversary of independence of the Republic of Gabon.

The Republic of Gabon, which on August 17, 1962, celebrates the second anniversary of its independence, is perhaps best known to the outside world as the locale of Dr. Albert Schweitzer's renowned bush hospital at Lambarene. In 1946, after being one of the four territories of French Equatorial Africa for 36 years, Gabon became an oversea territory within the French Union. In the referendum of 1958, the voters of Gabon chose to be an autonomous state in the French community, and it was 1 of the 16 African States to gain political independence during 1960.

The 400,000 people of Gabon, comprising nearly 40 distinct ethnic groups, are largely engaged in forestry. They provide the world with mahogany, ebony, and the valuable okoume trees, excellent for use in plywood. Up to now the principal industry in Gabon has been the processing of timber in sawmills and plants producing plywood. In recent years agriculture has become developed, including cacao, coffee and rice, and the future offers great challenge for the economy, with its manganese, uranium, and oil resources already being worked and its iron ore soon to become another large additional source of income. Hydroelectric power from the rivers will be harnessed to provide the country with energy. To achieve this goal Gabon must contend with the vastness and density of the forest, the resulting difficulties in developing an internal transportation system, and other problems relating to the climate and dispersion of the population. But the economy is being diversified and the extension of the transportation system continues. Economists predict that by 1970 Gabon may have the highest per capita income on the whole African continent.

With the coming of independence, the people of Gabon adopted a constitution reffirming the principles of the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, which are also embodied in our Declaration of Independence. The Constitution provides for freedom of conscience and religion. Gabon is a republic "indivisible, democratic, and social" and the sovereignty of the people is exercised by their representatives. President Leon M'ba, once convicted in a French court for his activities against French rule, now has led his people into freedom and a close friendship with France, as well as the entire Western World. Noting that the colonial era did not leave a heritage of bitterness, President M'Ba has declared that "Gabon is a hospitable land. Those who have trod our soil have taken away with them only happy and favorable memories." Believing with President M'Ba that "the struggle for man's freedom is a mission," we congratulate the people of Gabon on the second anniversary of their independence.

Our Industries—Jobs Sold Down the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, our own country, at one time the most prosperous country on earth, may soon turn beggar. In fact, in some instances, we have already done so. We are the only nation of consequence on earth that has more than 1,000 communities dying on the vine. We are the only civilized country on earth with 5 million unemployed. We are the only country on earth where industries are moving out instead of in. In the past 10 years more than 3,500 industries have left our United States to establish overseas. Every other industrial nation on earth is booming. Germany, France, Japan, England, and others are so prosperous that they are pleading for workers from all over the world.

We are begging countries to pay their bills to us so we can stay solvent. We are even begging Japan to establish an industry in the United States. Japan refuses unless she can bring along 25-cent-an-hour workers. More than 80,000 small businesses in our country are going broke this year. There is not a major industry in the United States that is not planning or studying the possibility of going to some foreign country in order to survive.

The United States is the only country in the world that does not protect its industries or the jobs of its workers. Every other nation on earth stops imports as soon as an industry is hurt or a single worker thrown out of a job. Every other nation on earth imports only what it needs and what it cannot produce itself. Our country is the only nation on earth that imports billions of dollars of products we already have in surplus and can produce ourselves.

In the past 16 years the U.S. Government has spent 10 times more building industries overseas than it has spent on building industries in our own country. Our gold is gone. The nations of the world are suspicious of our dollar. If these nations called for the gold due them, the United States would be $6 billion short of gold. In other words we would not have an ounce of gold left. In fact, we would $6 billion short of what we actually owe other nations. A few years ago we had over $30 billion behind our dollar and we owed nothing on it. But the crazy giveaway program of the past 16 years has reduced us to beggars.

FULL EMPLOYMENT EVERYWHERE EXCEPT UNITED STATES

Full employment exists in Europe and Japan. In fact, they have more jobs available than people to fill them. They are not worried about Russia. They are not spending 66 percent of their national budget for arms to defend themselves. They do not have the draft in full scale. Only the United States is spending 66 percent of its tax dollar for defense and keeping the draft of our young men. We spend for defense of them and build industry for them while our boys have to remain in service to defend foreign jobs and when our boys come home from service they find our own mines and factories closed. What a pity. What a farce. How long are the people going to stand for this one-sided giveaway?

WE GIVE MILLIONS FOR FOREIGN TOURISM

Northern Wisconsin is a tourist paradise. Just think how little help is given in this respect. I know how little. Resorts in northern Wisconsin are barely hanging on. Many just cannot save what they invested. In order to get a small business loan they must meet requirements impossible to meet. Yet, here is what Uncle Sam is doing overseas. Here is a typical letter of more than 100 I have received this year from people who have toured Europe, Africa, and Japan.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just returned from a tour of England, France, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, Germany, and Japan. These countries are humming with activity. Every day you see more people in these cities, mostly tourists, that you would never see at a Fourth of July celebration in America. There is no poverty. There is no unemployment. There are no depressed areas. These people are more prosperous than the average American.

Everywhere these countries and cities are humming with activity. They are building superhighways, bridges, resorts, apartment buildings 20 stories high, new factories, and hotel after hotel. Almost a million tourists mostly from America are here. One little town of 10,000 people has 80 hotels and are building 6 more. That is what our dollars are doing. Just why does our country do this for other nations when it refuses to do so for its own?

I NEVER VOTED FOR THIS GIVEAWAY OF JOBS

There is nothing wrong with our country, except that it has and is being given away with a complete disregard for the interest of our own people. In my 20 years in Congress, I have never supported this giveaway of our money, gold, jobs, and our industries. I feel proud that I had the courage to withstand the pressure. At one time there were only 18 out of 435 Congressmen who fought this crazy program. I was one of the 18. This year, there were 169 who voted against it. We need only 50 more votes in the House to stop it. The people can and will stop it if they know the truth as to what is happening.

The time is late. It is going to take northern Wisconsin 10 years to recover from the consequences of this shameful giveaway. The trouble is that people awaken only after they lose their business or their job. People, seldom show concern when their neighbor loses his business or his job. Unfortunately, too many people show concern only when they themselves lose their business or their jobs. But then it is too late to do anything about it.

WHAT IMPORTS HAVE DONE TO NORTHERN WISCONSIN

Just 4 counties in northern Wisconsin in the past 10 years have lost 3,800 jobs on account of imports. These jobs lost because of imports are as follows: 1,000 miners; 800 plywood workers; 1,000 railroad workers and shipping workers; and 1,000 jobs related to these jobs such as teachers, clerks, service jobs, barbers, sales, etc.

Here is what that means to the economy of these 4 counties: Loss of $30 million of capital investment—off tax rolls; loss of 3,000 automobiles; loss of 150 retail outlets; loss of $14 million a year in retail sales; loss of 3,000 homes; and loss of $11 million in bank deposits.

THIS IS JUST IN FOUR NORTHERN WISCONSIN COUNTIES

Taken as a whole, imports of products mined and produced in 4 counties in northern Wisconsin has cost the northern Wisconsin economy 3,800 jobs. This alone is why northern Wisconsin is a depressed area. In spite of this, imports are increasing and more and more jobs are going to be lost. Here is a clear example of what our crazy giveaway program is doing to northern Wisconsin. It is a blow that will take a long time to recover from, make no mistake about it. With the desire to move more industries overseas—3,500 in the last 10 years—and with 80,000 businesses going bankrupt each year at present rate, it is going to take most unusual skill to replace the jobs we have lost due to imports.

IRON ORE IMPORTS

In 1946, we imported 2.8 million tons of iron ore.

In 1959 we imported 39 million tons of iron ore.

And it is going to increase from year to year. Presently we are importing 61 percent of iron ore consumed in the United States.

The fact is that when present explorations and expansion in foreign countries are completed imports can and probably will fill all the needs of U.S. steel mills and they won't need to mine a ton of ore in our own country. Presently more than half of the ore consumed in the United States is imported. It will be 75 percent in a few years and on and on.

MINERS TAX MONEY USED TO TAKE AWAY THEIR JOBS

The tragedy is the U.S. taxpayers, yes the miners who have lost their jobs in Wisconsin, paid for a great part of this development of ore deposits and steel plants in foreign countries. In fact, U.S. taxpayers' money in excess of $2 billion has been used to develop these mines and steel plants in foreign countries. As a matter of fact, today the United States is importing more finished steel products than it is exporting. Recently, our Government has adopted the policy of buying foreign steel for our military and Government use. This is almost impossible to believe but it is a fact. Yet, northern Wisconsin miners, transportation workers, and sea shipping workers are laid off while foreign miners, transportation workers, and sea shipping workers are prospering.

How silly can we be. These miners now losing their jobs are the same miners who produced 80 percent of all iron ore used in the world during World War I and World War II and who were largely responsible for the production that won these two wars. Their reward for a job well done—go home—no job—we must take care of the miners of Africa, Canada, and South America. It is strange when we have a government which spent billions of dollars to develop foreign mines and steel mills. It just does not make sense.

Just the last 2 years, here is how the U.S. Government is helping foreign mines and steel mills while our miners are losing their jobs by the thousands:

In 1962, $66 million to Societe Anonyme Des Mines de Mauritanie (Miferma).

In 1961, $30 million to Lamco—no payments until 1965.

In 1961, $6 million to Compania de Acero del Pacifico, S.A., to develop iron ore deposits in Chile. One million tons to be shipped to the States per year.

In 1961, $6 million to the Mano River project of the Nations Iron Ore Co., of Liberia. This will boost their output to ship to the United States to 4 million tons a year in 1963.

In 1961, $6 million to Marcona to increase output to 2.3 million tons. Previously the United States had loaned Marcona $13 million.

In 1960, $150 million to Turkish iron and steel industries.

In 1959, $12.5 million to Cin Vale do Rio Doce to increase iron ore production from 3 to 6 million tons a year.

In 1962, $43.3 million to Fundidara, largest private steel company in Mexico. The private company is putting up a measly $4 million, the rest is U.S. money.

This, miners, is your money that is being used to develop these mines and steel plants in foreign countries. Yes, they use your money to build mines and plants overseas so that they can tell you they do not need you any more. Remember these loans and grants were made at a time when miner after miner in our own country was being told he was not needed any more. Since 1950 more than 6,000 iron ore miners in the Great Lakes area have been laid off. If we cut our imports to 20 million tons, just half of what we are importing, all these 6,000 miners would go back to work full time.

TAX BENEFIT IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

It was at the encouragement of the foreign aid program that U.S. steel companies established in foreign countries. Not only the Government but labor union leaders also encouraged it. It was and is another part of our foreign giveaway program. I never supported this giveaway in spite of heavy pressure. In fact, Congress even passed a bill to exempt these steel companies from U.S. income taxes, if they left their money in a foreign country. I did not vote for this either. When ore was in surplus, U.S. officials encouraged the steel companies to lay off U.S. workers but to keep foreign workers employed. In fact, a U.S. steel company in Venezuela cannot lay off any miner unless the Venezuelan Government approves. Somehow, the Venezuelan Government never approves and their miners work full time while U.S. miners are told they are not needed anymore. Miners in the United States have become second-class citizens and second choice. Miners in foreign countries are given job preference.

MINERS IN VENEZUELA BETTER OFF THAN U.S. MINERS

Believe it or not, the 5,000 miners employed by 2 U.S. steel companies in Venezuela are much better off than a U.S. ore miner even when working. The average annual wage and fringe benefits of a Venezuelan miner is $5,000 per year. No U.S. miner equals that kind of pay and fringe benefit.

The Venezuelan miner working for a U.S. steel company works 26 weeks at 6 days and 26 weeks at 5 days. Less 30 days' vacation and 7 holidays, this totals 249 days a year. But the Venezuelan miner gets paid for 365 days or 7 days a week for 52 weeks in a year. In addition a Venezuelan miner gets 60 days' pay as a profit-sharing bonus. This means that in Zenezuela, working for the same U.S. steel company that our own miners work for, a miner in Venezuela gets paid for 425 days a year for 249 days of actual work. Almost half the pay of a Venezuelan miner is for days not worked. Only the oldest U.S. miner working in the United States working for the same company is lucky if he gets paid for 262 days.

Our U.S. miner in the United States gets an average vacation of 2 weeks. A Venezuelan miner, after working for 1 year gets a 30-day vacation with pay of 7 days a week plus a bonus. Nice work if you can get it.

A U.S. miner furnishes and owns his home. A Venezuelan miner gets a home furnished by the steel company for which he pays a measly indemnity of $1.79 a day. This includes everything, no extras such as water, lights, heat, repairs, paint, furniture, and so forth.

A U.S. miner gets limited medicare for himself and family. A Venezuelan miner gets the works for himself and family including glasses, pills, transportation and time off with pay and massages and the works.

A U.S. miner gets no family leave with pay. A Venezuelan miner gets 6 days off with 7 days' pay plus a bonus even in case of death of a common law wife of which there are many.

Besides all this which U.S. steel companies do for foreign workers, the U.S. Government has given Venezuela over $333 million in foreign aid. Remember Venezuela has a population of around 7 million. So we can see that Venezuelan miners are first-class citzens as far as the United States is concerned and our own miners are second-class citizens.

This is what has happened to iron ore mining in Wisconsin. I did all I could to stop it. I never voted for the foreign aid program which made this possible. I never voted for the foreign tax benefits which made this possible. I never voted to reduce our tariffs or to eliminate the tariff which made this possible. For 15 years I have been warning the miners this was going to happen but their leaders would not listen. I always voted to prevent this tragedy. Those who criticized me most were those whose jobs I tried to save.

FARM PROBLEM TOO IS REALLY CREATED BY IMPORTS

During the past 10 years farm support programs have cost the U.S. taxpayers $26 billion. Believe it or not during this same 10 years, under our crazy foreign aid program we imported farm products valued at $42 billion.

While we are importing farm products, we have in Government storage more than 1 billion bushels of wheat, 1.4 billion bushels of corn, 1.6 million pounds of tobacco and about 336 million pounds of butter, cheese and dried milk. These are valued at about $5.8 billion.

Yet, in 1960, and it is much worse now, we imported the equivalent of 1,504,000 head of beef, 1,341,000 head of hogs and 1,105,000 head of sheep and lambs. What is even worse with the surplus of dairy products depressing the dairy industry last year, we imported the equivalent of 1 billion pounds of milk and dairy products. It does not make sense yet these imports are increasing and increasing.

It is costing the taxpayers of the United States of America approximately $40 million a year to buy up the surplus and store the surplus dairy products of American dairy farmers because of imports. In other words, we import foreign dairy products so that we have a surplus of our own dairy products to pay storage on.

The bulk of the feed grains other than what we have in Government storage today has been imported. Our disappearance of feed grains over the past 10 years has been greater than our production; yet, we, as taxpayers are paying some $20 million a year to store what is termed "surplus" feed grains. It is surplus to be sure, but not a surplus created by the overproduction of the American farmer. It is created by imports of feed grains.

FARMERS NOT TOLD HONEST FACTS

The foreign aid propagandists brag about the $4.9 billion of agricultural exports. This is how they deceive the farmers of America. These propagandists do not tell that $3 billion of these agricultural exports is given away to foreign countries under our foreign aid program and under our Federal subsidies which are paid for by the taxpayers of America and not by any foreign country. Thus only $1.9 billion of our farm exports are commercially sold or farm products that we actually get anything for. When you consider the farm products that we give away under our foreign aid program, the United States of America is in reality a farm importing country, where we import twice as much farm products that we do not need as we sell for dollars. But this is how the propagandists fool the American people and the American farmer. The United States of America is the only country in the world that imports farm products that are already in surplus in the United States of America. Every other country in the world prohibits U.S. farm products that are already in surplus in their own country.

If the beef and the sheep and the hogs that we imported last year were raised here in the United States of America, these cattle and hogs and sheep would have eaten up all of the wheat and the corn that we have in storage throughout the United States of America which is costing the taxpayers $1½ million a day just for storage. How silly can we be?

As a further illustration of how the farmers are being sold down the river by imports, let us take the case of blue cheese. Our current U.S. production of blue cheese is less than 14 million pounds. Yet, we permit the importation of over 4 million pounds a year. This is indicative of how our farmers are being misled on the foreign aid program through the years. This is just one of many examples.

Wisconsin is passing more and more laws compelling farmers to spend more money on sanitation facilities, such as coolers and barn equipment. While Wisconsin is compelling its farmers to spend money for costly sanitation facilities, we permit the importation of millions of dollars of the same products from countries that have little sanitary regulations if any.

If the United States would stop importing dairy products and if all the Government agencies of the United States including the armed services all over the world would purchase U.S. dairy products instead of foreign dairy products, there would be no dairy surplus in the United States of America at the present time.

EIGHT HUNDRED PLYWOOD WORKERS IN NORTHERN WISCONSIN LOST JOBS DUE TO IMPORTS

What has happened to the iron ore industry has likewise happened to our wood products industry in our area. Since the turn of the 1950s, 800 plywood workers in northern Wisconsin lost their jobs due to Japanese imports.

In April 1957, 30 percent of the working people were laid off in our plywood industries because of the cheap imports of plywood from Japan. At the present time, more than 60 percent of the workers in the plywood industry in America are without jobs because of the cheap importation of plywood from Japan.

When you consider that in some areas in Wisconsin, Michigan and Minnesota the plywood and veneer industry was the very lifeblood of their economic existence, this problem of imported hardwood plywood and veneer should give us all, including the Congress and other agencies of Government, cause for concern.

Communities such as Ashland, Butternut, Mellen and Rhinelander, just to mention a few, depended to a large degree if not entirely upon the plywood and veneer industry for their economic life and well-being.

Many other related industries such as logging, hard board, lumber and so forth also are affected indirectly by this cheap imported hardwood plywood problem.

When you consider that the American plywood and veneer worker competes each hour with a Japanese worker being paid only 11½ cents per hour, it is reasonable to say that the workers in both countries suffer hardship.

When you consider the American plywood and veneer industry competes with imported plywood from Japan that is imported and sold duty free for less than the cost of production in the United States, is it any wonder that plant after plant in our area is being shut down with thousands of skilled workers being thrown on the scrap heap, and numerous communities becoming ghost towns.

Examples: Japan's exports to the United States in January–June 1957 period totaled a 57-percent increase over the same period in 1956. Imports from Japan of hardwood plywood has increased 4,120 percent since 1951. These imports have eaten up 46.6 percent of the total American market in 1956 alone. It is even worse now.

Consumption of hardwood plywood in the United States is up 74 percent since 1951. Low-priced imports captured 99.4 percent of this 74-percent increase in consumption.

Japanese plywood industry has increased their production 400 percent since 1951, mostly with the help of American capital—American plywood industry has increased their production in the same period by only six-tenths of 1 percent since 1951.

Japanese labor cost per 1,000 square feet of plywood is $4.17 as compared to from $30 to $34 per 1,000 square feet in the United States.

These are but two examples of what is happening to the areas of northern Wisconsin, northern Michigan and northern Minnesota. For 15 years I have tried vainly to warn the people of our area of these consequences of our foreign policy. Unfortunately, it was not until workers actually got laid off that they are now beginning to stop, look and listen, and are beginning to pay some attention to the sad results of trying to take care of the rest of the world at the expense of American resources and the American worker.

I have introduced bills to impose a quota on imports of iron ore and wood products. But with the leaders of both parties plugging for more imports instead of less, such bills receive little consideration. Only the rude awakening of our citizens back home will reverse this trend. This year we had 169 votes in the House of Representatives out of 438. We need only 50 more votes in Congress to stop this sorry mess we got into.

SHOE INDUSTRY NEXT ON LIST

We have shoe factories in Rib Lake, Merrill, and 4 other northern Wisconsin cities, which employ about 600 workers. Their plight as a result of imports is getting more and more serious. In 1950 we imported few pairs of shoes. We are now importing each year almost 70 million pairs mostly from Italy and Japan. These are leather type shoes produced in northern Wisconsin. Besides that we are importing this year 92 million pairs of rubber type shoes and boots which are used as a substitute for leather type shoes which is also hurting our shoe factories and hurting bad. Imports are increasing in shoes by leaps and bounds.

WORKERS IN SHOE FACTORIES SHOULD BE CONCERNED

Foreign versus U.S. average hourly wages and fringe benefits in the shoe industry are alarming. If these imports continue to increase our shoe factories will be forced to close like our mines and plywood factories and another 600 jobs will be lost in northern Wisconsin.

Total labor costs with fringe benefits

Britain	$0.97
France	.93
Germany	.82
Italy	.45
Japan	.31
United States	1.94

There are 16,000 workers who make a living in Wisconsin making shoes and products going into shoes. Six hundred of these jobs are in northern Wisconsin. Unless Congress wakes up, the shoe factories in northern Wisconsin will go like the mines and plywood factories. There are 169 Members of Congress who want to save this industry in Wisconsin. I have always been one of these. We need 50 more in Washington to be sure this industry is saved.

FIVE HUNDRED SAILORS AND SHIPBUILDERS LOSE JOBS IN NORTHERN WISCONSIN

Since 1955 half the U.S. company owned ships sailing the Great Lakes have been cut up for scrap or are laying idle in various lake ports while foreign ships take over. More than 500 Great Lakes sailors and shipbuilders in northern Wisconsin have lost their jobs.

Total Great Lakes shipping of iron ore, coal, and grain during May of this year was 5 million tons ahead of last year. But at the same time American vessels continued to lose ground. American ships carried only 13 percent of the grain loaded. Foreign ocean-going ships carried 38 percent. Canadian lakers carried a whopping 49 percent. This decline in American shipping on the Great Lakes has been going on each year and each month. Foreign ships and Canadian ships are taking over almost completely. Great Lakes shippers, unions, shipbuilders, and workers are getting more and more desperate and about to throw up their arms in despair.

The real tragedy is that the construction, operational, and depreciation subsidies offered Canadian and foreign vessels is really American money. The motto of our Nation's leaders is millions for subsidies for foreign and Canadian shippers but not one penny for American Great Lakes shippers. Their decision is "get out if you cannot take the competition." The voices and cries of American shippers and workers fall on deaf ears. But the voices of foreign interests sound like music to our Nation's leaders' ears.

What voices do our Nation's leaders listen to? It is unbelievable but here are the facts. Our State Department invited and paid the expenses of a Nicholaus Snidjers, of Amsterdam, to make a 7-week study and tour of American ports and shipping. Yes, this is a fact, unbelievable as it may seem. What did this State Department selection report after his first-class tour of wining and dining at the taxpayer's expense? He reported as follows:

> The United States should get out of the shipping business entirely. American carriers and crews cost three times and more as much as European ones. The United States should get out of shipping entirely and leave it to us Europeans who know how to do it profitably.

These are the kind of people our Department of Commerce listens to. The voices and cries of unemployed workers on the Great Lakes mean nothing compared to a Department of State selected wined and dined European all at American taxpayers expense, of course.

What this European expert left out of his report was the fact that these Europeans operate at a profit only because of American subsidies given them which are not given to Great Lakes shippers. Without these American subsidies even Europeans would operate at a loss. There seems to be no end.

With Canadian shippers beating the stuffing out of our Great Lakes fleet with their subsidies, our Government recently negotiated a huge loan of $1 billion to Canada so that Canada can pay more subsidies to her shippers. Believe it or not, American shipowners are being forced to go to Canada for a shipbuilding subsidy. At the same time Canada comes to us for a billion-dollar loan. How absurd can we be? We deny subsidies to Great Lakes shippers but give money to Canada so she can subsidize her own and our ships. Oh, but these ships must be built by Canadian labor and they must use Canadian materials. Our leaders have no such concern for American labor and materials—even if it is really our money.

EVERY INDUSTRY IS IN TROUBLE ON ACCOUNT OF IMPORTS

I have given examples of iron ore, plywood, shoes and farm products. Space does not permit facts and figures concerning all the industries, jobs and factories which are barely hanging on because of the devastating effect of imports. But there is not an industry in northern Wisconsin which today is not in trouble because of the threat of imports.

Glove industry: We have several glove plants and several hundred workers in northern Wisconsin in these plants. Imports from Japan and Hong Kong are seriously jeopardizing the existence of this industry.

Fish industry: Go to Bayfield and Cornucopia and find out for yourself what imports of fish and fish products are doing to that industry.

Electrical products: Go to any electronic plant in northern Wisconsin and see for yourself what imports from Japan and Germany are doing to this industry. Last year we imported $56 million of small radios from Japan alone. We exported a measly $6 million worth as just one example.

Metal products: Go to any metal products factory in northern Wisconsin, Merrill Manufacturing Co., for instance, and see what imports of metal products are doing to that business. It will scare you when you learn the facts.

HOW DID THIS HAPPEN AND WHY?

It is part of our foreign aid program. We are running out of gold and money. We have handed out over $137 billion in foreign aid like mad since 1946. We have given and given until we find we are out of money and cannot give away more than $8 billion a year which is our present rate of foreign giveaway. We are fast running out of gold. In fact, in gold we are a deficit country. We gave that away too. If what we owe other nations in gold is called for we will be $6 billion short in gold.

So all we have left to give is our factories and our jobs. We are now in the process of doing this. That is why we are encouraging imports. That is why 3,500 industries left the United States for some foreign country in the last 5 years. We gave our money and gold. We cannot give any more of that. So we are now giving our jobs and our factories. This is how and why it has happened.

When this program first started there were only 18 of us in the House of Representatives who saw through this whole scheme. I was among the 18 and have seen through it all these years. Other Congressmen have slowly awakened and are still awakening. This year there were 169 Members of the House of Representatives who tried to stop this giveaway. We need only 50 more Congressmen to stop it before we lose all we have. I am sure that next year there will be enough of an awakening by the people to give us the 50 more needed. The hour is late, but not too late.

Community Service Organization: On Behalf of the Basic Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I should like to pay homage to an organization which, in the midst of technological and international chaos, has seen that there are many problems left to solve whose solutions require continued application of basic democratic principles.

The organization is the Community Service Organization. Their mission is to integrate the Spanish-speaking residents in the West of the United States into the communities in which they live. Their method of solution is to fully inform these people of, and teach these people how, to use their basic freedoms, including the right to vote, petition, organize, and assemble. In other words, the Community Service Organization wishes to make clear that the Constitution applies to all and that it is a document deeding to all the right to use and be protected by its guarantees.

During these times when we are so often so immersed in the sensational we forget how much remains to be done in this country that is just the plain everyday work of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, in my mind this is the mission of the Community Service Organization: It has not forgotten this plain everyday work of democracy.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the quickest way to convey the success of the Community Service Organization in tackling this task is a brief before-and-after sketch. For anyone from my home State knows that the lot of the persons with Spanish surnames in California was far different before the advent of the Community Service Organization and a striking contrast to the status this group is beginning now to enjoy.

The "before" picture was relatively grim. Many were shunted off into unsanitary and ill-cared-for "barrios" of California towns; less than 10 percent were registered to vote.

Sixteen years later, close to one-half million or more are registered; much of the parent generation have become citizens; and articulate leaders versed in organizational processes now speak for their own people and serve in public offices.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the strength of this hitherto amorphous and unheard-from group became a politically significant statistical fact, community leaders began to deplore, rather than ignore their condition, and then finally restore the areas in which they lived.

In addition, this 16-year-old organization now boasts at least 33 California chapters and several in Arizona and Texas. The membership is over 10,000 persons.

To really comprehend its place in the various communities where it is active, one should hear recounted the saga of each locale, for each is a story of tremendous dynamism and patience on the part of members of the Community Service Organization and those who believe in it.

The local chapters of the Community Service Organization have protected the the domestic farm laborer or worker from encroachment on his domain by the foreign worker. Simultaneously, they have backed the worker in his appeals for a decent minimum wage and unemployment insurance.

Chiefly active in my own State of California, the Community Service Organization has made its impact felt statewide by influencing the legislative program in our State. There is no question that the extension of the State old-age pensions to noncitizens was in great part their achievement.

There are many more examples to further document the accomplishments of the Community Service Organization: they better the lot of their members, not through huge spending programs or a complex committee superstructure, but through a persistent demand on the local level for the basic freedoms such as voting; and, in a period of almost frantic international awareness, they have remembered to fight for our own American immigrant—someone who has always been an important source of diversity and talent in our culture.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the names of but a few of the individuals who have contributed so much to make the Community Service Organization the viable instrument that it is. They include: Herman Gallegos, Jose Correa; Cruz Reynoso, David Burciaga; Luis B-arraza, Anthony Rios; Juan Govea, Alex Zermenio; Honorable Abelicio Chavez; Vicki Lebrado, Carmen Batiza; Helen Castaneda; Cipriano Salazar; Carmen Solis; Madeline Cepeda; Maria Scott; Mary Salizar, Claudine Arias, Helen Rosales; Louis Zarate; Mario N. Lechuga, Cesar Chavez, and William Salazar.

The immediate task of the Community Service Organization is to get as many unregistered citizens registered in order that they participate in forthcoming elections. This task will, in large part, measure the impact of the Community Service Organization on the community and go a long way in bringing into active participation a great number of citizens into the workings of the democracy.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the succinct remarks of William Salazar which outlines the work, and challenges, of the Community Service Organization:

> First, we have awakened hundreds of Spanish-speaking residents to their responsibilities as citizens.
>
> Second, we have organized a group of young, eager, responsible people for self-help and for the solution of problems facing the Spanish speaking and the community.
>
> Third, we are developing new leadership which will conquer the upcoming problems which will be facing us as a community. For example, through our English and citizenship classes, which our immigration committee is sponsoring, we are helping some 300 newcomers to find their way in becoming better citizens.
>
> Also our immigration committee offers needed help and assistance to those who are in need of special help in this field; and hand in hand with welfare committees they have accomplished their task.
>
> Through our housing committee we have joined other civil rights organizations to seek the establishment of a fair housing ordinance and to promote equal housing opportunities for all, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.
>
> Through our voter registration committee we have undertaken the task of registering the nonregistered and to wake up the Spanish-speaking to their responsibilities as Americans and to make this body a more responsible group of voters.
>
> Through our education committee we have as one of our goals the task of helping to motivate and raise the education level of our young people.
>
> Our civil rights committee stands ready to help and safeguard the rights of our members and all other minorities who might seek our help; but above all we wish to join other chapters of the Community Service Organization to promote the betterment of the Spanish-speaking in California; especially the many agriculture workers throughout the State.
>
> If the caliber of people we have attracted has any bearing on whether we will succeed or not, let me say that those already brought in by our membership committee insures us that we will succeed.
>
> As you can all see, we did not organize to stand still, we will move ahead as the Community Service Organization has done in the past and in the years to come we can be proud to say that we were the first to answer the call of the needs of the Spanish-speaking in San Francisco.

Farm Bill Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, after a 116-day strike, the Minneapolis Tribune has resumed publication. I, along with thousands of others, am happy to once again be able to read this fine newspaper. One of the Tribune's first editorials after resuming publication was entitled "Farm Bill Politics." It demonstrates a keen understanding of the farm debate in Congress this session. I want to share this editorial with our colleagues:

FARM BILL POLITICS

> Agriculture Secretary Freeman came home to Minnesota to charge Republican Congressmen, and particularly those from Minnesota, with narrow partisan obstructionism for voting down the administration farm bill.
>
> The same can be said to Freeman that was said to Mr. Kennedy when the President complained that willful Republicans defeated medicare and other of his measures—the Democrats have a heavy majority in each Chamber of Congress.
>
> For some years it has been Democratic Congressmen from the large cities who have been responsible for a growing movement to cut back on farm programs.
>
> The administration farm bill this year impressed many persons, in Congress and out, as taking away far too much freedom from individual farmers and giving the Department of Agriculture too much authority over crop decisions. Under terrific administration

pressure the Senate accepted the bill. The House voted it down.

However, the House then voted the extension of feed grain and wheat programs which Freeman asked. But the Senate has delayed further action, apparently because the administration hopes to salvage some of the strict controls the House refused.

Maybe it can be said that the administration and Secretary Freeman are playing some partisan politics in this matter.

They Earn $180,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Woody Hayes, football coach at Ohio State, says, "Outbid the pros."

Mr. Speaker, Coach Hayes is a great American and, like any of us, is convinced that we need more emphasis and not deemphasis on college football. I commend the following article to the Congress and to the country. It appeared in the Washington Star on August 8:

OHIO STATE COACH SAYS COLLEGES SHOULD "OUTBID" PROS FOR ATHLETES

(By Steve Guback)

If Tom Nugent or any other football coach ever gets worried about a player turning professional before he uses up all his eligibility, Woody Hayes, of Ohio State, has the answer.

"Outbid the pros," says Hayes.

Hayes isn't clamoring for a dollar war or outright professionalism by the colleges, but he does feel that the schools are missing a good selling point.

No Ohio State football player with eligibility remaining has left campus to sign with the pros since the volatile Hayes checked in a decade ago. He says this isn't merely a coincidence.

"We simply tell our kids that they are well paid at Ohio State," says Hayes. "For each year in school they're earning $45,000 in future earning power. For 4 years, that's $180,000. And how many kids sign for that?"

Hayes says that last year two members of his backfield turned down $40,000 bonus contracts in professional baseball to remain in college.

"The important thing," says Hayes, "is to make sure the kids aren't cheated. That means the coach should make sure that they get the education and that they're not just hired Hessians to play sports."

Hayes, like many coaches, bounces around during the offseason. He voiced his feelings in Chicago last week where he attended the game between the College All-Stars and the Green Bay Packers.

Hayes said he was concerned about pooled gambling, which is on the rise, and its influence on collegiate football. He also said he was concerned with the increase in juvenile delinquency.

"President Kennedy isn't stressing physical fitness because he thinks we need great, big muscles to beat the Russians. Hell, no," Woody said. "He's stressing it because he knows a kid has to find himself.

"The greatest tragedy among youngsters is that too many never 'find' themselves. They may wait and finally find courage by sticking a switch-blade in somebody's back. Or they may find this courage in competitive sports. That's why they are so important."

Hayes says people talk about intramural programs which can do the job. But he insists that there's a definite need for top-level varsity programs, too.

"Imagine somebody like a Bob Ferguson playing intramurals. Before long, he'd be smoking and growing lazy. A kid must compete on a level where he can reach his potential. That's why there's a need for varsity sports."

Editorial Comment on Administration Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials:

[From the Kneghtstown (Ind.) Banner, Aug. 16, 1962]

WASHINGTON ACCOUNTING—WE GIVE UP

Modern Washington accounting and mathematics leave all of us a little spellbound at times. This week, President Kennedy explained to the Nation that he now favors waiting for a tax cut until next January.

One Republican Representative observed that the 1952 campaign apparently is underway with the promise of a tax cut next year.

As we read these tax-cutting promises and suggestions, they don't add up. The national administration is chalking up a huge deficit, the national debt ceiling was recently lifted, and there is talk of more and more spending.

Twenty billion dollars will be spent on an attempt to reach the moon—that's about $110 for every man, woman, and child in the country. And other projects have been placed in effect to increase the spending at the highest peacetime rate in history.

So, now the Fair Deal has a solution to the Nation's money problems—cut taxes. And who isn't in favor of cutting taxes? Of course, there's the small matter of how to make up the difference when the national debt is going up by millions every day, but why worry about that?

If a local trustee or county official handled money in the reckless manner now being employed by the Washington money experts, he'd be out on his ear at the next election, but somehow the public seem to believe that the U.S. Treasury has no bottom and some mysterious people at some far off place are paying the bill.

Don't be so foolish. You, the taxpayer, will pay the bill later, if not now. The value of American currency on the world market, the value of the American dollar in buying power, and the reality that this debt cannot continue to mount forever should be matters of deep concern for us all. But how many care? Apparently not very many or such preposterous suggestions of cutting taxes while increasing expenditures would not be seriously made with the idea of winning votes.

Perhaps if your father had given you more than $10 million and you had never worked for a living or worried about operating a business for a profit, you'd think in such terms, too. Really, is there any other explanation?

[From the Greenfield (Ind.) Daily Reporter]

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE COMMUNICATIONS CONTROL

It appears that the U.S. Senate, Tuesday afternoon, broke a precedent of 35 or more years when it slapped a limitation of debate to stop the filibuster against the communications satellite bill. The filibuster was being conducted by Senator WAYNE MORSE and a few of his liberal colleagues. It takes a two-thirds vote to choke off unlimited speechmaking.

MORSE and associates oppose the bill, the important provision of which is the formation of a corporation which would be 50 percent Government owned and 50 percent owned by the private communications industry. Despairing of defeating the bill on a straightout vote, because an overwhelming percentage of the Senate favor it, they tried to "talk it to death" and did succeed in obstructing passage for several days.

Odd, these are the same guys who wanted to rule out the filibuster when it was being used by conservative southern Senators and had all manner of derogatory things to say about the rights of unlimited debate. But the shoe has recently been on the other foot.

They called it a "gigantic giveaway," representing that the launching of the Telstar satellite and its equipment and function were wholly the result of Government rocket and satellite research.

The fact is, the communications industry, led by A.T. & T. has spent in excess of $50 million on the successful project.

A glance at history will also prove that progress most often comes most rapidly and certainly more economically in the fields of private development and research.

You have to go no further than the field of communications itself. Telephone, telegraph, radio, and television in America represent one of the marvels of the age. The rapid developments of improved equipment and methods has been astounding. No other people boast anything approaching the communications systems which we accept as commonplace.

Incidentally, in most countries, telephone, etc., is a state or quasi-public enterprise. Only here is it completely in the domain of private enterprise. That could be the reason for our advanced position.

If you think a moment. If Samuel Morse, Alex G. Bell, and Marconi had turned their discoveries over to the Government and they had remained there ever since, do you think present communications performance would be on the level of efficiencies and costs as it is now?

Sandisfield, Mass., Bicentennial, 1762–1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker this year the little town of Sandisfield, nestled in the Berkshires in western Massachusetts, celebrates its 200th anniversary. This is a noteworthy event, commanding special consideration.

The pioneers who settled in Sandisfield in 1750, were a church-going people who strictly observed the Sabbath, which commenced, in those days, on Saturday evening. They had no fires in the churches then, and footstoves were in great demand. Preaching was had by taxing the people for the expenses of the church. Nonetheless, the people insisted upon services even in the face of inconvenience, and the town began its history deep in the belief of divine guidance.

The earliest settlers in Sandisfield were immigrants from Plymouth, Mass., and Wethersfield and New Haven, Conn.—Puritans all. They were concerned not only with problems of the soul, but with problems of practicality, including those of government. In 1758, a committee was appointed to receive conveyance of 1 acre for a burying ground, at a spot selected a little northerly and short of a mile from the meetinghouse. Community action in this instance bred further action and on March 6, 1762, the town was formally incorporated.

When originally admitted to the field of official community life, Sandisfield was largely controlled by officials residing in other areas.

The first town meeting following incorporation was called by virtue of a warrant issued by Joseph Dwight, of Great Barrington, justice of the peace, and the original town proprietors, the majority of whom were citizens of Worcester. In a short time, however, the people of Sandisfield were clamoring for control of their own destinies, and, as it was to work out, their demands were quickly granted.

Local assurance in the ability of self-government was founded on economic success, which came about the moment the first arrivals set to work in their own interest. Economically speaking, Sandisfield was blessed from the start with a great deal of promise. A soil better suited to the growth of rich, juicy grass is seldom found, and this fact had a decisive effect upon the outlook of the original inhabitants. Stockraising was instituted at once, and sheep raising and dairying were also soon in evidence. By 1855 there were 175,000 pounds of cheese produced locally, as well as considerable amounts of milk and cream.

Another early economic development of considerable significance hereabouts was the production of maple sugar. In 1885 it was learned that Sandisfield held the lead in amount of maple sugar produced—even exceeding that produced in Worthington, in Hampshire County, which was then laying claim to the title of the "Maple Sugar Capital." At one point the annual production of maple sugar by Sandisfield residents reached as much as 84,876 pounds, before the charcoal industry came along, to make use of maple trees for other purposes.

Local government sprang from a justified sense of self-importance, generated by considerable success in several economic fields. In response to the need for government, the people of Sandisfield came forward with ability equal to that already displayed in the matter of economic sustenance. Town meetings were conducted with much dignity.

The township covered a large area, the center being on a high hill, and the sites for future industry located to the east, on the Farmington River. When the Revolution began in 1776, there were 1,044 local-residents, and by 1800 Sandisfield had become the fourth largest town in the county with 1,857 people, and had supplied the citizens of Pittsfield with $300 to help them build a meetinghouse. Fifteen years later, in spite of migration to the West, the Sandisfield population held up to 1,615. At the start of the Civil War there were still 1,585, and the town remained prosperous.

The war hurt Sandisfield. The young men who volunteered for service in the Union Army included many who gave their lives, and many more who settled elsewhere in the postwar years. In addition to this, the call of the West began to take its toll, in the 1870's and 1880's, and the buildup of industry in neighboring districts had a similar depopulating effect. The resulting decline in local population figures was not checked until the arrival 45 years ago of Polish immigrants from New York who took up a number of the abandoned farms and helped to stabilize the community by their industry.

In the glory days, Sandisfield had at one time six tanneries, two mills making flaxseed oil, a larger maple sugar production than any other town in the State, a silk mill, a woolen mill, a hattery, a cooperage, a wagon factory, and numerous saw and grist mills. Sandisfield was a model version of the industrialized agricultural community. In spite of the merits of this way of life, the whole trend of the national economy after the Civil War was against it industrially, and there was nothing for Sandisfield to do but to surrender its temporary supremacy, in the face of overwhelming odds.

On the other hand, what has remained is by no means negligible. A variety of industrial concerns still supply a livelihood to the people of the area.

Today the people of Sandisfield can look back with pride upon a history devoted to work and reverence, patriotic regard and satisfaction in local achievement.

Moreover, the people of Sandisfield have the future still before them—a future in which the beautiful Berkshires undoubtedly will serve, and already are beginning to serve, as an area to which Americans will come in increasing numbers, out of respect for a way of life devoid of turmoil and chaos.

Sandisfield has shown, by its history, that progress is not only achieved through wealth, turmoil, and ever-increasing production, but by the nurturing of those qualities inherent in the original conception of the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to salute the good people of Sandisfield as they join together to celebrate the 200th birthday of their little community, years in which they saw their loved ones depart on seven different occasions to go forth and fight for the liberty we all cherish so highly.

Practical Social Justice and the Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr.. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following very interesting paper entitled "Spotlight on Social Reform," written by the Reverend William J. Smith, S.J., director of St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations, Jersey City, N.J.:

PRACTICAL SOCIAL JUSTICE AND THE POLITICIAN

The medical aid for the aged bill under social security is a dead issue for the present session of Congress. The corpse will rise again in full vigor during the coming election campaign. Basically the problem of adequate aid to the aged is one of social justice.

Unfortunately, practically every major public issue of any importance usually gets all cluttered up in the meshes of political strategies and implications. I say "unfortunately" only in the sense that partisan politics or personal political involvements too often becloud the issue. I do not say that it is unfortunate that an appeal is made for Government assistance in the solving of such problems.

It is quite in keeping with Catholic social teaching that public authority be looked upon as a proper partner in the promoting of the public good. This is particularly so when every effort is made to include personal participation and cooperation of groups and private agencies in the overall plan. As a matter of fact, this is what is meant when we talk of social justice in action.

There are some, even among Catholics, who endeavor to reduce every issue of this kind to one of purely political activity. They refuse to accept public authority as an active participant and agent of social justice. "You can't politicize religion or the spiritual," some would tell us. Therefore, they conclude, the concept of social justice must be divorced from any aspect of politics.

I repeat, nevertheless, that social justice involves the public representative of the people. In many instances the objectives of social justice cannot be achieved without such participation.

The aim and purpose of the virtue of social justice is to promote the common good. When that aim is adhered to and the objective achieved, you have social justice in action whether the participants be politicians, labor leaders, bankers, priests or plutocrats. It may very well be that some of the individuals thus participating are motivated more by their own personal interests than the common good. It may even be that some of them do profit personally. If the end result is actually and objectively the common good of the Nation, social justice is served.

Moreover—a personal motive that does not run contrary to the ultimate aim of the common good does not necessarily vitiate the action of the individual. The principle of "the end justifies the means" is morally repulsive. It is quite possible, nevertheless, and legitimately so, that a man may often act with a double motivation. So long as neither of those motives are bad in themselves, it is perfectly licit and moral for the participant to so act.

For instance, a politician (I use the term in its better meaning) urging the passage of a law for medical aid to the aged or for the creation of a new playground in a city or a slum clearance that will reduce racial tensions is acutely conscious that he has a popular issue. The social need is there. The people want action in this field. The means to be used are honest and licit. At the same time, our political example knows that it will bring him votes. He will be reelected. It will increase his own influence in the political scheme of things. Must he therefore vote against this common good proposition simply because he himself will also be a beneficiary? Nonsense.

The purer a man's intention is, the more he can divest himself of any selfish interests in the promotion of the common good, the purer will be his action and the nearer does he come to the ideal of a public servant. But idealist or no, he certainly does not have the obligation to commit political suicide simply because his own personal interests coincide with the interests of the public welfare.

"All this and heaven, too?" the cynic might ask. The answer is "Yes." So long as the papal encyclicals insist that the participation of public officials is often necessary for the promotion of the common good and so long as the participant avoids the Charybdis of corruption and the Scylla of sinful insincerity, he has a perfect right to feel that he is exercising the virtue of social justice even though it may result in the bonanza of reelection to public office.

Of course if you're an individualist, one who nurtures the illusion that Almighty God established human society as merely a collection of fragmented groups and individuals, you will not understand what the church is talking about when the sovereign pontiff speaks of socialization and of social justice. Almighty God, however, never intended that the babe in the crib nor the old person a few steps from the grave were simply to exist as isolated individuals and nothing more. We are born members of a human society. That membership places upon us the obligation of cooperating one with another—from government down and from the individual up—in the promotion of the common good. That is what the social question is all about. That we may understand and act upon that obligation is why the Popes write social encyclicals.

Excerpts, Erle Cocke, Jr., Briggs Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., Sunday, August 19, 1962, 11 a.m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, August 19, 1962, Hon. Erle Cocke, Jr., Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, was the lay speaker at the morning worship service of Briggs Memorial Baptist Church, Westmoreland Hills, Md. Portions of his remarks appeared in the Washington Post this morning and have been the subject of widespread favorable comment.

Because of my lifelong friendship with Mr. Cocke and because I share the philosophy which was expressed in his message yesterday, I requested his permission to include his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I believe that they are of universal interest.

Mr. Cocke is an outstanding young man who has served his country and his fellow man with honor and distinction and the thoughts which underlie his remarks confirm his dedication of purpose.

It is indeed a pleasure to include here his inspiring and thought-provoking message:

It is a sad commentary that in our society today doing good is not considered news. The yardstick of news these days is the evil that men can perpetrate. The bigger the community, the more violent is this yardstick.

Our greatest national problem today is not the H-bomb. It is not Communist Russia. It is not the space missile gap. It is not racial unrest. It is the cancer of moral decay eating at our Nation's vitals.

This cancer is slowly but surely destroying every traditional American virtue whether it be religious, patriotic, ethical, economic, moral, or political.

Just look how far we have drifted as a whole society from the framework of American idealism on which our Republic was founded. Where are today our pioneer day virtues of hard work, thrift and private initiative?

On one hand we have divorced the modern American from the rewards of his efforts through our all-devouring tax system. On the other hand we have divorced this same citizen from the penalties of his nonefforts by the growing paternalism of a welfare state.

Perhaps the threat of the H-bomb hanging over our collective heads day and night posing the instant cremation of the human race has accelerated the loss of all true old-fashioned values. We are today living only for the present. We are not living today for what we can contribute to the free American way of life but for what we can get out of it. We are nearing the bottom of the barrel because we cannot, either as individuals or as a nation continue to live beyond our means and forever defer the payment of the credit charges with which we have mortgaged our future.

Let us examine this picture of modern American materialism. It is charged with the high voltage of future ruin.

We are living in America today in the maddest pursuit of pleasure ever known to man on this earth. There is nothing like it anywhere else in this world. The gratification of every selfish whim seems today to be the all-absorbing passion of our people. The only power of indignation we have left is resentment over any interference with our enjoyment of life. In our homes we surround ourselves with every kind of push-button luxury. In our offices, shops, and plants we are concentrating on every kind of labor saving device, or automation. Today plans are on drafting boards to take away even the chore of driving a car by the development of highways and motor vehicles which will let us ride in self-steering, self-stopping, and self-accelerating automobiles.

No wonder we are getting soft physically. No wonder we make a poor showing against Communist athletes in the Olympic sports.

Because the almighty dollar greases our pursuit of selfish pleasures, we are concentrating on the chase of money. Possession of a big bank account is what counts today. It isn't how you got your million. Today what counts is have you got it? If you have it you are socially acceptable—by that I mean we no longer turn our backs on people with tainted money—we no longer care whether the character with the dough got it robbing widows and orphans, or a bank, or swindling his neighbors or stealing from his employer or cheating Uncle Sam.

We give a lot of lipservice to fighting communism. But how many of us today have the moral courage to turn our backs on individuals who have known records of consorting with the Reds? How many of us boycott shows whose scripts are written by authors who have taken the fifth amendment when quizzed about their Communist affiliations? How many of us accept as literary bibles book reviews done by known fellow travelers and parlor pinks?

We haven't got the courage to stand up and be counted against the followers of the Communist line. For my part I don't want any dealings of any kind with anyone who gives first allegiance to some foreign government while posing as an American citizen. I also have a very healthy respect for those people who are loyal to their own faith, church, synagogue, or mosque, as well as their loyalty to their own governments.

Unfortunately we are not merely confronted by an imported alien "ism" like communism. We have developed—I should say spawned—in this country a domestic—an American-grown evil philosophy that is just as bad as imported communism in its cancerous effect upon American character.

I refer to this growing concept that in these United States there is only one crime today. That is the crime of getting caught. You can see this vicious new belief reflected in the headlines of page 1 of every daily newspaper, every day, in every city and town of America.

It is reflected by the stories of the disappearance of personal integrity in public and private office. It is reflected by what has become known as "payola." It is reflected, finally, on the political and statesmanship levels by the sacrifice of principle to expediency and by compromise.

This Nation and our own Baptist Church was built around ideals. We didn't twist ideals to wrap them around our Republic and our other organizations.

There is a humorous adage that "everybody is against sin." My fellow Americans, examine your consciences. Is it still true? Or have we learned to wink at sin? Have we stifled our individual and national conscience?

There is a proverb which glows today with the eloquence of its truth. It is the saying that for evil to triumph it is only necessary for good men to do nothing about it.

As an American combat veteran of World War II, I am dismayed by press reports from Turkey some 2 years ago that some 30 American officers and enlisted men stationed there pleaded the fifth amendment when the Army opened an investigation of black market activities there.

Here is a new low in our morality when men who have sworn solemnly to wear the American uniform in honor to defend God and country become breakers of the laws they are pledged to uphold. It explains to us why we have turncoats in an American war.

The bulwarks of our freedom must first be erected in American minds. If the Communists can demolish these bulwarks in American minds, what good are our Army, our Navy, our Air Force, our Marine Corps? Our missileers?

We have made life too pleasurable in America at the cost of our Spartan manhood. Where else but here can a 17-year-old youth boast of a convertible, a hi-fi set, a portable TV, and a girl? No wonder he cannot stand the thought of giving up even 1 minute of such a pleasurable life to accept the highest obligation of American citizenship—that of bearing arms in defense of our freedoms.

No wonder that when the Selective Service System puts its finger on such a youth he appears before his draft board to explode indignantly, "Why pick on me?"

Who is at fault? We all are.

We have too many homes in our Nation today in which exist religious vacuums. Children are not taught to love and obey God, to respect their parents and elders. We pamper junior so much that he gets the idea that the world owes him a living and does him a grievous wrong when it expects him to submit to discipline of any kind. That's why we have unbridled young hoodlums who grow from junior delinquents to junior criminals.

We need more pausing to reflect before we take any step, or commit ourselves to any action, or make a decision, to square what we are about to do with what I call living with ourselves. Can you live with yourself in the days to come, knowing you have done someone a wrong or have sinned against your community, State, or Nation? If the voice of your scruples is weak, you need a spiritual and moral amplifier to give it a volume you cannot be deaf to or overlook. This church is where you can get these spiritual amplifiers. Without this spiritual equipment man is but an ape in velvet.

We need to shift the emphasis in America today from material riches to the kind of riches that money cannot buy. We need the personal philosophy that dedicates the citizen to the lifelong objective of leaving America better off for his having lived in it.

This is exactly the kind of life of service which we all should try to live. Briggs Church, Washington area, and America have been enriched immeasurably by your personal contributions. We have invested our time, our energy, our enthusiasm, our compassion, our helpfulness to make this community, this State and this Nation better places in which to live. We all have earned a reservation, when the good Lord summons us to post everlasting, to dwell in a land of pure delight where saints immortal reign.

We stand tall today on the American scene, as a bright beacon lighting the pathway of our people toward its true destiny with the greatness that is within our reach if we keep faith with God, with our conscience, and with our ideals of freedom, justice, and democracy.

The greatest problem that confronts a democracy like ours is the enlightened control of human selfishness. We can achieve this only by living up to divine precepts and by practicing that greatest of all American human relations ideal—by devotion to mutual helpfulness.

It has been a genuinely refreshing experience, and a privilege, to have had this opportunity of joining with you in worshiping together. May we all follow in His footsteps for the glory of God and the true welfare of America.

Local Efforts Fall Short in Lively Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the New Frontier started as an endeavor to enlist all our Nation's resources—human and material—in a much-needed effort to bring reality more in conformance with the great American dream. Some progress has been made, but as our President advised us in his memorable inaugural address, the job will not be completed easily or in a short time. It is, therefore, good that we have among us observers who remind us of the task before us. As regards cultural matters, Mr. Richard Coe, drama critic of the Washington Post, has performed this function in an admirable manner. While giving credit where credit is due and encouraging even the smallest steps toward greater cultural development, Mr. Coe, nevertheless, does not lose sight of how much must yet be done. I wish to commend the attention of the House the following article by Mr. Coe which appeared in the August 5 issue of the Washington Post.

The article follows:

LOCAL EFFORTS FALL SHORT IN LIVELY ARTS

(By Richard L. Coe)

Not too much should be expected from a civilization which turns the greatest lines of communication into a means for private huckstering, which rates the teachers of the young in lowly economic status and allows a family of six to live under a porch.

This is the time of year when we Americans are prowling about in unfamiliar spots and are likely to enter even admired cities through the back door, passing suburban settlements of dreary monotony, blinking our eyes at the sheer ugliness of signs and sleazy little buildings.

Visitors to our own city, recognized as one of the land's most beautiful, all too often drive in via New York Avenue, which not many years ago was broad and tree shaded but now is broader, denuded of trees and alive with boastful neons.

The reasons are infinitely complex, but the atmosphere cannot be disputed.

For all that, there are areas of uncommon beauty, and passionate hunger on the part of the public to enjoy them. Having read and learned through our new luxury of instant communication, the public flocks to feast on the exquisite beauties of the White House, the white splendors of Capitol Hill. Even the Seventh Street windows reflect the Louis Quinze taste of our most publicized First Lady.

Our visitors have heard of the lively arts, and this summer it's been possible to visit Shakespeare for free at the Monument Grounds' Sylvan Theater, to hear opera and watch ballet in Rock Creek Park's green-rimmed Carter Barron Amphitheater. Though Government subsidy of music is politically unthinkable, the service bands and orchestras perform at the Watergate and on the Capitol steps, courtesy of the largest military budget in human history. Friday nights the Marine Barracks twilight parade suggests the Music Hall Rockettes are clumsy sissies.

I have talked with some visitors who never have had the opportunity to see a Shakespearean production and I have found them pleasantly pleased by the current productions of "The Taming of the Shrew" and "As You Like It." I have met others who never have tasted opera or ballet and they have been exulted by Licia Albanese, Frank Guarrera and Jan Peerce in Rock Creek Park or by the prettiness of the ballets which began its season.

As we all know, it is a huge country, blessed with natural and man-created wonders, and in the inevitable gradualness of each generation, learning anything from those before it, one must expect great annual waves of earnest people to whom quality—the best of the past—is new and, just as naturally, open to argument. Is that best of the past quite so dazzling as the newcomers have been led to expect?

It is on this point where a bold, uncompromising "No" must be shouted.

The attractions themselves, for all the devotion, enthusiasm and good intentions, are utterly miserable. Only the well-subsidized military events are first-rate. The rest? No.

It simply is not possible for amateurs to play Shakespeare. It is not possible, as must be done on the sylvan stage, to move about on ill-proportioned steps which serve as the stage setting. It simply is not possible to act Shakespeare so that each speaker is smack in front of a microphone at a given instant.

It simply is not possible to produce the great operas properly with thin choruses, small orchestras, too vast a stage, too little rehearsal time and settings that were questionable on smaller stages 40-odd years ago. It is not even possible to produce Gilbert and Sullivan without a mass of ermined lords for "Iolanthe" or a bevy of little ladies for "The Mikado."

It simply is not possible even for America's oldest ballet company to present good ballet after a brief rehearsal period following a long lull of inactivity. It is not possible for an orchestra to leap from Aaron Copland to P. I. Tschaikowski without expensive hours and hours of rehearsals.

The facade looks so rosy, culture is fashionably served, and when Life magazine starts the Washington Shakespeare Summer Festival by snapping performers and smiling audience against the gleaming Washington Monument, everyone knows the record will look dandy—especially if Life ever prints the picture.

It is all, one reflects, another outcropping of huskstering, of saying things which aren't so and which, in the long run, fool few. The marvel, perhaps, is the long-suffering patience of unknowing audiences, settling for their dash of Shakespeare, their professionally sung individual arias, their assured spins from experienced dancers. As they crowd for these crumbs, they show their hunger.

They show, too, their appreciation, for without doubt those crumbs will lead some to find fuller sustenance. They will in time be kindled to more demanding tastes.

Still, we cannot say they are being served the best on these skeletal reproductions of civilization's glories.

The best costs money and, above all, time. The creation of ugliness is financially profitable, and looking around our despoiled lands, polluted streams, and wasted talents, is it really surprising that, when it comes to the finest, we settle supinely for its merest shadow?

Statement of Federation of Homemakers Before Subcommittee on Health and Safety, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the excellent testimony given by Mrs. Ruth Desmond, secretary of the Federation of Homemakers, before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Statement of Federation of Homemakers Before Subcommittee on Health and Safety, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Re H.R. 9101, H.R. 9102, and H.R. 9331 To Amend Clause (3) of Section 402(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, August 9, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the Health and Safety Subcommittee, I am Ruth Desmond, secretary of the Federation of Homemakers, a nationwide organization of public-spirited housewives. The need for such an organization became evident when its founders either attended the food additives hearings or read the printed record of the hearings and realized how little information of vital interest to homemakers regarding legislation dealing with the treatment of food is published in newspapers and magazines. The food additives hearings also made it plain that the homemakers of this country must, in fairness, be permitted to give their views to Congress on the probable harmful, cumulative effects of extensive treatment of foods with newly developed substances on humans, and whether they wish to take these potential risks—especially with regard to their children.

At the color additives hearings this federation had the privilege of presenting a statement before this committee. Our group was greatly encouraged when Representative Dingell complimented the federation on its statement and stated this organization is now fulfilling a need which had long existed in the Congress. It follows that members of this Federation heartily endorse the President's statement that consumers have the right to knowledge and the right to be heard—and certainly these rights are especially important where the public's health and well-being are concerned.

Now that the world has been shocked by the knowledge that a previously regarded as innocuous drug, thalidomide, has been capable of causing damage to unborn babies when taken by pregnant women in the early stages of their pregnancy—the advice of the late Sir Edward Mellanby seems more significant than ever to members of this federation. I am referring to Sir Mellanby's Sander-Wells lecture "The Chemical Manipulation of Food," delivered at the Middlesex Hospital on May 4, 1951, and published in the British Medical Journal, October 13, 1951. I quote briefly from this lecture:

"At the present time, both in the United States and in this country, it is possible for chemical substances to be used in food manipulation and production which ultimately prove to be harmful and deleterious. This does not mean that substances known to be harmful can be added to food but only chemicals are often assumed to be harmless and, after being used for a longer or shorter time, are then proved to have harmful properties. This kind of incident is constantly happening. It was stated at a recent inquiry in the United States that of 700 chemical agents at present used in food preparation 246 had not been studied enough from a toxicological angle to satisfy the FDA of that country that they were innocuous. Even when such chemical substances have passed through a battery of tests from the point of view of toxicology, unexpected harmful results have often ultimately been demonstrated."

Scientists and physicians echoed similar advice at the food additives hearings which apparently was not heeded. In a recent speech before the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union leaders on July 24, 1962, at Bushkill, Pa., Commissioner Larrick notes that now about 4,000 additives are used in food production—some, of course, in the packaging and wrapping materials and the coatings.

The thalidomide tragedy emphasizes the need for more realistic and thorough testing of drugs and food additives. Larger animals will need to be used in these more valid tests and a variety of species will need to be used. We hope the total impact of the environment (potentialism) as endured by humans will also be considered in undertaking these future tests of chemicals for safety when their use is contemplated in drugs and foods. This federation spoke of the need for research along these lines in its statement on color additives legislation and especially commented on the effects chemicals may have upon pregnant women (we see now that we should have stressed the probable harm to the unborn child). At the lipstick hearings conducted by FDA this federation again brought up the need for better animal testing methods. Later, Dr. Harold Stewart, pathologist with the National Institutes of Health, in commenting on the need for the Delaney anticancer clause in food legislation, stressed the need for extensive testing of chemicals—taking into consideration the effect of the whole environment upon laboratory animals.

Now a process has been developed for converting whole fish into a fish protein concentrate. It is our understanding that fins, gills, eyes, scales, intestines, stomach contents—all will be utilized in this process. The public is assured the final product will be esthetic in appearance and taste, will be clean, and will store indefinitely. Surely a drastic process must be necessary to convert such offensive items into a pure, almost odorless product? It is the understanding of this federation that first the whole fish and its stomach contents will be placed in a boiling solvent until the bones and fat and distressing items are removed or disappear or disintegrate. Then the protein which is left is subjected to boiling alcohol to remove the odor. Surely residues of the solvent and alcohol will remain in this final product—even if only in minute traces? The question follows, Have animal and human tests been of sufficient duration to determine its cumulative effect on humans?

The need for such a protein is justified in areas where the tiny children will starve to death without a cheap, complete protein added to their diets or else will live on permanently maimed for life because of inadequate food at this particular stage of their existence. The calculated risks would be justified in such a situation; especially until they are old enough to eat and assimilate properly an adult diet. Perhaps members of this committee recall the "Brinkley Journal" last winter on local TV where schoolchildren of Peru were shown eating their one substantial meal of the day (sometimes it was their only meal) which appeared to consist of American whole wheat cooked with native vegetables and I presume infrequently some meat was added. Although viewers were told it was difficult for these underfed or infrequently fed children to concentrate on their school lessons (understandably food and their lunch occupied their thoughts)—these children appeared surprisingly attractive and wholesome on this film.

This federation is not opposed to the use of this cheap, whole-fish product to save the lives of small children in underdeveloped impoverished countries. But our members see no justification for its addition to the diet of Americans who have an ample supply of protein in this country—sometimes at very reasonable prices. We have in mind supermarket sales of chickens—as an example. Nevertheless it is seriously being contemplated to add this drastically processed substance or concentrate to bread, cookies, cakes, cereals, and other food items already extensively processed for consumption by people who have an abundance of food. Our members are opposed to this concentrate being added to the food supplies of this country until it has been tested for years to determine its ultimate effect on the human body. Its value as an emergency ration certainly could be justified even in this country. If we were ever so unfortunate as to be engaged in an atomic war—this item could be invaluable. Possibly it might be needed in times of a natural disaster—such as a hurricane.

If the precedent to use whole fish in a fish flour is established by changing our Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—will this later result in a flood of requests to use other previously ruled undesirable food products in our foods? Later, as a result of this concession, will FDA officials be able to refuse permission to use rotten eggs or slightly decomposed eggs, chemically treated to insure cleanliness, in foods? Cannot certain portions of poultry and livestock, previously used in livestock feeds, now be incorporated in our foods?

Last year a member of this federation studied the FDA file on fish flour concentrate and observed at that time many letters in opposition to using whole fish in this product. Some were afraid that decomposed fish might also be utilized. Quite a few of these letters in opposition to the use of whole fish were from housewives and from women's clubs and organizations. The Federated Women's Clubs issued a resolution against the use of whole fish for this protein concentrate. This federation was not only opposed to the use of the whole fish but also to the method to be employed in such processing.

In view of the foregoing, this federation believes there is no justification (except perhaps profits of a financial nature) for foisting this fish concentrate product upon the American people who have access to a plentiful supply of complete protein for their diets.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of a dedicated group of housewives.

St. Stephen: Spirit of Hungary's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the Record an address I delivered Sunday afternoon, August 19, at the St. Stephen's Day celebration, held under the auspices of the American Hungarian Catholic Society, at the open-air shrine and chapel on the grounds of the Daughters of the Divine Redeemer, Lander Road, Orange Village, Ohio, on "St. Stephen: Spirit of Hungary's Future":

St. Stephen: Spirit of Hungary's Future

I am honored with the opportunity you have given me to join with you in your annual observance of St. Stephen's Day. This is a memorable day for all Hungarians everywhere in the world. This observance honors an enlightened ruler, a beloved king among men, and the patron saint of the Hungarian nation.

The history of the Hungarian nation is inseparably connected with the life and times of St. Stephen. It is generally agreed that the Hungarian nation existed as an European state for approximately 100 years before King Stephen became ruler of that land. But those 100 years are dimly recorded by history. The coming of King Stephen shaped the Hungarian nation, established its foundation, gave it identity to the known world, and blessed it with a greatness of purpose that has endured for almost a millennium.

It was King Stephen, youthful in years, with a rareness of mind, who studied Christianity and converted to it, brought conversion of the entire nation to Christianity. He assumed the kingship of Hungary with a crown that has since become known as the Holy Crown of St. Stephen, and which, to this day, stands as an indelible symbol of Hungary as a nation. So strong and so benign was the influence of King Stephen upon the life of his nation that long after Hungary ceased to be ruled by a king, the crown of King Stephen has remained as the symbol of state authority.

King Stephen brought many things to the Hungarian nation which have endured the test of time. But two of his contributions stand out in the world of our times. The first was his declaration of responsibility which must be assumed by all citizens of a nation, the foremost of which was the exacting duty of the rich to care for the poor. This declaration was based upon the basic Christian virtue of charity. King Stephen applied that virtue to the everyday life of his nation and judged his subjects by the manner in which they devoted themselves to that virtue. His second contribution was teaching the virtue of tolerance among his people—tolerance between and among all classes, tolerance of the people in the neighboring states, and especially tolerance of non-Magyars who were living under the crown of Hungary. These and other contributions of King Stephen to his people, given in the highest Christian tradition, accepted and cherished by the Hungarian people, contributed to the canonization of King Stephen as a great saint of the Christian church.

If we observe, but quickly, the long and glorious history of the Hungarian Nation since the reign of King Stephen, we may judge how well these virtues were adopted by the Magyars and the importance they bear to the existence of the Hungarian nation today.

In the 13th century, when the golden hordes were the scourge of the Eurasian continent, it was in Hungary that the campaign of Batu Khan, favorite son of Genghis Khan, was stopped. That battle cost the Hungarian nation dearly. Some historians estimate that as much as 40 percent of Hungarian manhood was sacrificed in the defense of Christian Europe.

Again in the 16th century the people of Hungary, standing as a bastion of defense for western Europe, were called upon to repel the Turkish invasions. Here we are reminded of Prince Hunyadi, leader of the defense of Christian Europe, and for the success of Hunyadi's campaign, the angelus prayer of Christianity was ordered by Pope Urban the fourth—these and many other epics of Christendom have earned for the Hungarian nation the esteem and the honor of Christendom.

In our times we witness Hungarian sacrifices in defense of their Chirstian heritage. Occupied as they are by the new infidels from Moscow, oppressed and persecuted as they are because of their devotion to Christian principles, dedicated as they are to the timeless principles of liberty, justice, and freedom, they are the special target of organized evil on the march.

The modern day symbol of this great Hungarian heritage is Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty.

When the hordes of Moscow occupied Hungary in the closing days of World War II, it was Cardinal Mindszenty who stood as the rallying point of a nation sentenced to national punishment because of political developments in central east Europe, little known or understood by the leaders in the West. It will be recalled that Hungary was not regarded in the councils of the West as a liberated nation, and worse, it was left to the pitiless tyranny of the men from Moscow. And the Russian despots lost no time in introducing their carefully organized program of national punishment upon Hungarian people. In these circumstances Cardinal Mindszenty, dynamic in the traditions of St. Stephen, rallied the Hungarian nation from the depths of despair to stand boldly before the Russian occupier. So strong was his appeal, so brave his leadership, that in the only free election held in Hungary, the Communist puppets were routed and the voice of Hungary spoke out for leaders that would guarantee the blessings of self-government.

But Cardinal Mindszenty and the gallant people of Hungary have paid a heavy price for their bravery and determination. To break the spirt of the Hungarian people, Cardinal Mindszenty was made the target of an evil campaign organized and directed by the Russian tyrants. Falsely accused, tried before a court of puppets, condemned and sentenced by the stooges of Moscow, Cardinal Mindszenty was put in chains.

The Hungarian people, in their great freedom revolution of 1956, removed those chains from Cardinal Mindszenty and returned him to his rightful place as spiritual leader of a Nation dedicated to those moral principles without which liberty, freedom, and Independence are meaningless. When the hordes of Moscow reinvaded Hungary on November 4, 1956, Cardinal Mindszenty found refuge in the American Embassy in Budapest. There he has remained these past 6 years, awaiting action by the nations of the free world on their promises expressed through the resolution on Hungary, enacted by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Cardinal Mindszenty has made it clear that he will not leave Hungary, that his duty is to stand fast with the good people of Hungary, and that the emancipation of Hungary is the only condition under which a change in his present status can be effected.

The brave and nobel spirit of Cardinal Mindszenty reminds the world of the brave and noble spirit of the Hungarian people which finds its foundation in the life, the times, and the teachings of St. Stephen, the first Christian king of Hungary.

And so today, as we celebrate St. Stephen's Day, we are reminded of a long and glorious past, as we recognize the cruel and demoralizing injustices which dominate everyday life in Hungary today. We who have faith, know the spiritual power of Christianity and have an unwavering belief in the goodness of Almighty God. These beliefs and this spiritual power have withstood attacks from tyrants and despots in the past and have gone on to greater glory and happiness for all who believe.

We who are gathered here, are confident of the future of Hungary because no power on earth can break the tradition of a thousand years of Hungarian history.

Wanted: A Policeman for Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, attached is an interesting paper which William A. Hyman, Esq., a constituent of mine, prepared on the subject of space law. It is entitled "Wanted: A Policeman for Outer Space." Mr. Hyman points up the necessity for a body of space law:

WANTED: A POLICEMAN FOR SPACE

(By William A. Hyman)

I. THE MIRACLES OF SCIENCE—THE FAILURE OF LAW

Man breaks his earthbound shackles. Science opens up new worlds far beyond the old dreams and hopes of mankind.

On October 4, 1957, the launching of the first sputnik blasted upon us the opening of the space age. Missiles, rockets, and satellites became household words.

On September 13, 1959, there was a direct target hit on the moon.

On April 12, 1961, a second stage in this new era was opened when Major Gagarin orbited the earth. On August 7, 1961, Major Titov orbited the earth 17 times in 25 hours followed by the short flights of Commander Shephard and Captain Grissom and finally, the triple orbiting flight of Lieutenant Colonel Glenn on February 20, 1962.

On January 20, 1962, Tass, the official Soviet press agency, quoted their scientists as stating "man will visit the moon. The establishment on the moon of a permanent scientific station and subsequently an industrial undertaking will permit us to tap the yet undeveloped resources of this perpetual satellite of the earth."

On April 2, 1962, there was referred to the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate the bill establishing a commercial communications satellite system.

World meteorological projects for weather forecasting, weather control, and instantaneous telecommunications, are on the verge of attainment.

We are now at the third stage in space.

Science has achieved sensational goals and promises to attain outstanding achievements in the future. This will require a change in the course of life everywhere. It will affect our relationships on an international, and also on an interplanetary basis.

Global science has attained world domination.

Law has remained static. It has been helpless in this new field.

This situation has brought forth exhortations for law from the leaders in the study of space.

In 1958, the challenge was hurled forth, "Law must precede man into space". Those who then urged that "national and international action and cooperation are at this time premature"—held "a point of view that was untenable—yes, and even dangerous."

Senator KEATING has said that the development of law for space cannot proceed at the pace which characterized the horse and buggy age. Other prominent members of the House and Senate have likewise urged this same view. We have been warned that the possible dangers of acting too soon were outweighed by the certain dangers of waiting too long for the enactment of any such regulations.

In other parts of the world, too, the urgency for establishment of law to regulate the peaceful uses of space has been emphasized.

II. THE UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

Pursuant to a resolution of the United States submitted in November, 1958, an Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was established.

On June 12, 1959, it submitted its report and unfortunately, took the position that no attempt should be made to establish a law to regulate the use of outer space.

The Committee, later was increased in size by the addition of new member-states and members from new nations. This Committee rendered its report on March 30, 1962. It covered features which are of importance but it failed to meet the demands of the day. It did—

1. Emphasize the need for international cooperation.

2. Express satisfaction with the exchange of messages between Mr. Khrushchev and President Kennedy in regard to the development of concrete projects in this field.
3. Direct the exchange of information and registry of launching objects into orbit.
4. Emphasize meteorology and telecommunications.

In this fifth year of the age of space, after incredible scientific achievements this Committee's report falls far short of answering the challenge that "Law must precede man into space."

The committee failed to give due consideration and take appropriate action on the questions of sovereignty and security involved in the use of space.

It failed to request the United Nations to make mandatory the application of international law and the United Nations Charter to outer space and the celestial bodies. Although the committee stated it "recognized the need both to take timely constructive action and to make the law of space responsive to the facts," up to the present time, this has not been done.

III. THE MAGNA CARTA OF SPACE

On April 12, 1961, *Vostok* (*The East*) was placed in orbit around the earth, the first manned spaceship satellite to do so. At certain points of its flight, its perigee was only 181 kilometers from the surface of the subjacent land (approximately 115 miles).

On the 7th of August 1961, the second manned spaceship satellite *Vostok II* (*The East II*) established a prolonged flight in orbit circling the earth 17 times in 25 hours. Its perigee at various points was as low as 178 kilometers from the surface of the subjacent land (approximately 110 miles).

And again, the achievement of Lieutenant Colonel Glenn in his triple orbit of the earth in *Friendship 7*—a wholly disclosed, unconcealed sensational flight—established a perigee, its lowest altitude, over subjacent countries during the flight as low as 87 and 89 miles above the surface of the earth. Under the various theories as to the extent of sovereignty into the upper reaches of the atmosphere—below the lower limits of space—is there any question that the flights of all three great cosmonauts necesasrily invaded the sovereign territory of subjacent lands at the lowest or lower points of their orbits? I believe it is indisputable that the upper reaches of sovereign territory were invaded somewhere in the course of these flights. Without agreement on basic fundamental principles, the invasion of sovereignty carrying with it the accidental invasion of national security, will create problems that may prove incapable of solution except by resort to force.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest your consideration of the Magna Carta of space which was accepted at Bogotá, Colombia, in February 1961, at the Convention of the Inter-American Bar Association and which was subsequently sent to the missions of the nations at the United Nations in May 1961.

Because of its importance, the basic principles enunciated in the Magna Carta of space are set forth. They are as follows:

(a) All space shall be divided into air space and outer space.

(b) All air space shall be deemed to be part of the sovereign jurisdiction of the subjacent land.

(c) All outer space shall be deemed "res commis" (and not "terra nullius").

(d) The interplanetary system shall be deemed "res communis" (and not "res nullius").

(e) Recognition shall be given to the distinction between "res communis" and "terra nullius" (the former denying rights of appropriation and exclusive control by any one nation, the latter conceding such rights of appropriation through the established principles of discovery, habitation, and settlement).

(f) Outer space shall be used solely for peaceful purposes with freedom of exploration and exploitation thereof given to all people for the benefit of mankind.

(g) There shall be no nuclear experiments in outer space.[1]

(h) Furthermore, since it is impossible to set out a boundary line with physical qualities such as characterize boundary lines on land and on the sea, that there be established a neutral zone embracing the upper limits of air space and the lower limits of outer space to be known as Neutralia in which the right of innocent passage shall be afforded all craft, vehicles, and objects of transit and movement without any such incident being deemed an invasion of sovereignty. In the event of any such innocent passage no nation shall have the right to attack or destroy such vehicle or object in transit or the nation from which the said vehicle or object was launched or to destroy any occupants thereof without prior, sufficient warning and notice of claim of invasion of sovereignty and without prior opportunity for determination of the merits of such complaints by peaceful methods.

(i) Provision shall be made for identification, registration, and disclosure of intent of launchings of all space vehicles.

(j) Provision shall likewise be made for the peaceful recognition of rights and places for reentry and landing of space vehicles.

(k) Provision shall be made for the allocation and control of radio frequencies.

(l) Provision shall be made for the avoidance of interference with aircraft by space vehicles and also by space vehicles with other space vehicles.

(m) In the event of injuries or death to persons or damage to property caused by space vehicles, rockets, missiles, satellites, and the like, the sovereign power by or through which the same have been launched shall be responsible and liable for all such damage without the requirement of any proof of fault, negligence, carelessness or recklessness.

(n) An international insurance fund shall be established through some appropriate international association such as the United Nations for the payment of compensation for such damages.

(o) Proper provision shall be made for the international policing of outer space and for the protection of the peoples and nations against violations of their rights therein.

(p) All disputes arising directly and indirectly through the use of outer space and the interplanetary regions shall be settled and determined solely by arbitration through accepted agency, court, or tribunal to be designated by the sovereign powers or by the United Nations.

(q) The landing on any other planet containing life, or the occupation thereof, by earthman shall not give to any nation on earth any right of ownership or control of such other planet.

(r) The peoples of the earth do hereby declare that they recognize the rights of sovereignty, ownership, and control of any other planet by the inhabitants thereof.

(s) War, in, by, or through space is hereby barred forever.

IV. THE OPPOSITION TO SUCH A SKELETAL OUTLINE OF PRINCIPLES FOR SPACE IS NOT SOUND

There is a school of thought which opposes the statement of any short, concise declaration of rights and obligations relating to the use of space. They urge that we should wait until an extensive codification can be established. They disregard the fact that the time has come for action to establish the basic principles that will affect the relationship between individuals and nations, nations and nations, the earth and the interplanetary system.

Let us use the guidelines of the past:

(a) The Ten Commandments.

(b) The Magna Carta of 1215.

(c) The Articles of Confederation of the colonies as planned at the Continental Congress in July 1776 and adopted in July 1778.

(d) The Declaration of Independence.

(e) The Constitution of the United States.

(f) The Bill of Rights.

All are short, concise statements which have proven to be the basis of security and progress.

The Sixth Commandment states, "Thou Shalt Not Kill." Laws have been enacted in every age and country prohibiting murder. Yet individuals as well as nations have violated this proscription. In fact, war has been stated to be a normal routine of man and that peace itself is an artificial creation.

Should the Ten Commandments then be rejected because the sixth is violated? Should the Bill of Rights be repealed because civil rights have been denied to certain people?

Are not our courts full of litigation arising from violations of civil and criminal laws? Because such laws are violated, are they useless?

The Magna Carta of Space will amass behind it world public opinion where the forces for proper behavior on the part of all nations are to be found.

World public opinion will prove the decisive factor for peace. Mankind wants peace. It will not tolerate nor forgive the outlaw.

V. THE POLICEMAN IN SPACE

The Charter of the United Nations should be amended to extend its jurisdiction into space. It must be freed from its earthbound chains. But a law or treaty which is not enforceable is a nullity. A traffic regulation without a traffic officer causes confusion rather than order and safety. The history of the United Nations has shown that proper policing has helped to prevent a world conflagration which would have meant the destruction of mankind.

While efforts are being made to effect an agreement to control nuclear testing and to prevent provocations for international strife, efforts can be made to provide power to the United Nations to police space.

CONCLUSION

The Soviet Union and the United States control the power to destroy the world.

Neither would deliberately set off a catastrophic world conflagration. Each knows too well the unavoidable consequences of such an undertaking. The risk lies in the creation of an unintended war set off by an innocent occurrence which is construed as a warlike act. A Soviet missile accidentally dropped in New York or an American missile accidentally dropped in Moscow could be construed as such an intentional attack.

In his plea before the United Nations on April 17, 1962, Hon. U Thant, the Acting Secretary General, urged the great powers to reach "temporary standstill agreements" on the issues that threaten to incite sudden disaster. Mr. Thant stated that the risk of unintended war was "very great." He stated that "from time to time we have been hearing of a nuclear-tipped missile being nearly launched by accident or on false alarm, even by an electrical short circuit. It is common knowledge that both the American and Soviet missiles are at hair-trigger readiness and controlled by electronic devices."

Furthermore, he stated, "But it is imperative that the seriousness of these situations does not develop to the point of application of this monstrous nuclear power. If no final solution can yet be found for these disputes, the most sensible and practical course is to insulate them as far as possible from war risks by temporary standstill agreements, while at the same time an effort is made to build a more permanent war-free international system."

The world wants peace not war—hot or cold. It is tired of continued international

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

provocations which constantly threaten the peace of the world.

Peace connotes the right of the common man the world over to live, to survive, to progress, to exercise the fundamental principles of equality, liberty and freedom under law, and in a society under proper supervision.

The world lacks the restraining force of law in space. The era of scientific domination without regard to the creation of additional dangers for mankind proceeds at a faster and faster pace.

Let us now terminate the legal vacuum in space. Let us now unite on the fundamental principles for the protection of all—the Marna Carta of Space and the establishment of the United Nations as the policeman of space.

"Nine-tenths of wisdom is being wise in time."

---

[1] Provision (g) hereinabove referred to was lost by one vote in committee but subsequently, the votes received from absent members of the committee supported the provision.

Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy To Take Possession of Naval Oil Shale Reserves

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would like to be advised when I have consumed 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late and I apologize to the Members of the House for imposing on their time at this hour of the day. I think it is important, however, that some legislative history be established in the consideration of this rule with reference to this particular bill. I might remind the Members that research on this particular shale deposit was in a very active state from 1944 to 1956. So the question immediately presents itself, if we had an experimental project in operation for 12 years, just exactly what is the further need for research in this particular field? You might ask, Why would you be apprehensive about this, other than the cost of such? What objection might there be to extending and reactivating the research at this particular shale deposit at Rifle, Colo.?

My only objection is this: Back in 1934 we were told that we were going to authorize a few million dollars for the Tennessee Valley project, and it was to be merely a yardstick to measure the actual cost of producing electrical energy; it was not to enter into the commercial production of electricity; it was to provide a yardstick whereby the actual cost of production of electrical energy could be measured against the rates that were being charged across the country by private enterprise. You know, of course, what has happened from that time to this. We have developed a monstrosity, in my opinion, in the Tennessee Valley that is engaged in the production of subsidized electricity on a commercial basis. It has cost the taxpayers of the United States many hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Here we are 30 years later, and just an hour ago we appropriated, in the public works appropriation bill, $35 million more for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

All I want to do this afternoon is to make the record abundantly clear that the reactivation of research in the shale deposits at Rifle, Colo., by the Department of the Interior, or the lessee of their designation, will be entirely restricted for whatever need might exist in the way of developing further information through a research program and is not—and I repeat—it is not in any way to be taken as consent by Congress for the commencement of commercial production of oil and other petroleum products.

May I ask the chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], if I have properly interpreted the purpose of this legislation?

Mr. PRICE. The answer to the gentleman from Kansas is that he has correctly stated the purpose of the legislation. It is in the interest of the development and research of potential oil resources for the Navy and the military forces in the event of national emergency and exclusively for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has consumed 3 minutes.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his comment, and I want his comment to be contained in the adoption of the rule proceedings here so that in retrospect there may be no doubt as to why the experimentation is being authorized in this legislation.

Mr. PRICE. That is correct. The Navy requested this legislation specifically for this purpose.

Mr. AVERY. By way of explanation I might add this. Perhaps some Members may ask, "Do we not need all the petroleum products we can get? And are we not importing a vast volume of crude oil and residual oil from foreign sources of supply?" The answer is, "Yes, of course we are." But the same as in many other industries, because of the importation of vast quantities of petroleum products and residual oil, and particularly crude oil, the independent producers of Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma, and many other States, have seen their production rolled back to where they are now producing only 25 to 50 percent of their potential. This, of course, preserves our natural resources, but at the same time I ask the Members of the House to place themselves in the position of having a potential return from your investment of $50,000 a year and suddenly you are then rolled back to $12,500. You would not like that; it would adversely affect the economy of your State, and it would hold you to one-quarter of your return on your investment that you had anticipated when the investment was originally made.

So I hope that this RECORD will be read by the Department of the Navy as they proceed to reactivate this experimental project in Colorado.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma who has done more research on this matter, probably, than any other Member of the House.

Mr. STEED. I think the gentleman has just made a very important point. I agree with everything he has said and associate myself with him in his presentation of this point to the House. I hope there will be no mistaking what he has said here today.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman refresh my memory? Did we not have a bill before the House not long ago that denied funds for the operation of this plant at Rifle, Colo.? Or was that the story? Is this bill designed to activate that plant?

Mr. AVERY. I would have to respond to the gentleman by saying that I am not personally familiar with the legislation to which he is referring. I defer to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. We have not had a bill up here in recent years on that. I believe the gentleman refers to the time when the Department of the Interior decided to close this plant and end the experimentation there. That was about 1958.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman form Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman refers to requests for funds to reactivate this plant during fiscal year 1963. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] proposed an amendment when the Interior Department appropriation bill was before us. The gentleman from Colorado now speaking opposed that amendment because there is no possibility of this plant being reactivated or any work being done at the facility until the jurisdiction question has been settled. This bill is for the purpose of determining the matter of jurisdiction. It has nothing to do with appropriations or the production of the product—kerogen—from oil shale.

Mr. AVERY. In response to the gentleman from Colorado, I concur that what he said is entirely true, that this bill does not envision any commercial development. I would repeat what I said when TVA was authorized, little did we think then that that authority was going to be engaged in the commercial production of electricity.

I may say further, Mr. Speaker, that on present-day prices it would require a subsidy of $1.50 a barrel to feasibly produce crude oil from this shale deposit at Rifle, Colo. I would remind you, however, that would not necessarily prohibit commercial production because we subsidize other production that is just as nonessential as this is at the present time. I do not want to deter or restrict further research, but I repeat, I hope our colloquy here this afternoon will not be in any way construed as a green light on commercial production of crude oil.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Battery C, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 43d Artillery, Honored at Erie, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a very fine welcome-home ceremony was held at Erie, Pa., Sunday, August 19, for Battery C, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 43d Artillery.

This outstanding Army Reserve unit had just completed 10 months of active duty during which it won many deserved honors and received the rating of "superior."

These young men exemplified the high type of able and unselfish young people in our Reserve forces. I was proud to participate in the welcome-home ceremony and under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a copy of the ceremony's program and the address I delivered as principal speaker:

WELCOME HOME: BATTERY C, 5TH HOWITZER BATTALION, 43D ARTILLERY FROM ERIE, PA., SUNDAY, AUGUST 19, 1962, 8 P.M., ACADEMY STADIUM, ERIE, PA.

Battery C, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 43d Artillery, U.S. Army Reserve: Capt. Clair W. Steel, commanding; 1st Lt. Paul B. Kraus, executive officer, 1st Lt. Thomas M. Heintzel, assistant executive officer; 1st Sgt. Louis S. Pisani; M. Sgt. Harold E. Beck, chief, firing battery; Sgt. Frank La Riccia, motor sergeant; Sfc. Richard M. Thompson, mess steward; Sgt. Ronald A. Faster, supply sergeant; Sgt. Harold E. Veit, platoon sergeant.

HISTORY

Activated during World War II and earned battle credits for participation in the Ardennes-Alsace; central Europe; Normandy; northern France and Rhineland campaigns of the European theater. Served in the Army Occupation of Germany following the end of the war until August 1945.

Deactivated following World War II. Reactivated as a Reserve unit in Erie, Pa., on February 14, 1956, as part of the 377th AAA Automatic Weapons Battalion and was reorganized as an artillery unit (155 millimeter) in June 1959.

Entered on active duty October 1, 1961, with mobilization station at Fort Sill, Okla., as a result of the Berlin crisis. Returned to Erie on August 9, 1962.

PROGRAM

Master of ceremonies: Lt. Col. Walter H. Sapp (retired).

Invocation: Rev. Jack E. Spencer.

Introduction of guests: Master of ceremonies.

Welcome from city of Erie: Hon. Charles B. Williamson, mayor, city of Erie.

Welcome from county of Erie: Commissioner Louis J. Rzymek, board of commissioners, Erie County.

Welcome home address: Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress.

Letter of welcome from commanding general, XXI U.S. Army Corps: Master of ceremonies.

Résumé of unit activity: Capt. Clair W. Steele.

Formation of units: Unit commanders.

Retreat ceremony: Armed services Reserve units.

Benediction: Rev. Jack E. Spencer.

WELCOME HOME RESERVES

(Address by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, House of Representatives, at the homecoming ceremonies in honor of Battery C, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 43d Artillery, Erie, Pa., August 19, 1962)

All of us in Pennsylvania are glad to welcome home the men of Battery C, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 43d Artillery.

We extend to them our most sincere good wishes and we pledge our help in making their adjustment to civilian life as swift and as smooth as possible.

We recognize the great debt of gratitude we owe to the men of Battery C. We know, too, that we owe them our heartfelt respect and honor. They have earned our gratitude through their unquestioning service in our Nation's Armed Forces.

These men have sacrificed much private comfort and wealth that we might remain safe and free.

Many of them have had to interrupt their careers or their schooling in midstream and many have suffered great financial loss during their terms of active service.

Through this welcome home program—grateful residents of Erie demonstrate their appreciation for the magnificent work they have accomplished.

I would like to take a few moments now to outline briefly for you the achievements of the Erie unit during their activation.

Battery C established a record of which it can be justly proud.

It is a record which should give comfort to all Americans in the knowledge that the defense of the Nation is in capable hands, when it rests on the shoulders of men who are of the caliber of Battery C.

The unit quickly organized itself when it was ordered to active duty, and proceeded, without accident or incident, to Fort Sill, its assigned training site.

Before a month was out, Battery C was already undergoing the initial phases of its training.

During the succeeding 3 months the unit completed the 4th U.S. Army training test. It might be well to note at this point that the training program which Battery C completed was a stiff one. It is meant to harden men for possible combat. It is tough. It is difficult. We can sense some measure of the hardships experienced by the personnel of Battery C—if we realize that during the month of January the unit spent 2 nights per week in the field in preparing for its training test—2 nights per week in the field in bitter cold of winter.

They had to work hard but they successfully completed their initial training assignment. In short, the men of Battery C demonstrated that they could do the job. But this was only the beginning.

Battery C's next test was the 41st Artillery Group training test.

Through the icy months of February and March the men and officers of Battery C welded themselves into an efficient and effective fighting force firing the 75-millimeter, 105-millimeter, and 155-millimeter howitzers.

They readied themselves for the group artillery test. In April they proved that their long hours of training had been productive. Battery C scored an amazing 91.4 on the artillery test, the highest score recorded at Fort Sill in 10 years.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, Battery C Reserve unit had bettered the Regulars.

Battery C also had a score of 100 percent in gunnery, which marked the first time that this feat had ever been achieved.

This exemplary record was capped in June when Battery C passed the annual general inspection and received a rating of "superior," the highest rating in the 5th Howitzer Battalion.

Battery C also earned the privilege and honor of firing for the artillery school at Fort Sill. Now, the men of Battery C were teaching other soldiers their skills.

Battery C was chosen, too, to fire the 105-millimeter howitzer phase of the post demonstration, "the mechanized infantry in attack."

Some 330 rounds of ammunition were fired in this demonstration, 150 shells being expended in the short space of 11 minutes. In all, a total of 14,250 man-hours were spent in supporting the artillery school on firing demonstrations.

There is a good reason for the success of Battery C. It lies in the competence and devotion to duty of its men. Capt. C. W. Steele, the commanding officer of Battery C, has been an inspiring leader to his men.

Certainly their magnificent performance while on active duty must be partly related to the high character of the leadership they received. But the enlisted men of Battery C deserve commendation too. We have the example of M. Sgt. Harold E. Beck, who was awarded the Army Commendation Medal for meritorious service during this tour of active duty; the example of Sp5c. James J. Strub, who received a commendation for his outstanding performance while serving with the artillery school; and the example of Sp4c. David Brunner, who was commended for his assistance to the 41st Group in preparation for its annual general inspection.

These men set a high standard for their comrades in arms. Without the great work of these men, as well as the teamwork of the other members of Battery C, its mission and the mission of the entire Army Reserve program could not have been accomplished.

I would like to sketch for you that broader Reserve mission to which the activity of Battery C contributed so much.

It is critically important that we understand why these men of Battery C, as well as 156,000 other reservists, were called to active duty for a year.

During the long months while these men served their Nation, many of them—and many of us at home—may have questioned the value of activating the Reserves. Their training assignments while on active duty may have appeared to be only remotely related to the struggle against possible Communist aggression. Nothing could be further from the truth. It bears reemphasis that the Reserves were called up to prevent a war from beginning, not necessarily to fight one. And in the event that war should have broken out, the Reserves were preparing to fight in such a conflict until it was successfully concluded.

This is the meaning behind the long, certainly painful, months of training at Fort Sill. This is the meaning behind the great sacrifice these men have made. Any attempt to obscure the value of the service of the Reserves does them a great disservice and threatens the morale of the American people in their efforts to win the cold war.

The Reserves were ordered to active duty in the midst of the Berlin crisis last Summer. There were clear indications at that time that the Soviet Union and the East German Government might attempt a quick take over of the city. This would have presented the West with an accomplished political fact of life.

Such a situation could have either touched off world war III with all of its attendant horrors or would have perhaps cowed the West into submission. Neither alternative was desirable. Both threatened to disrupt, perhaps shatter, the fabric of Western unity. Capitulation in Berlin would have spelled the breakup of the western alliance.

Confidence in America's ability and willingness to defend our Allies, or to defend itself and its vital interests, would have been seriously undermined. There was a compelling need to demonstrate to the Communists our determination to meet their pressures on Berlin.

These pressures were further heightened by the erection of the infamous Berlin wall. We had to find some way to convince the Soviet Union that we were not making idle protests. We had to convince the Kremlin that we were willing to use force, if necessary, to live up to our treaty commitments and to secure our rights in Europe.

Several policy changes were initiated that were decidedly aimed at convincing the Soviets of our firm resolution. Congress was asked to provide a sizable increase in the defense budget. Gen. Lucius Clay was sent to West Germany as the personal representative of the President. American troops were dispatched to West Berlin and deliberately routed through the disputed corridor which runs between West Germany and West Berlin. In addition, the Reserves were called up.

The activation of the Reserves, therefore, was a part of an overall response to growing Communist military moves which might have pushed us out of West Berlin before we were in a position to forestall them.

The Reserves performed at least three vital functions during their tour of active duty. First of all, they clearly demonstrated that the West was willing to use its military might to preserve its rights in West Berlin. It showed the Communists that we were prepared to back up our strong words with the force of our arms.

Second, the Reserves were called up to strengthen our conventional fighting forces in the event of war. Our strategic striking power was unmatched. We had more bombers and long-range missiles than the Soviet Union. We were in a better position to fight a general war than a conventional one. Yet we were aware that such a conflict would be massively destructive for both sides.

Frankly, we needed military capabilities that would make it possible for us to respond to a threatened Communist attack with weapons that were short of the biggest and most powerful that were in our arsenal.

We had to hold these latter weapons in reserve for the contingency of an all-out Communist attack.

The Communists might well have calculated that we might not use our big weapons if they simply took West Berlin. They might have assumed that we would have hesitated to use force to retake, or hold, West Berlin if all we had available were our most destructive weapons. This calculation was upset when Reserves were called up. They were more prepared than raw recruits to be organized into effective fighting units.

They were in a more advanced stage of preparedness to bolster our Regular Army, Navy, and Air Forces, than any unit which we might have organized from scratch.

As the impressive record of Erie's Battery C demonstrates—confidence in the Reserves was justified.

By bolstering our military power quickly and effectively, the Reserves strengthened the bargaining position of the United States in its negotiations with the Soviet Union—not only on West Berlin—but on the entire spectrum of political issues which still separate East and West.

It should not be forgotten that the United States would not have been able to deploy thousands of its regular combat troops to Europe unless the Reserves had been activated.

The reservists who were ordered to active duty, including the men of Battery C, filled the void created by the deployment of Army units to Europe. These Regular units could not have been safely transferred from their assignments in the United States unless some other troops were available to take their place and assume their responsibilities. The Reserves were given these tasks.

They acted fully in their capacity as Reserves, as backup support for the Armed Forces.

Finally, the Reserves bought time for the United States to build a larger conventional force that will now be sustained into the future. During the year of Reserve activation, the Army has laid plans, and has already taken definite steps toward the organization of two additional divisions.

In all, the Army will stand at about 1 million men grouped into 16 divisions and various specialized units. The expansion of the Army would have been seriously hampered, and the Nation's security would have been gravely undermined, if the Reserves had not been on station.

The Reserves provided a protective screen, so to speak, behind which the Army and the Nation were able to take stock of its defenses, to repair weaknesses, and to initiate needed changes in our military posture.

If we view the Reserve callup in the broader perspective of the cold war, we will be in a position to better appreciate the value of the Reserves and we will be more prepared to understand and properly evaluate the magnificent work accomplished by them.

The reservists who are now coming home should not minimize the mission they have accomplished. They have a right to claim our gratitude and honor. They have a right to point to their record with pride. They have served their country well and honorably and the Nation is better for their service.

Let no cynical voice doubt about the merit of the job done by the Reserves. Let no one suggest that the reservists wasted their time while on active duty. Let everyone be assured that the Communists were moved by the Reserve callup. Let everyone understand that the Reserves helped keep the peace.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services and ranking minority member of the subcommittee handling the Reserve program, from a congressional standpoint, the record of the Reserves over the last year leads me to one final comment. It seems to me beyond dispute that the Reserves have underlined the continued need for a strong military Reserve program. The cost to the Nation of maintaining its Regular Armed Forces would be considerably greater unless we have a large well-organized Reserve system to rely upon.

We count on the Reserves to come to the aid of their country in time of peril. As their performance during the recent callup indicates, they are reliable troops who can be swiftly organized into tough, well-trained fighting units.

They can perform the following functions which no other military organization can discharge: (1) They cost relatively little in terms of their usefulness; (2) they can perform a great variety of military jobs; (3) they can release regular troops for deployment to bases overseas; (4) and, when necessary, they can strengthen the Nation's bargaining position in negotiations with its enemies.

You men of Battery C have displayed a high level of service which the Nation expects of the Reserves. The proud record of the Reserves has buttressed our confidence in the Reserve program and has pointed up the need for our continued support of it. We are comforted that the Reserves are coming home, that, like the men of Battery C, they are returning to their loved ones. We are comforted, too, in a higher and more profound sense. We are comforted in the knowledge that we can rely on the Reserves.

Finally, you men of Erie's Battery C have given heightened meaning to that knowledge, and by your contribution to our national security, we acknowledge today that we owe you an undying debt of gratitude.

Serving Freedom's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to be present at the joint 32d Division homecoming and V–J Day celebration at the County Stadium in Milwaukee on Sunday, August 12.

The commemoration of a past event is an empty gesture, I think, unless we use the occasion to remind ourselves of the significance underlying that event. Our victory over Japan, it seems to me, teaches the important lesson of the need for military preparedness. V–J Day, which ended the war, and Pearl Harbor, which began it, each in its way underlines the necessity of strong defenses. We best celebrate V–J Day by renewing our pledge to make whatever sacrifices necessary to keep our country's military posture strong.

In that regard, it is particularly fitting that honor be paid to the men of Wisconsin's famed Red Arrow Division who have returned home after 10 months of active military duty in the service of their country. For them "sacrifice" is not merely a word. For them it has reality in terms of economic loss, broken family ties and other hardships.

The role of the men of the 32d Division is in some ways more difficult than that of those who fought in World War II. It is not hard to recognize and honor heroes of hot war battles. History makes their duties clear. But history tells us nothing of cold war soldiers. That history is still being written. One chapter—and a notable one—has been inscribed by the 32d Division.

The mobilization last year was in answer to direct and persistent Soviet threats to Berlin. Mr. Khrushchev had promised, in ultimatum language, to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany that would, he said, exclude United States and allied forces from Berlin. Communist harassments of air lanes and land routes, as well as construction of the wall, lent force to his threat. There was very real danger of actions which might lead to a shooting war.

In this context, the President issued his order mobilizing Reserve and National Guard units. Following the mobilization, Mr. Khrushchev lost some of his bluster. The deadline for a peace treaty was lifted and tensions eased.

It is clear that the response of our reservists and National Guardsmen helped change the Soviet leader's mind. In answering our President's call to arms, they played an important part in easing the crisis. For this the 32d Division and its men can take due credit.

The events of the past year have demonstrated the value of our Reserve military forces in cold war conflicts. In a hot war a strong Reserve force could mean the difference between victory and defeat.

It has been an age-old axiom of warfare that getting there "the fustest with the mostest"—as the Confederate general said—gives an armed force the best chance of success. The revolutionary changes which atomic power has made in warfare have modified that motto. Today it is not enough just to be the first with the most. We must be second with the most as well.

Because this Nation has promised that it will never use its military power first in a preemptive attack, we have shut the door on the kind of initiative that being first with the most represents. Therefore, we must have the power to withstand a blow and retaliate effectively and conclusively.

It is clear that the United States cannot be second with the most unless we have a broad base of mobilization, the ability to recover quickly and effectively, and the power to strike back. To attain these objectives we need strong, well-trained, well-equipped reserves.

Congress, I believe, is convinced that maintaining a strong reserve will be a powerful factor in deciding the outcome of future conflicts. For that reason, many of my colleagues believe as I do, that, if we are to make a mistake in determining the number of reservists required, let it be an error of too many, not too few.

For it would be tragic indeed if, in the final analysis, we were both not first and second with the most, but too little and too late.

Today, therefore, in paying tribute and expressing our sincere thanks to the 32d let us demonstrate our appreciation by rededicating ourselves to the cause of peace by preparedness.

Mr. Speaker, the celebration welcoming back Wisconsin's 32d Division was most impressive, combining food and fireworks, entertainment and speeches. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address given by the principal speaker for the occasion, Lt. Gen. Louis W. Truman, deputy commanding general for Reserve Forces; the benediction by Maj. William J. Mayer, chaplain, U.S. Army; a proclamation issued by Milwaukee County Executive John L. Doyne, and a resolution passed by the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors which was read by Supervisor Edward W. Lane:

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. LOUIS W. TRUMAN, DEPUTY COMMANDING GENERAL FOR RESERVE FORCES HEADQUARTERS, U.S. CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND, FORT MONROE, VA.

It is an honor and a pleasure for me to join with you, as a representative of the Department of Army, in this homecoming celebration for the members of the 32d Red Arrow Infantry Division.

This month, in cities and towns in many parts of the United States, troops of the National Guard and the Army Reserve are being welcomed home after nearly a year of active military service.

However, I doubt that any of those ceremonies will equal the one taking place here today. Certainly, none could express more eloquently the high regard in which the returning soldiers are held by the folks back home. On behalf of the Army, I should like to express deepest appreciation for your esteem and friendship.

Your patriotism and visible interest in the men of the 32d Division is, in a large measure, responsible for the outstanding record attained by this organization during the 45 years of its existence.

The foundation of any military organization is good morale—but morale is not attained solely from within the command alone, but it is furthered by assistance from the people back home, the relatives and friends of those in active service—who understand and appreciate the job their men in service are doing. The soldier in uniform has tangible evidence that he is serving his country. The sacrifices he is called upon to make are clearly understood and recognized. He receives the thanks and appreciation of his fellow citizens, and particularly during wartime we recognize and applaud his deeds of valor and his service to the Nation.

Yet, seldom is an accolade bestowed upon those at home who are denied the comradeship of military service, the plaudits of the public or the pageantry of the victory celebration. However, they still must make sacrifices and endure hardships, not the least of which are uncertainty and loneliness, worry over the welfare of their loved ones in service and the necessity for readjusting their own lives.

Too often, their only reward is in knowing that they have tried to fulfill their duty toward members of their families, who are in the military service. There are too few who appreciate or recognize the full weight of their contributions to victory.

It is even more difficult for them, in this period of cold war activity, when the danger is not as clearly apparent, and the threat to the country is not believed generally to be as great as in a hot war, when the victory is not as clear cut, but is just as important, and just as decisive as when won by force of arms.

To you who have served at home, bolstering the spirit and morale of your friends and relatives on active duty, again as a representative of the Department of the Army, I want you to know that your sacrifices and your assistance have not gone unnoticed nor unappreciated.

The 32d Infantry Division, in addition to being one of the largest National Guard divisions of the Army, has established a long and impressive line of "firsts." Their record of achievement started in World War I when they earned the nickname in Europe of being "Les Terribles" from their Allies, the French Army. They were among the first to break the vaunted Hindenberg line and to set foot on German soil. At that time it was said that the Red Arrow insignia of the 32d Infantry represented the fact that they "pierced any enemy line they faced."

It is significant, also, that this Red Arrow Division was the first to score an infantry victory in any theater during World War II, when they pushed the Japanese back in New Guinea and started the long march up the Pacific to eventual victory. Again, the 32d Division was the first unit of the Army to airlift an entire regiment to the scene of combat—a system which is now standard and accepted—and is the basis of our highly mobile Army of today.

The 654 days of combat recorded by the division during World War II were more than that of any other U.S. Army division in any theater of operations. And I can add that an impressive number of individual awards for valor were won by its members, in addition to organizational battle honors.

There are many present and former members of the division here today who will recall that first mobilization for active duty in 1940. Then, there was a clear-cut threat to our national security, and the enemy was identified unmistakably. The first peacetime draft had started, and all units of the National Guard and Army Reserve were recalled to active duty for intensive training and preparation for possible combat. The initial year of training was extended to 18 months—and before its expiration, "the duration plus" was the standard term of enlistment.

But at that time, the enemy was known and the danger was imminent. It is true that although every man, woman and child in the United States was affected in one way or another, by a new pattern of life. We did not then know the dark side of war. We were not aware of the price to be paid in the dead and wounded, the long separations, the steaming jungles and blistering deserts on which wars are fought, the temporary but disheartening defeats, and the final victory to be paid for at a bitter price.

In contrast, in 1961, with World War II and the Korean war both being in the distant past, and with the world in a state of chronic unrest, the partial mobilization had a different effect. The Berlin threat was one of a long series of international political crises. We were not faced with actual hostilities. No foreign enemy maneuvered against our troops, or, at least, not visibly so.

Why, then, were we building up the Army and why were some National Guard divisions being mobilized while others were not?

The answer is that because of the gravity of the situation, the callup of two National Guard combat-ready divisions was urgent to accomplish the partial mobilization. They were picked from an already designated high priority group.

And I should like to emphasize the fact that only the Kremlin knows exactly how close we were to war at the time of that partial mobilization. The threats they made against the peace of the world were certainly real enough. It is very probable that the partial mobilization of almost 120,000 troops caused the Kremlin to have some second thoughts about embarking upon the dangerous adventure of war.

Those mobilized forces of the National Guard and the Army Reserve represented a substantial increase in our active Army Forces. The state of readiness that they soon achieved provided us with a much increased military posture.

I think it can be said: The fact that our Army was not called upon to fight was a victory in itself. Even though that victory added no battle streamers to the division colors, it's value should not, and will not, be underestimated.

In keeping with it's past record of high achievement, the 32d Infantry Division was assigned to the Strategic Army Corps, the Army's "first team," within a few months after mobilization. It's selection for duty with Strac, as the Strategic Army Corps is called, is a tribute to the leadership and training of the 32d Infantry Division.

As members of Strac, this division joined a highly mobile team composed of the best combat troops in the Army, the "brushfire warfare element," ready to move any place on the globe within a few hours and establish a beachhead or an airhead. To go wherever our security might be threatened or wherever a hostile move demands immediate bolstering of Armed Forces anywhere in the free world.

During visits to the 32d Division, both in the field and in garrison during this past year, I have been most impressed with the professional competence of General Smith, the division commander, and his two principal assistants, General Dunlap, his assistant division commander, and General Schweinler, the division artillery commander. Their outstanding performances were made possible by the wholehearted support given them by the officers and men of the division.

Tonight's celebration is serving a twofold purpose: In addition to honoring the homecoming of the 32d Infantry Division, it also commemorates V–J day, the end of the war in the Pacific, the closing chapter of World War II. As deputy commanding general for the Reserve Forces, U.S. Continental Army Command, I can enthusiastically join in both of these happy occasions.

To you of the Red Arrow Division, I can say that the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, and your country salute you for your devotion to duty, your sacrifices and your contribution to the defense of the United States—and I wish each and every one of you good health, good luck, and every success in all your future endeavors.

BENEDICTION

(By Maj. William J. Mayer, chaplain, U.S. Army)

Almighty God, we ask Your blessings upon us and our country. In this age of missiles and antimissiles, of Telestars and spaceships, we cannot forget Thee, the Creator of the world. In this century of space progress, give each of us a clear understanding and a strong will to obey your commandments, to be grateful to Thee for allowing us to live in a free country.

We thank Thee for watching over all of us who are devoted to the cause of freedom throughout the world. We ask Your divine providence to bring peace to all nations: that men everywhere may learn to know the fatherhood of God through the brotherhood of man. As we return to our individual homes and duties, remind us frequently that the price of peace is eternal vigilance; that we shall remain free only if we remain morally and physically strong; strong in the beliefs that all men are created equal and that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

PROCLAMATION

(By John L. Doyne, Milwaukee County executive)

Whereas the 32d Division answered the call of the President of the United States when the Communists threatened the peace of the world; and

Whereas the 32d Division, which is composed of several thousand men who come from all walks of life, gave up many personal comforts to help prepare in the protection of this great country; and

Whereas the 32d Divsion is endowed with a history of courage and heroism, for it has answered the call of duty three times in 45 years, from the battlefield in Germany in World War I to the South Pacific jungles in World War II, and now to answer the Communist challenge; and

Whereas the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors did on the 18th day of July 1962, by resolution publicly commend the 32d Division by resolution;

Now, therefore, I, John L. Doyne, county executive of the county of Milwaukee, do proclaim August 12, 1962, as "Red Arrow Day" in commemoration of the 32d Division's contribution to the great effort by the people of the world to be rid of war.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON JULY 18, 1962, AND READ BY SUPERVISOR EDWARD W. LANE

Whereas in August 1962, the 32d Division will return to Wisconsin from active duty; and

Whereas the 32d Division, while on active duty for the Federal Government did greatly lessen the possibility of a third world war and

Whereas the citizens of this county desire to show their appreciation by publicly honoring this great division: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board publicly commends this great Wisconsin division; and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive in behalf of the county government issue a suitable proclamation in commemoration of this event; and be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this resolution be transmitted to the commanding general of the 32d Division.

Today's Promises Are Tomorrow's Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter offers a terrific program for the Congress and for the Government to consider. I commend Philip F. Swart, chairman of the New York Board of Trade for offering this program for our consideration:

NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., July 27, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DORN: The New York Board of Trade, joining the President of the United States in the desire to "get the country moving again," commends the following program and principles, unanimously adopted by the board's committee on taxes and government economy:

1. An immediate tax cut of 10 percent across the board for individuals and corporations, but only if matched by an immediate expenditure cut of equivalent amount. To have a tax cut without an expenditure cut is to endanger the economy, not improve it. We don't get stronger by depleting the Treasury. If budget deficits were the way out, we should now be enjoying economic stability since we have had sizable deficits in 25 of the last 31 years. But we know from history what happens to nations that persist in living beyond their means.

2. Budget balance alone is not enough. What counts is to achieve it at the lowest possible level of expenditures and revenues. That is what releases the Nation's full productive energies. That is what imparts strength. That is what instills confidence.

3. The complete opposite of that is a deliberately created, substantial deficit piled on an already huge debt. A deficit does put more dollars into the economy. That is not of itself the equivalent of more purchasing power or more purchases. A deep-rooted anxiety, reaching out to the entire Western World, is not about the quantity of our dollars, but their quality. Quantity without quality places in jeopardy the savings bonds, life insurance policies, bank balances, and pension benefits of our own people. Adding deficit on deficit may get the country moving again—but in the wrong direction.

4. The road to tax reduction is in expenditure reduction. Expenditure reduction requires determination and forthrightness by all. Lipservice and pious resolutions won't do it. Everyone must recognize that expenditure reduction may curb or eliminate advantages that certain groups, areas, or parties now unwarrantedly enjoy.

5. The President properly put it to the Nation when, at his inauguration, he said it is time for the people to ask: "What can we do for the Government?" Here are some of the things we can do if we are serious about having our economy advance:

(a) We must stop calling for, or condoning, the spending of money that we don't have.

(b) We must realize that today's promises become tomorrow's taxes. We must therefore turn a deaf ear to candidates painting rosy pictures of lavish welfare programs, and other spending that we can't afford.

(c) We must recognize that nothing impoverishes us, as a nation, more than to pay out a dollar without getting a dollar's worth in return. Featherbedding, or sloughing off of any sort, comes at a high cost to all of us. We must therefore instill or restore in ourselves an interest in work, a pride in work, a sense of responsibility about work. We must stop trying to get the most and give the least. Otherwise our economy and our jobs are imperiled.

(d) By the same token, we must insist that our elected representatives scrutinize every public program or activity, and measure it in terms of dollar's worth in results, efficient administration, and elimination of waste. The same rigid analysis, support, and yardsticks must be applied to public expenditures, as is expected of business in its expenditures. The space age is no excuse for a dollar of unneeded expenditure. Noteworthy areas that could pay off handsomely by this approach, without having the programs themselves suffer, are foreign aid, public welfare and assistance, the whole gamut of business activities engaged in by Government through about 700 agencies. Furthermore, priority should be assigned to the different expenditure requests to permit postponements or eliminations as need be. Congressional staff facilities should be improved to afford this sort of thoroughgoing, incisive review.

(e) We must not only welcome, but insist upon, tax reform. The tax structure lacks stability in its excessive reliance on the income tax. The income tax, in turn, leaves a great deal to be desired in simplicity, equity, certainty, and administrability. More important, we must get away from the present situation under which taxes, rather than commonsense or good judgment, run our personal and business lives. The cost to the Nation in man-hours devoted to taxes, instead of productivity, is too great.

Very respectfully,

PHILIP F. SWART,
Chairman of the Board.

Washingon Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 18, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

THE TWO FACES OF DANGER: MISREPRESENTATION, MISUNDERSTANDING

Free America is poised on a precipice. A slight push can send our free society crashing to disaster and this push may well be generated by the two faces of danger: (1) Misrepresentation and (2) misunderstanding. How close we are to this fate was clearly brought out in the President's television report on the economy in which both faces of danger were nakedly exposed. Point by point the President was either deliberately creating a false impression or is woefully lacking in basic understanding of our economy, or both—whichever, we must be concerned with the direction which President Kennedy's policies are forcing this Nation. Obviously, he is incapable of realizing that our greatest economic danger is the Federal Government—its tampering, taxing, planning, regimentation, and control. With this danger in mind, let's analyze the President's speech.

The general economy:

It's good, but not what it should be. We are moving ahead, but at a declining rate. It is called a sidewise direction and is now caused by Government tampering with the forces of production. In measure after measure in the Kennedy-directed 87th Congress the President has asked for more Federal control over business and the economy and has proposed additional restrictions and restraints on a free economy to cure the problems which too much Government has created in the first place. Examples: The tax bill with massive withholding on dividends and interest, taxing profit on foreign investment before the taxpayer actually receives it; the trade bill which makes it less possible for American industry to compete in foreign markets and then provides for Government takeover of business forced into bankruptcy as well as Government subsistence to workers who lose their jobs; the drain of our wealth through foreign aid and domestic welfare programs; interest rates; Federal takeover of unemployment compensation by imposing Federal standards on the States; etc. The positive approach to moving the economy ahead is to free it from Government control and restraints, cut Federal spending in order to free capital for investment, industrial expansion and the creation of jobs. The Kennedy approach breeds uncertainty and lack of confidence.

Inflation:

The President said: "Inflation, therefore, remains no longer a serious threat." This is not true. There is continuing inflation which reduces the value of the dollar and is a very real threat to the purchasing power of the people. Misunderstood is the fact that the Government is responsible for this inflation through increased Federal spending and deficit financing. The fact is 1.9 percent increase in the cost of living over the past 14 months (Consumer Price Index) plus fantastic continued spending has one unquestionable end result—more inflation.

Balance of payments: The President: "We can be proud also of balancing our international payments." We are not balancing our international payments. Foreigners hold $22 billion in claims against our gold supply and we have only $16 billion in reserve, $11 billion of which must be kept to back up our money. At any moment the confused policies of this administration (excessive spending, deficit financing, easy money policies and attitudes, foreign aid gifts of our money) could cause a run on our dollar. Surely the President must realize that such a precarious position is going to force devaluation of the dollar, possibly soon.

Labor peace: "We have had an overall extraordinary record in labor peace in the last 18 months." Absolutely contrary to the facts. The Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that for the January–June 1962 period U.S. industry and workers lost 9.8 million man-days, a 60-percent jump over the previous year's strike losses. Worse even than the total time and money lost through increased strikes is the nature of the strikes, principally in the field of defense—missiles and nuclear space industries. The Kennedy administration is wholly responsible for a new double standard in industrial relations—limiting profits and prices for business but insisting that labor's demands be granted and all productivity gains be rewarded to labor alone. Little attention has been paid to the fact that again the Government is responsible for the increase in industrial disputes because of its hostile attitude toward business while at the same time it coddles labor and labor leaders, granting them special privilege and refusing to entertain any kind of restriction such as making labor responsible under antitrust laws.

Growth: "We have been standing still, economically at least in comparison to the countries of Western Europe and Japan." This statement ignores the facts completely: (1) By not recognizing that we started from a much higher economic base than any other country in the world; (2) there can be no comparison with Western Europe and Japan, countries which were completely devastated by war and had to be totally rebuilt; and (3) American industry has supported foreign industrial growth through taxes to build up others at the expense of their own growth. (Example: Japanese textile plants and German steel plants.)

Gross national product: "The gross national product has gone up 10 percent." In making this statement the President used rigged economic statistics. In a study by Congressman TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, it is shown that when President Kennedy said the gross national product increased 10 percent he used current dollars when he and his Council of Economic Advisers are fully aware that constant dollars should be used to correct for the Kennedy inflation. This more economically meaningful figure would give an increase in gross national product of about 8½ percent (compared to over 10 percent during the two previous postwar recoveries). The President's claim that actions by his administration pulled us out of the recession is totally without foundation. The recession bottomed out in February 1961—less than 30 days after he took office—before any action by him could become effective and before Congress had enacted any legislation. He also failed to mention that for the first time since World War I the civilian work force has not increased in peacetime. Since 1957 the civilian work force has been increasing at almost 1 million a year—but in 1962, the civilian work force actually decreased. Therefore, President Kennedy is in error when he says the economic gap has closed during his administration—it has widened—and because of Government.

Unemployed: "The unemployment rate has gone down 23 percent in the last year and a half." This is the President's statement for public consumption, but his spokesmen, appearing before congressional committees constantly urge the enactment of new legislation because of the high incidence of unemployment. Actually, we cannot be sure if the present rate of unemployment is too high or too low. (Although to the man out of a job any unemployment is too high.) No official of the administration, and I have asked the Secretary of Labor repeatedly to tell us who the unemployed are, no official can say with certainty. We do know that the figures include all those over 14 years of age who have held jobs, even temporary student summer jobs. Lately the Department of Labor has attempted to check unemployment through State unemployment compensation rolls, but even here only three-fifths of work force was sampled (in itself, recognized as inconclusive). With such inadequate figures, by what right can the President claim progress in this field, and why does he tell the public we are licking the problem while his spokesmen tell Congress, in private, that unemployment is serious?

Corporate profits: "Corporate profit, after taxes since January 1961, have gone up 26 percent or a total of $10 billion." Any responsible economist knows, even if the President does not, that corporate profit must be related to investment and this shows lower profits over the period the President indicates and his figures allow nothing for replacement of equipment, depreciation, and obsolescence, without which new products and jobs are impossible.

Personal income: "The disposable personal income, which is the amount of income we have left after taxes, has gone up $30 billion, 8 percent." In this figure the President conveniently overlooks the forced wage boosts through pressure of unions encouraged by the Government and not matched by increased productivity, and at the expense of profit, investment, and equipment replacement which creates jobs.

The Preisdent's partisan speech laid strong implication on the need to increase the Democratic Party majority in the next Congress creating the impression that economic progress and the interests of the people can be advanced only through Democratic leadership. What are the facts? If the figures on voting in the Senate are any indication, then the President and his party in Congress are far apart. There are 16 Democratic chairmen of committees in the Senate. Since January 1962, these 16 chairmen have cast a total of over 250 votes against the President's program in Congress. These collective votes against the President's program by his leaders in Congress are all the more astounding when the general rule of thumb is applied (by both parties) that chairmen of committees normally must—and do—support their President in the White House. The only reason that can be attributed to such political sacrilege is that Members of Congress are more in tune with the people and they know the President's programs are not supported by the majority of the people of the United States.

Why, then, is it important to change the leadership in Congress and put Republicans in charge of the committees? Because while Democratic chairmen in both the House and Senate may vote against the President, they must and do, report his legislation out of committee. Therefore, we never get the opportunity to vote for proper legislation. Republican chairmen of committees, on the contrary, would report out the correct, constructive legislation to meet the challenge of this day, at home and abroad, so all Members of Congress could vote in favor of proposals which would move the country ahead instead of being forced, as we now are, to vote consistently against administration-sponsored measures almost solely designed to move this country into the "democratic socialism" advocated by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., one of the White House advisers. (Yes, being negative or positive depends on what you're for and against.)

As Representative of the Fifth District of Texas I will not sit idly by while the two faces of danger—misrepresentation and misunderstanding—force us closer and closer to the ADA-socialistic programs and the end of our free competitive system. It will continue to be my constant endeavor to fight for what I believe is the goal of the people of the Fifth District of Texas, the strengthening and expansion of the free enterprise system with all its guarantees of liberty for the individual, its promise of reward for those who are willing to work and risk for the opportunity to get ahead, the system which is, in truth, our American heritage and which has given a richer, fuller, more abundant life to more people than any other system ever devised by man.

Appendix

Senate Passage of Communications Satellite Bill Lauded by the Evening Sun, Baltimore, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was gratifying to note that on August 17, when the communications satellite bill reached a vote in the Senate, the outcome was overwhelmingly in favor of passage. In my belief this new type of legislation represents a wise and beneficial decision on the part of the Senate in allowing a Government-controlled private industry to operate the American portion of the Telstar system.

The advisability of this course becomes clearer when one considers that the recent history of private, regulated communications networks has been marked with success, and that portions of private enterprise involved in the management of this program seem well equipped to administer both the managerial and technological areas of the project.

An editorial appearing in the Baltimore, Md., Evening Sun, August 17, 1962, lauds the passage of the communications satellite bill. The Sun, a respected newspaper, points out that the program is not a giveaway and that no vital American interests are likely to be disregarded. The public should be more than adequately safeguarded through the efforts of the Federal Communications Commission, and the appointment of three public directors to aid in controlling the corporation itself.

The Sun continues by saying that—

> It seems likely that the new public corporation will be directly responsive. If, as opponents of the bill fear, this is not the case, Congress can always reverse its present decision and put the Government in charge. This is far easier to do, politically and technically, than to pry the Government loose from an operation it has started.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Senate Victory" appearing in the August 17 issue of the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE VICTORY

The decisive 66 to 11 vote by which the Senate has passed the communications satellite bill is probably an accurate reflection of the temper of the upper House. This was not a close decision in which Members who had serious reservations might vote for the bill anyway to insure that at least something would be done. Passage was certain. Presumably all who dissented in principle from the idea of private operation under Government control of this newest international communications system and who preferred direct Government operation felt free to vote against the measure. That less than a dozen did so is significant. In the House the opposition also amounted only to a handful.

We believe the majority is correct. The recent history of private although regulated operation of communications systems is on the whole an excellent one. The private carriers, led by the huge American Telephone & Telegraph Co., have the financial and technical resources to do the job, given the necessary degree of Government cooperation in lifting the satellites themselves into orbit. They believe—as does the administration—that the project can be self-supporting. And the public interest ought to be adequately protected both by close regulation through the Federal Communications Commission and by the three public directors of the proposed corporation to be appointed by the President.

For all these reasons the case for direct Federal operation has seemed a weak one. Nothing is being "given away." No vital American interests are likely to be disregarded, any more than they have been in private operation of international cable and radio communications services. And the rule of thumb that an efficient private enterprise can usually adapt more swiftly to changing developments and demands than a bureaucratic Government agency ought to hold unless and until the opposite is shown in a particular case.

The future of international communications via satellite is only dimly visible. The demand for instantaneous transmission of sight and sound via Telstar and her sisters may be less than now supposed or it may be overwhelming. In either case it seems likely that the new public corporation will be directly responsive. If, as opponents of the bill fear, this is not the case, Congress can always reverse its present decision and put the Government in charge. This is far easier to do, politically and technically, than to pry the Government loose from an operation it has started.

War of 1812 Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the highway of freedom is not an easy road to follow. Many obstructions and roadblocks are found to be in the way. Often freedom is won, only to be subverted at a later date. This fact is geographically shown in many of the newly emerging nations of the world that have found that freedom is not simply the act of independence. The United States had to learn this painful lesson also. We learned it in our "second war of independence"—the War of 1812. This war is an important landmark in the history of our Nation, for it showed the determination of a freed people to stay free. But because 1962 is part of the centennial of the Civil War, the sesquicentennial of the War of 1812 has been obscured.

But New Jersey is doing its part to perpetuate the observance of this important fight for the preservation of those rights for which we fought in 1776. Gov. Richard Hughes has issued a proclamation marking the period of September 21–28, 1962, as "War of 1812 Week."

The Elizabeth Daily Journal of August 3 has editorially commented on the sesquicentennial. Their editorial makes some cogent points which I feel should be understood by those interested in freedom. Therefore, I ask for unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR OF 1812 SESQUICENTENNIAL

This year is the sesquicentennial of the War of 1812, an anniversary obscured by attention to the centennial of the Civil War and lesser knowledge of the conflict. Nevertheless the New Jersey chapter of the Society of the War of 1812 has undertaken a formal observance.

Governor Hughes issued a proclamation making the period of September 21–28 "War of 1812 Week." The State society will be host to the national organization in Atlantic City during the same interval.

"New Jersey was always a stalwart defender of the Nation and many officers and men of this State rose to the defense of their Nation," Governor Hughes noted in his proclamation.

The War of 1812 merits an observance. Although among the smaller conflicts thrust upon the new Nation, it served to inform the world that the zeal and the will of the struggle that achieved freedom was not a transient phase and that the United States was intent upon preservation of the inalienable rights for which it had fought.

Tribute to General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last week the Speaker of the House, Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, presented to Gen. Douglas MacArthur an engrossed resolution passed by the Congress expressing recognition of his outstanding devotion to the American people and for his brilliant leadership during two world wars. Mr. President, this recognition was long overdue but I feel certain that there has been engrossed on the hearts of all Americans a feeling of honor for this man and a feeling of gratitude to our Lord that he has been with us during three periods of trial placed on our Republic by the enemies of freedom. Had his word been more closely listened to those enemies might not now enjoy the strength they do.

I ask unanimous consent that the general's remarks on the occasion of the presentation be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MacArthur Expresses Gratitude for Citation

Mr. Vice President, Secretary McNamara, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Congress, I cannot tell you how greatly embarrassed I am at the compliments that have been showered upon me today. I am sorry to say I won't live to be 100 years old as Mr. Rivers said, but as long as I do live I shall remember and treasure this day.

EXPRESSES GRATITUDE

I am grateful to receive this highest award conferred by the American Government on one of its citizens. I am grateful that the American Congress—that body famous as the most forward-looking lawmakers of the world, after a lapse of sufficient time to be swayed neither by sentiment nor emotion—has rendered an opinion of my services that I feel does me too much honor.

I am grateful to the American men at arms who were my comrades in the vital exploits involved. A general is just as good or just as bad as the troops under his command make him. Mine were great! Something of the luster of this citation glows on each one's shoulders.

I am grateful to the citizens of this powerful Republic who accorded me opportunities challenging memorable results. They sent me to West Point. They gave me a chance to battle for my country. They placed me in command positions where the Nation's destiny to some extent was in my hands.

GRATEFUL TO CONGRESS

I am grateful to each Member of the Congress who voted for this resolution, and thereby joined in its general purpose. This body wields the power of the Nation, they speak the voice of the people. Accordingly my thanks are deeper than any words can convey.

I am grateful above all to Almighty God who has so often guided me through the shadows of the valley of death and who nerved me in my hours of lonely vigil and deadly decision.

Mr. Speaker, again, my grateful appreciation to you all.

Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Surgeon General Terry of the U.S. Public Health Service is to be commended for organizing a 12-member Committee to sift facts and ferment in the effects of air pollution, excessive cigarette smoking, and motor vehicle exhaust.

This study is long overdue. For too many years we have heard rumors that there is a link between cigarette smoking and cancer, that air pollution causes lung diseases, and that motor vehicle exhaust is dangerously unhealthy. Now at last, a group of qualified personnel will move in a two-pronged attack. First, determine the real extent of the health hazard and, second, determine a corrective course for the hazards that are found. Mr. Terry's leadership is to be admired.

The Elizabeth Daily Journal of August 3 has commented on the Committee's founding in a most constructive way. I therefore ask for unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Inquiry on Poison in the Air

Surgeon General Terry of the U.S. Public Health Service is plunging boldy into controversy that may embroil economic and emotional factors as well as the weal of the man in the street, the everyday, taxpaying American. The Surgeon General will unleash a 12-member Committee within a few weeks to sift facts and ferment in the effects of air pollution, excessive cigarette smoking, and motor vehicle exhaust.

This is an inquiry too long delayed. Grave suspicions attach to all three facets of its program. Mr. Terry's forces doubtless will encounter strenuous, although neatly screened opposition. Each suspect will repudiate responsibility for poisoning the lungs of the populace, although willing to concede the others may be at fault.

If as industry, the tobacco factory, and the internal combustion engine builder, insist, separately, they are not contributing to the easily detectible pollution of the atmosphere, they should be willing to expose their operations to Mr. Terry's Committee. They should be happy to prove their innocence.

Lipservice will be abundant, but the facts will be dredged up by his Committee, the hard way.

Fortunately a variety of lay and professional groups with qualified experts in related fields will be at his elbow to supply personnel and advice. They will move in two phases—the first to determine the real extent of the health hazard and then toward a corrective course.

Residents of a land of intelligence and prosperity should not be subjected to despoliation of the air they breathe (nor the water they drink—another condition). To undertake rectifying measures easily falls within the sphere of government. Virile leadership as the top will influence State and local health officials to positive action.

Success Story of Our Italian-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Italian-Americans the country over applauded last month when Anthony J. Celebrezze, mayor of Cleveland, was appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He was born the ninth of 13 children in Anzi, Lucania, in southern Italy and was brought to this country at age 2.

Mr. Celebrezze's appointment to the Cabinet by President Kennedy indeed marks a high point in the great contributions which American of Italian descent have made toward the progress of the United States.

Mr. Celebrezze's success story is a familiar one, particularly in Chicago, where many prominent citizens share similar backgrounds or are descendants of Italian immigrants.

The Chicago Sunday Tribune, in its edition of August 19, has prepared an excellent tribute to the inspiring contributions of Italian-Americans to the growth of the United States. Written by Francis Coughlin, this fine article should be a source of national pride to all Americans, regardless of ethnic background.

I take pleasure in bringing this fine feature story to the attention of my colleagues by including it in the Record today in its entirety. I trust my colleagues will agree the Chicago Tribune deserves the highest commendation for illustrating once more the positive contributions of this large and important segment of the American community.

The Chicago Tribune has placed the spotlight on the magnificent contributions of Italian-Americans in their proper perspective. This fine article follows:

The Success Story of Our Italian-Americans

(By Francis Coughlin)

Antonio, typical of 4 million Italians who came to the United States in those hope-filled decades immediately before and after the turn of the century, settled in Chicago in 1907. Typically, he was a peasant from the agricultural south of Italy. Typically, he was poor. For his kind were the hard, the dirty, the dangerous jobs at the lowest wages. His countrymen often antagonized native Americans by underbidding them at unskilled jobs in the streets, the factories, on the railroads. Antonio's first job was in a brickyard.

Like most Italian country folk, Antonio had married young. And when he scraped together enough money from his long hours of labor in the brickyard, he sent for his young wife. A year later, the year in which Giuseppe was born, Antonio applied for his first citizenship papers. His name was on the parish roll of the church of St. Philip Benizi. Antonio had a wife. He had a son. He had a home. They put down roots through sullen pavements.

Joe, who was born Giuseppe in the Italian settlement near Milton and Oak Streets in Chicago, grew up speaking Italian. He and his brother and two sisters were happily unaware that some people considered them underprivileged.

As Joe looks back, he remembers his father's house as an Italian home with its own special quality and influences. It was a tenement flat, small, dingy, and dark cold in winter and all but unbearably hot in summer. Ventilation was bad, the lighting sketchy, the plumbing horrifying. Even in 1910, housing experts were quite justified in calling the place a slum. Small matter. Home was home. Mama was the heart of it.

Mama saw to the shopping, sewing, cooking, and cleaning. Her adjustment to the New World was slower than Antonio's and infinitely slower than her youngsters'. Much of American speech and society remained altogether alien and bewildering to her. Still in her sphere, Mama presided—devoted to her husband and fiercely possessive of her children—advising, worrying, loving, and sustaining.

Papa acted his part with dignity and honor—not dignity falsely assumed, not honor commanded, but dignity in his status as formal head of the family and honor confirmed by strength, endurance, and wisdom.

Thus, Joe learned deference to his parents and regard for them. (Few Italian oldsters are cast off by their children.) He learned the first great precept of family solidarity: Man and wife, family and kinfolk, stand against the world.

In the home, too, from parental example, Joe learned affection and indulgence. (Wife beating is exceedingly rare; crimes against children, even harshness toward the young, are all but unknown in the Italian community.) Such family attitudes have long been characteristic of Italic peoples. Experts on civilization have explained the steadfast Roman character as nutured in the sober discipline and the close unity of the Roman home.

Yet, if home was Joe's first private academy, then school and the street were Joe's Harvard. His school was the public school—Father Antonio could hardly afford four children in parochial classrooms—and the boy made suitable progress. By and large, most Italian youngsters were lively and intelligent. Joe was these and studious besides. He was well behaved, perhaps because Antonio had a way of puzzling out each report card with special concern for his first-born's deportment. Antonio believed in schooling as an act of faith. Moreover, he expected Joe to set a standard for the family.

In any event, at school Joe learned English of both formal and informal varieties. He learned, too, that as an Italian, he was subject to being called a Guinea or a Wop by high-spirited classmates. Yet this was hardly a soul-scarring matter. Often enough the caller was a boon companion and by every token a Wop himself, or if not, then subject to designation as a Polock, Hunky, Sheeny, or Mick. Joe's vocabulary was as free as any.

For the first time, Joe permitted himself the thought that his parents were old-fashioned, old-country Italians. The same thought was occurring for all sorts of reasons in a good many neighborhood families.

Public school was only part of Joe's Harvard. The street offered its own curriculum. Growing up in the vicinity of Milton and Oak 40 years ago was a vivid experience, multifaceted and multilingual in the spacious tradition of the liberal arts. The festa was the great occasion in the Italian neighborhood.

The true, old-fashioned festa was a parade and a street fair, a holy day, and a band concert and a class reunion all in one. It came to its climax, officially at least, in the church. But the day was a day of rejoicing. Prohibition or not, wine was sold in a dozen outdoor booths. Crabs, snails, spumoni, and a special confection called "bones of the dead" were eaten. A band discoursed from a central bandstand, heavy on operatic melodies rescored for trumpets and trombones. Kids decked out as angels and supported by clotheslines made perilous flights between tenement roof tops.

The day was bedlam, and heat, and powder smoke and a happy crowd. E'viva San Filippo. Patrons of a score of raffle wheels besought his favor. And when the saint at last made his progress through the people, his statue borne on the shoulders of parish promenenti, candles ablaze in his procession, fresh currency pinned to his vestments, approval was explosive—literally explosive because the saint moved to a cannonade of firecrackers so that he might be mindful of his honors, and—it may be—of certain reciprocal obligations to the community.

Funerals and weddings were great occasions, too. The plumed nags, the solemn music, the awe at the family outlay, and the public grief of the mourners, all made a leavetaking memorable. To be sure, there were those who deplored the expense and disparaged the old country custom. But in the Latin view of things grief and joy are sentiments to be shared. Friends and neighbors are privileged to weep at funerals and to dance at weddings. As for the expense, well—miserliness never loves company.

The lesser holidays also had their glories. On Sundays, the whole family visited or received relatives, and the mamas made poetry of pasta. The peasant dishes of Joe's youth are the specialties of a thousand restaurants now. The pizzeria has become as popular as the hot dog stand. Suburban hostesses take pride in serving cafe espresso and gorgonzola verdi.

But in Joe's boyhood, visiting cousins near Taylor and Halsted, the lad made the delightful acquaintenance of a little old man who sold nickel pizzas from a wash tub carried on his head, and for Sunday dinner rarely, but sometimes, the family conferred its custom on another Giuseppe, a worthy Sicilian who played the mandolin between courses, and whose lasagna was a masterwork of sauce and texture.

After Sunday dinner at home, Papa took a glass with his cronies. The women chattered of households and children. Uncle Riccardo revealed that his boy was going to high school, thinking of becoming an accountant even. The family was, to be sure, a little skeptical of Riccardo. Like a good many old Americani (he was already a citizen and a voter), Riccardo was inclined to draw the long bow. But Papa Antonio listened thoughtfully, his eyes on his boys and girls. In America—Dio Mio—what was the word, impossible?

Looking back upon his teens, Joe recalls it wasn't always pleasant or popular to be an Italian. Some of the things said about the oldtimers, even about his own father were true enough. The paesano was clannish. He was touchy as to his personal dignity. Some Italians were noisy and untidy. Some could be violent.

The community at Milton and Oak Streets had small respect for a good many Anglo-Saxon proprieties and little regard for minor regulations, civic or sanitary. The older men shared an ingrained suspicion of officialdom and a long nurtured distrust of the police. This is not to say the community was lawless. It is simply that families lived by their own codes. Loyalties were to family and individual values. The law is an untrustworthy servant, say the poor.

Some Italians were criminals. No group knew it better than the closely knit immigrant neighborhood. The concept of a special Italian criminality is a familiar stereotype. It continues as a kind of folk libel. Yet crime was no stranger to America before the Italian ghetto. The new thing was that the victims, for the most part, suffered in silence. In a sense the law was feared as more alien than the lawbreaker.

Looking back on the decade of the 1920's, Joe remembers the prohibition years as a degrading time for the Italian image and the Italian community. The worst individuals of Italian origin—the vicious, the greedy, the gangland killers and conspirators—came to power and wealth undreamed of in a jungle of corruption. Their names stood out.

It was all but futile for the Chicago historian Lloyd Lewis to point out that such pistoleers were by no means representative of some 450,000 immigrant and first generation Chicagoans of Italian descent. You might as well cite Billy the Kid as a specimen New Yorker, or John Dillinger as an emblematic Hoosier.

Neither did it avail the long libeled Sicilians to disavow Alfredo Caponi, who was of Neapolitan stock, nor for Neapolitans to explain that the chief Chicago hoodlum was an American thug long-scarred as a slugger with the Five Points gang of Brooklyn well before he appeared on a local police blotter as Al Brown, later Capone.

Unfortunately, too, gang guns drowned out the sober story of Italian accomplishment. In Chicago great enterprises were alerady wearing Italian names. The Cuneo Press, the Salerno-Megowen Biscuit Co., the fruit and vegetable complex centering on old South Water Street were flourishing undertakings. They were to grow with the years. In California the Giannini's Bank of America was prospering beyond all expectation. In San Francisco, too, young Angelo Rossi was beginning to be heard of as a vote getter. In New York the corresponding name was Fiorello La Guardia. But these were already names beyond the ordinary in fields of public notice. In Chicago, hundreds of able and ambitious young fellows were already making a promising way in the world. Except that lads at work, as Joe was, or in school and college, as so many others were, went uncelebrated in the headlines.

The idea that being of Italian descent was reprehensible came as a shock to Joe. That he, an American, born in America, was charged with any kind of inferiority outraged him.

If Joe had been debating the issue, he might have pointed out that most of the great names adorning the frieze of the art institute were Italian. If high school students didn't know that Wetsern law was derived from Roman law, and that Western enlightenment began with the Italian Renaissance, it wasn't because they weren't told often enough. Clearly, Christopher Columbus, that Genoese navigator for the court of Spain, had discovered America. Undoubtedly, an Italian, William Paca, had signed the Declaration along with John Hancock, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and the rest.

But Joe was working 6 days a week in the brackyard. (Papa got him the job by petitioning in terms so humble Joe would have been furious had he heard them.) Oh, there was no getting away from it. Joe's parents were old fashioned and his home was an old-country home.

Under these and similar circumstances, the rebellion of native-born children against foreign-born parents is a common American experience.

In Joe's case, the conflict came to no hurtful crises, as it had for some, who went bad. Joe remained a loyal son, stanch in the family support, steady in his contributions toward the education of his brother and sisters. Yet, inwardly, Joe had enough of being Italian. His father was truly a paesano. Let him smoke his cheap cigars, drink his wine, and gabble with old-fashioned countrymen as backward as he.

Joe resented the old ways. He chafed under precepts that looked only to hard work and lowly status. (To Joe's shame, Antonio tipped his hat to the boss in the brickyard.)

The old man simply could not, or would not, understand that there were openings in management as well as on the working force. A brisk young man about the brickyard might think beyond the daily round of mixing clay and stacking brick. He might learn something of sales, and processes, and costs and contractors, for example.

As for the old-fashioned paesano, who thought wisdom was born and learning ended in the old country, all that got him was a fleatrap on Oak or Taylor Street. Joe had no love for the term "paesano." The word, for him, held overtones of condescension and contempt. From now on the brickyard was Joe's campus. The city was his Yale.

Joe did well—extremely well—at Yale. He was, in American terms, better educated than many who worked there. Joe was busy, and burly and handsome in a rough-cut way.

(Like so many sons of immigrants he was a head and then some taller than his father.) He was diligent, likable, and at ease with his superiors. He did things well and he got things done. He was accustomed to the American pace and at home in the language. He was sober as compared with a good many American-born laborers. (Alcohol is seldom a problem among Italian immigrants or their children.) In short, Joe was a young man on the rise. His career was already conforming to a pattern an ocean apart from the hand laborer and the struggling tradesmen of his father's world.

In Chicago, in America, thousands upon thousands of sons of immigrants were rising also. Some, of course, come to spectacular notice. On radio and in the sports pages, Italian youngsters were in the news. Baseball players, boxers, football greats were noted and approved. Most Americans cheered Carideo of Notre Dame and Tony Lazzeri of the New York Yankees. Most Italians knew that the famed Lou Little of Columbia was, indeed, chistened Luigi Piccolo.

Joe was 18 when he finished high school. He was 22 when he was made a strawboss in the brickyard. He was 24 and a foreman when he married Rosemary (nee Rosa Maria) of Franklin Park.

Because of the depression, the wedding was not so elaborate as some. Still, both families approved the match. Mama was happy that her first born had married a good Italian Catholic girl, not so much as a matter of religious exclusiveness (Italians are likely to be tolerant in sectarian matters) but because it is felt in most immigrant families—and in a good many others—that marriages are best made among one's own. Later, when Joe's brother married an Irish girl, and his sister a German, both Catholic as it happened, the religious conformity helped Mama to a modified approval.

To be sure, Mama practiced a bit of not entirely innocent deception on the non-Italian members of her family. She conveyed the impression—oh, very delicately and very much by indirection—that she was a gentle old lady all but too fragile to supervise the family affairs. Joe's Rosemary was under no such illusion. From their first crossing of glances Rosemary knew Mama to be as tough as a hacksaw blade.

Papa Antonio kept his own counsel. He thought Mama rather too insistent upon a grandchild the first year. If it came to complaining, Antonio thought, Rosa might speak more Italian than she did. She understood the language, all right. She and her family, for all their airs, were as much paesani as Antonio's own. Even his own Irish daughter-in-law had learned to greet the family with the phrase, "Salute a tutti." But Rosa was one of your Franklin Park Italians, Antonio concluded—sometimes a little too elegant.

In the easygoing Latin fashion, Antonio was not especially pious, nor always punctual in minor church observances. But he considered himself—acknowledging his sins—a good Catholic. He brought his children up in the faith. He supported his church. He made his Easter duty.

Taking pride in his eldest son, already a foreman and well respected; taking pride in his second son, an avvocato, a lawyer no less, and his daughter married to a man whose family owned—yes, owned—a furniture store, Sunday, at Mass, Antonio gave reverent thanks to God.

And so it was in keeping that to Antonio, God granted the grace of a happy death. A brief illness—and that was all. It was Father Luigi, himself—Father Luigi Giambastiani, the venerable pastor of St. Philip Benizi—who administered the last sacraments.

Joe saw to the services. It was no poor paesano's funeral either, but a proper observance beginning—in the new fashion—in a fine funeral parlor in the formal surroundings of ritual and respect. Men—important men from the brickyard came, and the friends from the neighborhood, actually from many neighborhoods—from Kensington and Melrose Park and Oak Park and Highwood—because the old Italian families were moving to better areas of the city and suburbs.

Humblest among the mourners were the companions of Antonio's youth. Old men, now, some familiar, some barely remembered, they mumbled the words of condolence and sat alone. Looking upon them, Joe felt a sudden surge of forgotten kinship. So stanch, so loyal, so venerable, so much enduring, the old paesani.

Within a year after Antonio's death, Rosemary brought the first grandchild to Mama's house.

The Second World War passed lightly over the family. Since Rosemary had borne two children before the Japanese strike at Pearl Harbor, and because Joe's services in the brickyard were important to the war effort, his registration with the draft board was little more than a formality. Wars need clay products—special ceramics, special tiling, insulators, clay crucibles. The young superintendent of production at the brickyard had drive and know-how, and by the end of the war his name was on the company letterhead as an officer of the firm.

Perhaps 400,000, perhaps 500,000 Americans of Italian descent served in the war. Many of their names were on the casualty lists. The memories evoked by those names, in the small, bold print made Joe infinitely sad. The other Italian names, often in larger type, the gangsters in the news, made him seethe with a grim and abiding anger, brought the old harsh Oak Street speech through tight lips. "The no good dago ——— ——— ———. They live. And the best kids go."

Wearily the war years passed and the postwar years began slipping by for Joe and Rosemary, who now had four children, a suburban home, a commensurate income. Joe and his family were keeping up with the Joneses—keeping up with the Gianninis, too.

In the 1950's, U.S. census figures show that some 450,000 Chicagoans were Italian born or the children of Italian immigrants, foreign born approximately 135,000, native born 315,000. Beyond this no official agency takes count. But family traditions and the family name—yet sometimes not even the name—link third and fourth and fifth generation Americans to an Italian ancestry. The tide of the earlier immigration, though assimilated and submerged, continues to lend its surge and lift to the full flood of American life. In law and medicine, in business and industry, in sports, and learning and government, the children and grandchildren of many a paesano have come to place and honor.

Three hundred Chicago lawyers (some among the most eminent), 500 physicians (some deservedly famous), leaders in business, and government, in science and the arts are of Italian stock—Chicago is a long way from Naples or Calabria or Sicily.

The grandsons of men who could barely read are scientists, professors, and deans and college presidents. Their granddaughters teach in city and private schools. Small merchants and neighborhood craftsmen have their descendants, too. Major figures in the printing industry, in contracting and building, in wholesale produce, in electronics and importing and banking and baking and tabulating and catering are of Italian origin. The country over, whether in sports or on the stage, name any game you like and there are plenty of Italians to field a team, plenty of performers to cast a show. The country over, vote in any election you please—in the cities, anyway—and you'll find Di Salles and Rosselinis and Pastores and Volpes on the ticket. And a Celebrezze in the Cabinet.

Sometimes, to his mild astonishment, Joe thinks himself to be becoming less, and his children more Italian. If it was no novelty to be of Italian ancestry on Oak Street, it was no particular distinction either. In Joe's youth, interest in Italian matters was viewed as eccentric or old fashioned. The Italian heritage was counted more embarrassing than enriching. Not so in Wilmette.

Young visitors to Joe's home—and his four youngsters have platoons of friends—seem impressed by the closeness and comradeship of the family, certainly by its lavish resources in kitchen and refrigerator.

Their parents speak of Italian art, music, and cuisine with obvious respect. Joe knows little of art. He thinks music a bore. He prefers steak and bourbon to elaborate dishes and foreign wines. Still, it is pleasant to be regarded as the head of a family of interesting and unusual accomplishments. It is heartening to be accepted. It appears after all, there is something distinctive—and admirable—about being Italian.

Italian? Joe sometimes smiles at the idea. When the children and cousins gather for a family barbecue it's a strange Italian family, Joe thinks. Toney, his first born, and a senior at Cornell (his name is Italian enough). And Marya, their daughter, accepted at Northwestern (after all, Marya is only another way of spelling Maria). But Karen and Clifford (all right, Cliff was named for Joe's old superintendent) and the cousins—Shaun, and Linda, and Pamela, and Eric and Harold and Cynthia, and Una and Alan—Oh, well, lucky the kids have second names or they'd never be properly baptized.

Nevertheless, on state Sundays Joe's family is Italian. State Sundays are the days Mama visits Wilmette—one Sunday a month with each of her four children.

Mama makes her progress from the Villa Scalabrini in Melrose Park to Joe's home a triumph and a round of inspection.

Mama has been a resident of Villa Scalabrini for years, now. She is, to hear herself tell it, a valued consultant to Father Armando Pierini (very likely she is, too) and she has Fra Noi, the villa's Italo-American publication dealing with civic and cultural affairs, read to her by volunteer writers and editors half and a third her age. It was Mama's idea to retire to the villa.

To live in an old people's home, Mama considers, is a sensible, enlightened, and altogether admirable American custom. It is her duty, of course, to look after her children and theirs. Joe smiles at the old lady's assumption. The older grandchildren indulge her. The younger ones adore her; she spoils them. Even so, when Mama approved young Tony's fiance—a girl named Martha Weatherbee—the men of the family were pleased and proud. It is no small thing to win Mama's sanction.

In the adventure and adjustment of everyday life and living, words change their meaning as men's horizons change. Yet, if the old ways alter, the essence of the old values is changeless.

Thus, when Perry Como or Vic Damone tosses a TV mention to Dean Martin, or Tony Bennett, or Frank Sinatra, it's likely somebody gets saluted as "paesano."

It's likely, too, that perhaps 10, perhaps 15 million Americans of Italian descent, immediate or remote, hear the greeting with a kind of inward, personal satisfaction reflecting a sense of shared triumph.

For paesano is by now a fond and friendly word, a word denoting a special kind of kinship. Today it means a fellow American of Italian ancestry. It means a descendant of one who gave his new country better than he received in work for wages, one who brought a sometimes grudging tolerance for an unfaltering outlay of strength and spirit. It means one who has made his own and his people's pledge of allegiance in terms of talent, courage, work, and will.

Appendix

Progress in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico stands as a living symbol of what an underdeveloped society and a highly industrialized society can do together to build the underdeveloped land. Ten years ago, Puerto Rico was a small poverty stricken country with little industry and one of the lowest per capita incomes in the Western Hemisphere. Today is stands as a country rapidly growing in prosperity and now boasts one of the highest per capita incomes in the Western Hemisphere.

What's more, Puerto Rico stands as the beacon of how American capitalism can develop a country without injuring it or the individuals within the country. Communists have accused us of developing our economies by exploiting workers. Puerto Rico has proven the fallacies of this argument. Proof of the loyalty of Puerto Ricans toward this system is the reelection of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, campaigning on a platform of continued commonwealth status as against statehood or independence. But to further prove this point, another referendum has been called specifically for the purpose of voting only the issue of the land's status. We offer the Puerto Rican people a free choice as to the type of political status they desire. Can the Communist nations say the same thing?

Two great newspapers have written editorials on the occasion of Puerto Rico's 10th anniversary as a commonwealth: The Christian Science Monitor of July 30 and the Newark Evening News of July 26. Both editorials bring out different aspects of the Puerto Rican success story. I, therefore ask for unanimous consent to have them both printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 30, 1962]

AMERICAN BEACON LIGHT

Puerto Rico is a success story. It is the best gift of the United States to the underdeveloped world. Its record of the past decade proves that rapid, startlingly rapid, economic progress is possible. It proves that a big industrial country can reach out its hand and lift a small, poverty stricken country onto its feet without hurting that country and without hurting anyone.

Without hurting. That is the triumph. The Communists say that capitalism climbed to success over the backs of exploited workers. To a degree that was true over the long century and a half when industrial development came to this planet for the first time in history.

But the Communists and the Socialists are wrong when they say that free enterprise today stands for selfish gain by a few at the expense of the many. That is not true. This is now a mature politicoeconomic system where individual gain and incentive are kept from injuring others unduly (there is no perfect system) by both economic and political checks and balances. The result is the most widely diffused prosperity the world has known—wide enough to be called something new under the sun: a private enterprise system that is socially conscious.

This is where that remarkable American, Luis Mañoz-Marín, comes in. Before he appeared on the scene, the weakest point in Western capitalism was its operations abroad. When businessmen left their home country where the community insisted on reasonable behavior, when they invested in weak, defenseless countries where bribery was the rule and governments could be bought, when the hazards of doing business seemed to justify a degree of exploitation that would never be permitted at home—here were the old flaws in the capitalist system of the past, continuing to plague the present.

The Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Mr. Muñoz, stood guardian over the entry of American investment into his small and frighteningly poor country. He was the conscience of the American system as it ventured abroad. He was sympathetic to its aims and abilities. He would not tolerate its abuses. Together with a wide variety of responsible American businessmen, he and they installed modern capitalism—repeat, modern capitalism—in a spectacular period of "bootstrap" development. There were excellent profits but no piracy, rapid expansion of jobs in the midst of overwhelming labor surplus but on exploitation. Factories were intelligently placed where they would do the most good for everyone concerned but there was no heavy, dictatorial hand of the bureaucratic government planner.

We congratulate Mr. Muñoz on the 10th anniversary of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth, with a particular depth of gratitude. We will comment at another time on the political future of the Commonwealth idea, whether it should be supplanted by independence or statehood or evolve into a fully mature and special Commonwealth relationship.

Before doing that, however, it is first necessary to honor one of the most significant services rendered to the free world.

This man has not only bridged the barriers of race and language for his country, and made himself the symbol of an American people which can listen to other peoples and learn from them and thereby help them better. He has shown how the comparatively free economic system can be confidently invited into a developing country. He has proved that a favorable climate for enterprise can be established in which its benefits can be enjoyed and its historic shortcomings excluded. This, in the context of today's worldwide need for a new basis on which to help and be helped, is a towering service.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, July 26, 1962]

FOR THE RECORD

As Puerto Rico celebrates its 10th anniversary as a commonwealth, Governor Muñoz and President Kennedy agree its people should once again have an opportunity to vote for independence, for statehood, or for perfecting the status it now enjoys.

The Governor wants no doubt to remain anywhere that the principle of self-determination has been thoroughly carried out. The President says this is not only a matter of fairness but also of establishing "unequivocal record" that the island people are freely expressing their own preference.

Actually, this preference has been repeatedly expressed in free elections. Governor Muñoz himself, 2 years ago, running as always as advocate of commonwealth status, won a landslide reelection over candidates who espoused either statehood or independence.

The islanders prefer a commonwealth because it gives them all the privileges of American citizenship, except voting for Federal officials and paying Federal income taxes.

Why, then, the emphasis now on still another referendum? The reason is that both the Soviet bloc and Cuba have been denouncing U.S. "occupation" of its Puerto Rican "possession" and demanding that this "colony" be freed.

While this is obviously absurd to anybody who knows the facts, not everybody does. Therefore it is wise to stress anew Puerto Rico's repeated exercised right of free choice, and its growing prosperity and friendly ties with the United States.

Over $100,000 in Excess Profits Should Be Recovered by Justice Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Navy Department Bureau of Ships has paid a manufacturer almost 50 percent in excess profits for the manufacture of a small, transistorized power supply and in so doing has wasted at least $175,000 of the taxpayers' money—probably much more.

As a result of my study of military procurement and as a result of the assistance given me by the General Accounting Office, I have been able to pinpoint payment of excess profits by the Navy whereas a Senate committee failed in the same attempt. I have also been able, with GAO cooperation, to set the stage for the recovery of excess profits from the Admiral Corp. of Chicago, Ill., by the Justice Department to whom I shall shortly refer this case.

The power supply that has been purchased is known in procurement circles as the PP-2100. It fits into an aircraft radio known as the ARC-27. The prices paid for this small power supply are fantastic, and the overcharge by the contractor is even more fantastic. The fact that the Navy allowed this overcharge to occur without taking even routine audit procedures to find out about it is an indictment—a further indictment, I might say—of the inefficiency, incompetency and resultant waste that is rampant in our defense budget.

My attention was first alerted when I read testimony before the Senate Select Subcommittee on Small Business on the procurement of the PP-2100. In those hearings, Navy people declared that because of urgency of delivery the Navy was forced to buy the power supply sole source from the Admiral Corp. of Chicago, Ill.—7,000 units were purchased at a price of $360 each. About 90 days later, the record shows, there developed additional requirements which resulted in a competitive procurement. This resulted in an award of contract to Crescent Communications, Inc., at a unit price of $180. This, in itself, might not be significant. What I found to be startling was the fact that on the competitive procurement, Admiral submitted an unsuccessful bid of $181.45 per unit for the identical equipment they had been selling the Government for $360. This was exactly one-half Admiral's previous price.

To my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, had I purchased a home in Bedford, Ind., for $36,000 and found out 2 months later that the same builder sold an identical home in an identical location for half that price, I would be alarmed, to say the least.

On this basis of thought, I made inquiry of the Comptroller General and asked for assistance in obtaining more facts.

Last August I requested the Comptroller General to review this entire procurement. In October, the General Accounting Office responded with a report that indicated that according to Admiral's records it realized a lower rate of profit than contemplated at the time of negotiations with the Navy. The GAO report continued that Admiral, while allowed to make a 10-percent profit on the contract, stated it actually made a profit of only 3.93 percent. GAO felt this to be sufficient evidence that no excess profits were involved.

This pitiful profit stimulated my curiosity even more and on October 17, 1961, I advised Mr. Campbell that I was not satisfied with the report or with an unsupported overall statement by Admiral. I requested a complete audit of the contracts involved.

Just a week ago today, the Comptroller General reported to me that the audit for the PP-2100 power supply procurement had been completed. The General Accounting report states that the Admiral Corp. actually realized a profit of $355,000, or more than 14 percent of the contract. This compares, the GAO report continues, to an allowable profit of $252,280 and with a profit of $179,000 or 7 percent of the total contract, which Admiral now says it made.

In other words, we have this situation. Admiral at first said it made under 4-percent profit. Now it says it made over 7 percent. It was allowed 10 percent by terms of the contract, but General Accounting Office auditors have learned it realized a 14-percent profit.

This means that Admiral enjoyed a profit of at least $100,000 more than ever contemplated by the Navy or allowed by the terms of the contract. It also should be said that the Navy has never pursued this matter nor has it attempted to recover the excess profits. When I think of how hard it was for me to get $75,000 added to the public works appropriation bill for flood control to save lives, this throwing away of the taxpayers' dollars makes my blood boil. The highhanded, profligate policies of our Constitution Avenue "junkers class" is again disclosed for what it is—Incompetency, Incorporated.

So, Mr. Speaker, here is another "after the fact" story. Navy sole-source purchasing officials buy a 6-pound power supply for $360 and spend $2.5 million for 7,000 of them. The "sole source" action was based on urgency of delivery, and the taxpayers' pockets were picked. This has been proven by subsequent GAO reports and by the fact that the price was cut in half when the power supply was bought with the force of competition applied.

The astounding thing to me is that this has not been brought out in previous inquiry in the Senate, when a lone Congressman has been able, by keeping his nose to the grindstone, to ferret out the facts. Another astounding thing is that, while the purchase was "justified" as a "sole source" action because of an alleged critical need, the tube version of this power supply involved has been bought by the Navy Department since about 1940, and since that time, up to the first public procurement, it was bought sole source from either Admiral or Collins.

In other words, we are asked to believe that the Navy had been buying equipment that was operational until it suddenly all failed at once, and the only way to keep the aircraft using the radio in combat readiness was to pick the taxpayers' pockets again. The utter asininity of this position is only tragic because the constituted committees in looking into it did not blow it to "smathereens."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to forward this entire case to the Attorney General for his attention in the very near future. I shall make available to him my files and the GAO report to me which says that sections of the Armed Services procurement regulations have been violated. I think the Justice Department should recapture in the courts the $100,000 overcharge. This examination will turn up information which will lead, I believe, to further recapture of money by the Justice Department for the taxpayers of this Nation.

It may not be criminal to waste the taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker, but it ought to be, and it is high time we started getting back some of the money that has been wasted when the paths of waste can be traced and the money located.

Clifton, N.J., High School Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey sent over to the Netherlands its finest representatives to participate in the world music festival at Kerkrade, and they did New Jersey proud. The Clifton High School Mustang Band finished first in the marching competition and second in the symphonic competition while the champion Woodbury American Legion Band, the Bonsal Blues, finished third in the marching competition. Considering the fact that approximately 150 bands competed in the various divisions, the performance of the two New Jersey bands is more than commendable.

These young students have brought credit not only to the State of New Jersey but also upon their parents, their teachers, and their country. It is a fine commentary on American youth when they enter an international competition and finish with a first, a second, and a third place. There is not too much more that they could have accomplished for us.

I am indeed proud of both bands' activities as well as the American National Theater & Academy—ANTA—and the State Department which screened the bands. Their assistance toward both bands is a matter of public record and I need not dwell upon it.

The Herald-News of Passaic-Clifton, N.J., ran as its lead story on page 1 of August 6, the news story on the Mustangs' victory in the world marching competition. They also editorially commented on it. Therefore, I ask for unanimous consent to have both printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Three Cheer's for Clifton's Band

The members of the Clifton High School Mustang Band outdid the fondest hopes of their well-wishers at the world music festival at Kerkrade in the Netherlands.

Their record at the festival was almost perfect—second in the symphonic competition Saturday and first in the marching competition yesterday. In the marching competition, they bested 23 bands from 15 countries.

The Clifton High students in the band brought credit to the young people of America with their outstanding performances. Their parents and teachers and the entire city should be proud of them.

Mustangs Win World Top Marching Honors—Clifton High Band Second in Symphonic Contest

(By George Homcy)

Kerkrade, Holland.—Muddy, but very much unbowed.

That was the story yesterday as Clifton High School's Mustang Band slogged to victory here in the marching competition at the World Music Festival.

The big Mustang musical unit had already covered itself with a major share of glory Saturday afternoon by taking second place in the symphonic competition. Their loss in this contest was a heartbreaker. A group from Meggen, Germany, nosed out the Mustangs by a scant 2 points—381 to 379.

But yesterday's victory assuaged the disappointment of the close Saturday loss. It was also a triumph over fatigue and the elements.

It had been raining all day. The dirt track on which the band was to march was virtually inundated. The thousands of hearty onlookers in the stands had sat patiently through 3 hours of marching competition, lulled by the slow tempo used by European bands.

They came to life as the Woodbury, N.J., American Legion Band took the field and were cheering and applauding vigorously by the time the south Jersey unit finished.

A Mustang bandsman, weary from a 7-hour plane trip, a bus ride that took another 7 hours, the symphonic appearance and heavy rehearsals, took a deep breath and said:

"Wait 'til they see us."

Then they splashed out onto the field in their new maroon and white uniforms, electrifying the crowd with a stepped-up tempo. The uniforms were soon splattered with mud. Their flashing white shoes were indistinguishable in minutes.

When they were through, they had piled up 102 points out of a possible 120 to win. They swirled around the field like Indians doing a war dance as the announcement of their win was made over the public address system.

Then they swept into an encore performance as the spectators rose to give them a tremendous ovation. They used a number of precision formations—the type usually seen at football halftime shows—and they were great. Significantly the skies cleared as the program ended.

Festival officials said yesterday's program was the first to be held in such a steady rain since the international event opened last month.

Finishing behind Clifton in the marching event was a Swiss band. Third went to Woodbury.

The Clifton group received its awards—the gold medal for taking first in the marching event, a silver one for being runner-up in the symphonic competition, and a scroll.

Twenty-three bands from 15 countries competed with Clifton in the marching feature. In all, approximately 150 bands competed in the various divisions. The month-long festival ends August 15.

One practical problem confronted the Mustangs when it was all over. They only have one set of uniforms and they need cleaning badly. When they left here this morning, each band member carried his uniform over his arm—the boxes they came in had been smashed beyond usefulness. They hope to get them drycleaned in Paris.

The awards were presented late yesterday afternoon at a reception in Kerkrade Town House. Peter Librizzi, vice president of the Clifton Board of Education and chairman of the committee which planned the band trip, presented a letter from Clifton's Mayor Ira Schoem to the mayor of this hilly mining town. He also turned over a resolution passed by his school board colleagues.

The visitors were welcomed by Dr. Theo Gyzen, lord mayor of Kerkrade. Paul Wintgens, president of the festival, also extended a cordial welcome and told the visitors that "their appearance in the event brought you new musical friends throughout the world." Dr. Gyzen told Librizzi he would send a letter to Clifton's Mayor Schoem commending Clifton and the high school bandsmen.

This morning, the band and its supporting group, made up of the color guard, majorettes and escorts, parents, relatives and friends, left the festival community for Cologne.

They will spend almost 2 days in the German industrial center before moving on to Luxembourg Wednesday.

In Clifton today, Mayor Schoem had this to say:

"We're just thrilled and delighted with the tremendous accomplishment of our kids. Everybody agrees that they're a credit to themselves their teachers, parents, and everybody in Clifton. We knew we had an excellent band, but it's wonderful that they proved it in worldwide competition."

The mayor said nothing had been planned yet, but added "I'm sure there will be a proper celebration and reception for them when they come home."

"I think it goes to show what type of music program we have in our school system," said Emil J. Wiatrak, school board president, who joined in congratulating the group.

William F. Shershin, superintendent of schools, lauded the band for its diligent preparation.

"This added laurel to the band's many accomplishments is the result of perseverance, sparked by outstanding ability developed since the fourth grade."

Back in Cologne it was cloudy, but there were a lot of beaming faces.

Tribute to Samuel Klein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Samuel Klein, of Newark, N.J., was honored by the conferring of an honorary doctor of science degree on him by the St. Joseph College, of New Mexico. The degree was given in recognition of his original published papers to medical research, papers which have appeared in leading scientific and medical journals here and abroad.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement prepared by the Newark Defense Council, of which Mr. Klein is presently the service chief, emergency medical and health services division, about this occasion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Newark Defense Council through Leo P. Carlin, director, announces that its medical and health services chief, Samuel Klein, of Newark, N.J., on May 30 received an honorary doctor of science degree conferred on him by the College of St. Joseph, of New Mexico. The college is an affiliate of the Catholic University of America.

Of all the degrees awarded annually only about 4 percent are for the honorary doctor of science degree, since this degree is usually given only to worthy and selected scientists, scholars, and investigators with certain attainments and as a deserved recognition of outstanding and meritorious contributions to the advancement of science.

Those in the medical and allied professions who in the past were given the honorary doctor of science degree were, to mention a few, Dr. William J. Mayo, of Mayo Clinic fame; Dr. Alexis Carrel, the world-famous scientists; and Dr. W. C. Gorgas, of Panama Canal Zone renown.

In the case of Klein, this honor and recognition was for his original published papers (contributions) to medical research.

The results of his independent research have appeared in print in leading internationally famous scientific and medical journals in the United States, Switzerland, France, England, Italy, and Germany.

In awarding the degree of doctor of science to Klein, Sister W. Viatora Schuller, president of St. Joseph College, stated, "The board of trustees and the administration of the College of St. Joseph wholeheartedly approve and are gratified and honored to grant a person of your stature and renown the doctor of science degree."

Klein, a native of Newark, N.J., was educated in the Newark schools and is a graduate of the Rutgers University College of Pharmacy, the U.S. Army Military Instructors' School (civil defense), and holds certificates in pre-flight aeronautics, plastic engineering (Rutgers University), and a certificate in physical medicine subjects, U.S. Army Medical Service School.

Besides being a licentiate in pharmacy in many States, he also is licensed as a food and drug inspector (New Jersey), registered sanitarian (Massachusetts), and is on the board of editors of the chemical formulary and an abstractor, of the chemical abstracts, American Chemical Society.

He holds membership in the Royal Society of Health, England, the world's largest health society, the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association, and is an elected affiliate member (section of experimental medicine and therapeutics) of the American Medical Association.

He is the author of nine published novels and one of his published books was judged "a contribution to American humor" by the International Mark Twain Society, the world-famous literary society, and placed in the Mark Twain Collection, Library of International Literature, Washington, D.C. Klein is an elected member of the International Mark Twain Society. For his volunteer public service during World War II and in recognition as chief officer, Chemical Warfare Division, Newark Defense Council, Klein was given a national citation by American Druggist magazine and placed on the U.S. Army officers' honorary retired list and received the Gold Service Ribbon, the highest U.S. Office of Civil Defense award. Klein is listed in the monthly supplement of Who's Who in America, and in Leaders of American Science.

At present, Klein is the service chief, Emergency Medical and Health Services Division, Newark Defense Council, a volunteer, unpaid public service duty.

Jewish Military Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Helen Keller, that valiant woman who overcame so many handicaps, once said that the highest result of education is tolerance. "Long ago men fought and died for their faith; but it took ages to teach them the other kind of courage—the courage to recognize the faiths of their brethren and their rights of conscience." The United States as a Nation took cognizance of this courage of which Miss Keller spoke, on July 17, 1862, when President Abraham Lincoln signed into law an act which for the first time enabled rabbis to serve as Jewish military chaplains. For close to the first 100 years of our independence only regularly ordained ministers "of some Christian denomination could serve as chaplains."

The importance of this act is not to be underestimated. For in its wider significance, America showed that it truly allowed freedom of religious belief. The Jews, whose history is marked by persistent fights for religious freedom, have every right to be proud of this event, the 100th anniversary of which was celebrated by a dedication of the Jewish chapel in the Air Force Academy. The over 700 rabbis who have served in the military forces have proven themselves to be good soldiers and have exhibited great heroism. Most everyone is familiar with Rabbi Alexander Goode, the chaplain who perished aboard the *Dorchester* in World War II with three other chaplains, each representing one of the other great faiths. Arm in arm with true brotherhood, they died in order that others may live. A commemorative postage stamp was issued in their honor to mark the event. Rabbi Goode's story, however, is not an isolated one of Jewish heroism in the armed services, for many other Jewish clergymen have proven that they could be religious Jews and loyal American citizens at one and the same time.

Bernard Turteltaub, associate editor of the Jewish Standard—Jersey City, N.J.—brought out the importance of the July 17 milestone in American Jewish history in his July 20 column. His column is instructive and welcome. I therefore ask for unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH MILITARY CHAPLAINS

During this month, a milestone for the Jews will be reached. On July 17, 1862—Abraham Lincoln signed into law an act which for the first time enabled rabbis to serve as Jewish military chaplains. Prior to that date only regularly ordained ministers of some Christian denomination could serve as chaplains. A highlight of the celebration of this event, will be dedication of the Jewish Chapel in the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colo. According to all the records kept by the Jewish Welfare Board, over 700 rabbis have served in every branch of our military forces. The first Jewish chaplain to be commissioned by the U.S. Government was Rabbi Jacob Frankel, of Congregation Rodelph Sholom, of Philadelphia.

The most famous rabbi to have served to date was Rabbi Alexander Goode, who, with Father John Washington, Rev. George Fox, and Rev. Clark Poling perished aboard the troop transport *Dorchester* in World War II—because they chose to give up their lifejackets to helpless GI's rather than save themselves. The story of the four chaplains, linked arm in arm on the deck of the sinking ship and praying aloud, each in his own way, is now an epic chapter of heroism and devotion in our history. There are other stories of heroism and valor of Jewish chaplains who served faithfully, with devotion toward their fellow men, with undying love for their country.

The Public Career of Lewis Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch entitled, "A Fascinating Memoir."

It refers to the book that has been written by the Honorable Lewis Strauss on his public career and the very important positions he has so ably filled from time to time.

As the Times-Dispatch states, this is a fascinating book and contains very valuable information as to the period in our country in which Lewis Strauss played such an important part.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FASCINATING MEMOIR

Virginians know Lewis L. Strauss—who grew up in Richmond—as an able public official and unselfish citizen who has given many of his best years to his fellow man. But most of his friends and acquaintances may have been unaware that Mr. Strauss is also a highly competent writer, with a notably readable style. This latter fact is abundantly evident in his new autobiographical work, "Men and Decisions."

In other words, Lewis Strauss not only has had a fascinating career; he knows how to tell of it with both humor and modesty. Early in that career he showed the spirit of dedication that was to characterize his life thereafter. He served without pay in the Belgian relief organization of Herbert Hoover from 1917 to 1919. Having saved $20,000 from his successful work as a shoe drummer in the years immediately preceding World War I, he was able to fall back on these savings while acting as Mr. Hoover's aid.

After the war, young Strauss joined the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. and in a few years became a partner. He was eminently successful as a banker. But when World War II broke out, he went into the Navy, rising to the rank of Admiral.

After that conflict was over, President Truman persuaded him to accept a place on the first Atomic Energy Commission. He did so at a great financial sacrifice. When his term expired, he sought to retire—to his Virginia farm, near Culpeper—but President Eisenhower prevailed on him to take the chairmanship of the AEC. In that post he served with brilliant success.

Once more he sought to retire, but President Eisenhower persuaded him to accept appointment as Secretary of Commerce. Here Mr. Strauss ran into a barrage of the phoniest and most synthetic series of charges from Senate "liberals" that could well be imagined. As a result of this disgraceful and politically motivated "smear" attack, based on nonexistent "facts" and far fetched innuendoes, he failed of confirmation by 49 to 46.

In his book he tells of this rejection without bitterness, but rather with restraint and good humor. Also in the volume he relates fascinating conversations with many of the great men of his generation, both in this country and Europe, and sheds important light on vital questions—such as, for example, why we dropped the atomic bombs on Japan in 1945.

Lewis Strauss has known just about everybody who was anybody in the past several decades. He has been in the middle of some of the most important events of our time, and has made some of the most significant decisions. He tells of his experiences and observations with lucidity and charm. No wonder critics from coast to coast are praising his book.

Conservation Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in 1879, Chief Joseph of the Nez Perce wrote in the North American Review:

> The earth is the mother of all people, and all people should have equal rights upon it.

In the tradition of this great Indian's philosophy, the administration has been pushing a farsighted recreation program which is being skillfully handled by Interior Secretary Udall.

The Camden Courier-Post has described the status of pending legislation in the conservation field. The editors are pleased at the number of national parks that will probably be established, and they comment that the major battle will be over the wilderness bill. Secretary Udall's position on the bill appears to me to be the logical one; that is, unless we set aside our wilderness areas and keep them free from encroachment by commercial interests, the Nation may end up with none.

> The overriding need of men—

He said—

> is for an environment that will renew the human spirit and sustain unborn generations.

But perhaps this point of view has been brought to its fullest extent by the following poem which appeared in the Sierra Club Bulletin in January 1962:

We need the sea.
We need a place to stand, watch, and listen—
To feel the pulse-beat of the world as the surf rolls in.

The Courier-Post concluded its editorial of July 23, by predicting that we in Congress can share the credit by putting into action programs that will bring permanent benefits to the Nation and to its people, present and to come. I, therefore, ask for unanimous consent to have their editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, July 23, 1962]

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS ADVANCE

Congress may be lagging on other matters, but is making good progress on at least one legislative front as sought by the Kennedy administration.

According to Congressional Quarterly, legislative action is almost certain to be completed this year on three major recreation programs pushed by Interior Secretary Udall, who is zealous about setting aside land for public recreation use.

The three programs would:

Establish a national wilderness system which will preserve the forest primeval for future generations of hikers and campers.

Create a land conservation fund to "stake" Uncle Sam to buy up more land for conservation and recreation uses.

Set up a program to make a continuing inventory of recreation needs and resources in this country and to make grants to the States to help them establish outdoor recreation areas and parks.

In addition, Congress is expected to establish three new seashore parks within the national park system before the end of this session. Cape Cod National Seashore Park in Massachusetts was established last year. Point Reyes in California and Padre Island in Texas are expected to become national seashore parks this year.

This would be a record number of new national parks created by any one Congress. Only three national parks have been created in the past 15 years, Everglades in Florida in 1947, Virgin Islands National Park in 1956, and Cape Cod in 1961.

The major battle centers, as usual, over the wilderness bill. The bill which passed the Senate last year is now in the process of being amended by the House Public Lands Subcommittee. Conservationists on the one hand and supporters of multiple uses of public lands have battled over this legislation for the past 6 years. They are still at it.

The bill that is finally enacted into law is not likely to satisfy either side. But at a minimum it will give statutory authority to the present wilderness areas which have been created by the Secretary of Agriculture within the national forest system. And there will be restrictions on building roads, buildings and commerical enterprises in such areas and on nonrecreation uses in these areas.

As Udall sees it, unless America sets aside its wilderness areas and keeps them free from encroachment by commercial interests, the Nation may end up with none.

He told the White House Conference on Conservation May 24 that "the overriding need of men [is] for an environment that will renew the human spirit and sustain unborn generations." He said this "requires some sacrifice of short-term profits."

The various conservation groups, including the politically potent garden clubs, hold the same view.

However, to Curtis M. Hutchins, chairman of the board of the St. Croix Paper Co. of Bangor, Maine, the wilderness bill would lock up millions of acres of resources in the wilderness areas forever, for the benefit of only "a few hardy hikers."

Testifying for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce before the House Public Lands Subcommittee May 9, Hutchins asked: "Is it in the national interest rigidly to restrict access to such vast areas of scenic beauty so that only a very small percentage of our population will ever have the chance to use them?"

This view is shared by many present users of public lands including lumbermen, livestockmen, miners, oil and gas interests, water and power groups. They are skeptical of attempts to restrict multiple use of public land, as is done under the wilderness legislation. However, they are in the minority, looking at the situation through the glasses of their own special interests, and we believe that broadly speaking they are in the wrong.

Other recreation legislation before Congress is not so controversal. The administration on June 18 withdrew its proposal to tax recreation boats as a means of providing a major source of revenue for the land conservation fund. This action materially upgraded the chances for such a fund to be created by this Congress.

All in all, the recreation legislation in prospect is welcome. Udall is entitled to praise for proposing it and for his adroit handling of it with Congress. Congress will share the credit with him for a program that will bring permanent benefits to the Nation and its people, present and to come.

Unemployment Insurance Inequities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the unemployment insurance program has been expanding greatly in recent years. It is apparent that many inequities are resulting from this expanded Federal program and that if the program is carried forward in its present concept, it will run into serious trouble. It is already meeting considerable criticism and opposition.

One of the best articles I have read on this subject is a speech by a good friend of mine and a very capable businessman, Mr. Richard H. Barry, financial consultant, of Fargo, N. Dak. Mr. Barry has a distinguished record in dealing with problems of businessmen. In his speech he points out some of the present difficulties with this program and suggests some possible solutions.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of Mr. Barry's remarks before the Cass County Republican Finance Committee at Fargo, N. Dak., on August 15, 1962, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE HEADED IN THE WRONG DIRECTION?

In an article "Are We Headed in the Wrong Direction," former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, on page 22 of the August 11, 1962, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, lists six matters which should be of broad public interest. One of the six points pertains to a drive for authority to federalize the unemployment compensation system of this country. Your chairman, Pershing Boe, has asked me to take the subject of Federal and State unemployment compensation taxes, pose the question, "Are We Headed in the Wrong Direction?", and then bring the subject matter down to the level of a State like North Dakota—and in a manner that will interest the barbers, the hospital administrators, businessmen, students of government, and taxpayers in general.

It would be a great milestone in political procedure and an encouraging step forward, in behalf of present and future generations, if starting in 1962 each of the approximately 3,000 county committees in our country of both the Republican and Democratic Parties would attempt more often to develop a better understanding at the local level, of the various economic issues and philosophies confronting our Nation. I think your chairman should be commended for the start he has made in the right direction.

The subject of the Federal-State unemployment compensation system which now exists, is a bit too complicated to be thoroughly discussed in a brief luncheon meeting of this nature, but the following points may be helpful, as well as alarming in developing a better understanding of whether the system from a tax standpoint is headed in the wrong or the right direction:

(1) Are we headed in the wrong direction from a tax standpoint? The answer, I believe you will agree after you have studied the subject, is "Yes." You will find that in all but three States the employer pays all of this social insurance—and that the tax structure for employers is one of the most inequitable systems of taxation in existence involving millions of dollars in North Dakota and hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the Nation.

(2) The following figures can be used as a start in establishing a foundation for today's brief discussion, to point out just a few of the inequities in the unemployment insurance tax system. For example, note that the business firms in North Dakota are confronted with an average rate on their taxable payrolls that is twice as high as the rate in South Dakota. In round figures on approximately the same number of employers and employees North Dakota has a tax burden of $2 million more per year than South Dakota. Iowa has a comparable rate that is only one-third as high as North Dakota.

Unemployment insurance financial data

	Number of employers covered	Number of covered employees	Collected from employers	Average employer rate (percent)	State total reserve for benefits (percent)
North Dakota	5,841	64,937	$3,826,000	1.98	2.8
South Dakota	5,709	73,447	1,826,000	.81	7.0
Iowa	22,789	446,731	8,178,000	.61	8.6
Nebraska	12,276	233,717	7,335,000	1.05	5.9
Minnesota	41,474	705,948	21,716,000	1.13	2.3
Wisconsin	33,647	907,324	36,621,000	1.41	7.7

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor, Annual Report, June 30, 1961, for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1961.

Comparisons of benefits paid (percentage of average taxable payrolls)

	Percent
Wisconsin	2.7
North Dakota	2.6
Minnesota	2.3
Nebraska	1.4
Iowa	1.4
South Dakota	1.3

NOTATION

(a) The tax is based in each State to a large extent on the statutes of that State, providing they conform to certain provisions of the Federal social security laws and the Internal Revenue Code.

(b) The laws of North Dakota provide for a minimum rate for an individual employer depending on the reserve in the trust fund which can vary from 0.3 percent to 2.7 percent.

(c) The maximum rate for an employer is 4.2 percent (North Dakota).

(d) In addition there is a Federal excise tax of 0.4 percent.

(e) Anyone starting a new business in North Dakota with four or more employees is confronted with a minimum contribution rate of 4.2 percent plus 0.4 percent on the salary of each employee up to $3,000 per calendar year.

(3) Does effective leadership exist on a local, State or national level to take the unemployment compensation tax system and turn it in the right direction? The answer unfortunately appears to be no.

(4) What action can and should be taken by the citizens of North Dakota especially the employers, who are faced with a staggering unemployment tax load in the years ahead? At the close of my remarks today, I will pose a few potential tax and administrative guideposts for the consideration of business, civic, and legislative leaders, plus the need for imagination and leadership in creating a broader economy and more job opportunities.

(5) As the Federal and State laws now stand, North Dakota citizens are faced with an unemployment tax load that may total in the next 10 years a minimum of $50 million—and if legislation now pending in Congress (H.R. 7640 and S. 3411) is passed in its present form, the total could be closer to $100 million. If this forecast is hard for you to believe, all you have to do is to add the unemployment benefits paid in North Dakota in 1961, and multiply the figures by 10 years. Then read the provisions of H.R. 7640 and S. 3411. It would also be well to keep in mind that the tax for unemployment compensation in North Dakota as recently as the year 1958 totaled less than $2½ million.

(6) According to the annual report of the North Dakota Unemployment Compensation Division for the year 1961, benefits paid totaled $5,057,406. In addition, temporary extended unemployment compensation amounted to $423,817, unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen was $441,154 and unemployment compensation for Federal employees was $130,805.

(7) Is there a possibility that certain North Dakota employers are vulnerable to having their unemployment tax increased as much as 200 percent commencing January 1, 1963? The answer if we have another year like 1960 or 1961 is "Yes," but until the figures are in for benefits paid and tax collected in the last 6 months of 1962, a definite answer cannot be given to the question. In round figures in North Dakota there are now approximately 6,000 employers of four or more persons. In the aggregate, these employers have a monthly average of about 66,500 employees. In addition about 600 State and local government employees are covered plus about 7,800 Federal employees. One of the yardsticks in determining the tax rates for North Dakota employers is to take and measure the balance the employers have collectively in a trust fund against their combined annual taxable payroll. In the calendar year 1961, taxable wages totaled about $185 million. As of the end of 1961, the employers had a balance in the trust fund of approximately $6,366,000 or a trifle less than 3½ percent of the taxable payroll. The balance in the trust fund is dangerously close to a provision in the State law which requires a minimum tax of 2.7 percent on the first $3,000 of wages paid to each employee. In the event the reserve in the trust fund on December 31, 1962, is less than 3 percent of the combined taxable payroll for 1962 the above provision would take effect. In addition there would be a minimum Federal excise tax of 0.8 percent. It is significant to note that the trust fund in North Dakota has shrunk from approximately $10 million to approximately $6 million in the 4 years between December 31, 1957, and December 31, 1961. In 1960 and 1961 it shrunk over a million dollars each year. In thinking about the tax load for North Dakota employers in 1963 we must also keep in mind H.R. 7640 and S. 3411.

(8) At present, approximately 80,000 employees in North Dakota are covered at certain periods of the year by unemployment compensation laws. In connection with the previously mentioned drive for authority to federalize the unemployment compensation system, it is pertinent to note that H.R. 7640 would extend the coverage in North Dakota to an estimated additional 20,000 to 25,000 nonagricultural employees, including not only employers of one or more persons, such as barbers, but many tax-exempt institutions, such as hospitals and parochial schools. In round figures, this would increase the operating costs in the next 10 years of one Fargo hospital a minimum of $30,000. The tax load for all of the hospitals in the State in the 10-year period would amount to a minimum of $300,000 and a maximum of about $500,000. Keep in mind that social security taxes now running in excess of $40 million annually in North Dakota will also increase 48 percent for all employers in less than 6 years.

(9) H.R. 7640 would increase the tax base upon which an employer must calculate his unemployment tax by 60 percent from a $3,000 tax base to a $4,800 base.

(10) S. 3411 would increase the rate of tax on the above-mentioned base from 3.1 percent to 3.5 percent. This is an excise tax and is subject to a credit for payments made by employers to their respective States. For all practical purposes, without getting into too many details today, the State of North Dakota has authority to charge an employer a maximum of 4.2 percent on whatever the base is (at present, $3,000), and in addition, the Federal Government can collect 0.8 percent on the base, making a total tax of $150 per employee. A new industry coming to North Dakota with 100 employees is confronted with a minimum the first year of $15,000 in unemployment taxes plus $15,000 in social security taxes, in addition to workmen's compensation and all other State and Federal taxes.

(11) It is not generally known to employers but once each year the validity of each State's unemployment compensation program must be approved by the U.S. Secretary of Labor. In the event this approval is not obtained, the Secretary of the Treasury will not permit the employers in the particular State involved to partly offset (2.7 percent) their tax contribution to the State trust fund against the employers' Federal excise tax. Members of the 1961 North Dakota legislature will recall the hurry-up bill that had to be passed that year to satisfy the U.S. Secretary of Labor. The Fargo Forum, in an editorial dated January 19, 1961, reported that the legislature had to act to forestall the Federal Government from collecting an extra $5 million from the North Dakota employers. Some persons might argue that North Dakota's experience would suggest that the unemployment compensation system is already federalized.

(12) Can the citizens of North Dakota, especially the employers, do anything about the direction in which the unemployment compensation system is going and the staggering Federal and State tax that is required to support it? The following thoughts occur to me from 20 years of observing the piecemeal approaches in North Dakota to finding equitable benefit programs and equitable tax rates:

(12.1) The Unemployment Compensation Division in North Dakota is relatively a large operation compared to many State departments. It is the only division of its kind in the United States that is attached to a workmen's compensation bureau. The unemployment compensation program is important enough and expensive enough to the employers of North Dakota to warrant strong, imaginative, and courageous leadership. The program should be under the direction of a revitalized and independent commission, which would report directly to the Governor and to the legislature instead of to the workmen's compensation bureaus. The proposed Unemployment Compensation Commission should have a full-time administrator but would not require full-time members of the commission. The commission members, however, should be persons who by experience and training would be able to give the type of administration suggested above.

(12.2) In addition, because of the heavy tax burden and complexity of the tax rate and benefit structure, there should be an employers' council, made up of 5 to 10 employers who should meet quarterly and at intervals advise with the proposed Unemployment Compensation Commission. The scope of the employers' council should not only embrace unemployment taxes at the State level, but recommendations to Congress for improvement in the Federal laws.

(a) The requirements in the North Dakota laws to qualify for benefits probably permit too many persons to become eligible, who are in reality only part-time workers.

(b) It is possible under North Dakota laws to obtain unemployment benefits totaling $864 by actually working less than 14 weeks out of 52 weeks in a year, and earning a total of only $1,404. This may account for the relatively high benefit expenditures.

(c) In some States the problem of segregating temporary workers from those in the permanent work force is handled by requiring an applicant for benefits to earn at least $100 in each of the four quarters of a year.

(12.3) Between now and the opening of the next North Dakota legislative session in January, 1963, the employers of North Dakota should: (a) create an unemployment compensation employers' council, (b) employ competent technical assistance and (c) be prepared to make an informed presentation to the next legislature on upgrading the operating mechanics of the unemployment compensation system in this State. For example, it is possible that if North Dakota had the benefit of the laws and regulations employed in South Dakota, it might mean a savings to North Dakota business firms of from $1 million to $2 million per year and help attract more industry to North Dakota. On a national level, the North Dakota employers should find a vehicle such as a national employers' council on unemployment compensation through which they can work with the employers in the other 49 States, to prevent complete domination of the unemployment compensation system by the Federal Government not only by statutes but by regulations (watch for the scope of regulations permitted in H.R. 7640). At present, the Federal system is administered to a large extent by the U.S. Department of Labor. The time has come for the employers, possibly through the U.S. Department of Commerce, to have a voice in a program that vitally affects the economy of this Nation and a program which at present is full of inequities to hundreds of thousands of taxpayers.

(12.4) The scope of the employers' council, on both a State and national level, should in addition to seeking sound and equitable tax and benefit programs, include study of ways and means to: (a) stabilize employment, (b) expand the economy and (c) create more job opportunities.

Mobile Swimming Pools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, physical fitness is one of the most important aspects of man's life. It is particularly necessary for the youth of America. This fact has been recognized by President Kennedy's youth fitness program and by educators all over the country. But many youngsters in the crowded cities of our land find it difficult to exercise during the summer months; most difficult is the attempt at finding a place to swim. The "ole swimmin' hole" disappeared in the urban sprawl and new means of providing youngsters with this needed recreational facility had to be found. Gerald H. Croushore of Cranford, N.J., a secretary at the Eastern Union County YMCA, hit upon the idea of bringing the mountain and Mohammed together in a most unusual way: moving the mountain. In order to move the mountain, Croushore decided to bring the Y to the youngsters by organizing a swimming pool on wheels.

This initiative on Mr. Croushore's part and the generosity of the citizens who helped make a $15,000 item available to the Y at a cost of less than $700 is to be commended. Time, workmanship, and materials were contributed by local firms. When a community works together for the common good, all stand to benefit.

I am proud to ask this body for unanimous consent to have the report by Jesse Brodey of the New York Daily News printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It appeared on July 29, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOBILE SWIMMING POOLS

(By Jesse Brodey)

In this motorized age of sprawling suburbia, it had to come: swimming pools on wheels. Now, 500 youngsters a week, from Elizabeth to Camden, are learning to swim in two YMCA swimmobiles that set up shop right in the kids' own neighborhoods.

The swimmobiles were dreamed up by Gerald H. Croushore of 128 Mohawk Drive, Cranford, a secretary at the eastern Union County YMCA in Elizabeth for the past 5 years. "Our aim is to 'drownproof' the State," Croushore said.

Each swimmobile is a 20- by 8-foot swimming pool mounted on a tractor trailer. One is 3 feet deep and the other 4.

"It's just another case of the mountain and Mohammed," Croushore said. "We had to move the mountain. We found that we had a growing community to serve and transportation, parking problems, infrequent bus service and so forth were discouraging many from using our YMCA in Elizabeth."

"We just decided to bring the Y to the youngsters," Croushore added. "We call it, 'Instant YMCA.'"

With 2 instructors taking turns handling half-hour sessions, each swimmobile usually schedules 24 classes a day. By the end of five lessons, more than 50 percent of the youngsters age 6 to 11, can pass the beginners' test by swimming two lengths of the 20-foot pool.

THREE TRAILERS DONATED

According to George W. Hoffman of Scotch Plains, Y secretary in charge of swimmobile class registrations, each swimmobile is worth about $15,000 but because of donations of time, workmanship and materials by local firms, the total cash outlay by the Y was less than $700 each.

Joseph Perrotto, vice president of Eastern Motor Dispatch and a member of the YMCA Men's Health Club, donated three trailers. One was a 22-foot long box carrier, which the Y converted into a Funmobile by equipping it with tumbling mats, athletic equipment and a long arts and crafts work bench. It has since been donated to Puerto Rico and is being operated by a YMCA branch there.

Members of Carpenter's Union Local 715 of Elizabeth erected the swimming pool walls of plywood on a heavy steel frame without charge. Ed Bitner, an executive of Better Finishes & Coatings of Clifton which supplies material for mothballing the U.S. fleet, put on overalls to spray on five waterproof coats of flexible vinyl plastic coating.

One swimmobile has been touring different cities elsewhere in the State this past month and has already been in action in Camden and New Brunswick.

It is scheduled to be in Cedar Grove this week, in Trenton for the week of August 6 and in Linden for 2 weeks starting August 13. To haul the pool from place to place, Eastern Motor Dispatch is contributing both a tractor and a driver.

The second swimmobile has already handled an average of 250 youngsters a week in swim classes at sites in Elizabethport and Union.

After this second week in Union, it will move to Kenilworth for 2 weeks starting August 6 and to Roselle and Roselle Park for 2 weeks starting August 20. Cranford has use of the swimmobile Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday evenings.

Berman Trucking has donated the use of a tractor for the second swimmobile for the summer. James McAteer, 22, of Cranford, a second year law student at Vanderbilt University, doubles as driver and swimming instructor. Croushore's daughter, Karen, 20, a student at Bethany College, West Virginia, is the other swimming instructor.

Our Policy of Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the New York Times of August 18, 1962, concerning the recent address of Secretary of State Dean Rusk affirming our policy of winning a worldwide victory for freedom.

The editorial follows:

OUR POLICY OF VICTORY

In a recent major policy statement Secretary Rusk gave a wider perspective to our foreign and defense policies. Expanding on President Kennedy's "revolution of freedom," the Secretary declared that our goal—and that of most nations of the world—is "incompatible" with the Communist goal, that this means a "global struggle" and that, however long it may last, we intend to win it in a worldwide victory for freedom not only for ourselves but for all mankind. He hopes that this victory can be won without a military climax, but he warns that we shall defend our vital interests and those of the free world "by whatever means may be necessary."

This speech, which seems to sound a firmer note of resolution born of the frustration of all attempts to negotiate with the Soviets, was an answer to Moscow's threats, as well as a reply to American rightwing charges that we pursue a "no win" policy. It was also addressed to the neutralists who, in disregard of the issues involved, see the struggle as a power contest between the United States and Soviet Russia and adopt a plague-on-both-your-house attitude. Mr. Rusk reaffirmed our pledge to protect the freedom of West Berlin and vowed that Communist aggression in Vietnam shall not succeed.

This renewed proclamation of our goals and pledges should provide new reassurance to Western Europe disturbed by debates about our military strategy. So should the declarations of General Taylor, designated new chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General Norstad, the retiring allied commander in chief in Europe. Both urge Europe to increase its conventional forces to strengthen the NATO "shield" that must meet a first attack. We seek to evolve a strategy that will leave us, and Europe, a choice of means before resorting to "massive retaliation" in the event of attack on Western Europe. But such a strategy is possible only if Europe does its part.

Supranational Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the great, fundamental problems and challenges facing mankind often extend over and beyond national boundaries, beyond continents, and, now, indeed, beyond the globe itself.

Moreover, the research required to explore the "great unknown" often exceeds the brainpower and resources of individual nations.

For this reason, there is a need for ever-greater cooperation among people and nations on problems of universal significance.

The International Geophysical Year, for example, represented one of the great programs of international cooperation for mutual exchange of knowledge and information in the history of the world.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published an editorial reflecting thoughtfully upon the great scope of challenges in science, and of international cooperative efforts now underway.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune, Aug. 18, 1962]

YEARS OF OUR DAYS—NATIONALISM, ISOLATION IMPOSSIBLE IN SCIENCE

The international importance of science was brought home to the ordinary citizen during the famous International Geophysical Year, even though the sputniks and Vanguards and Explorers stole the show from the other sciences.

The IGY was no one-shot extravaganza, however. A number of other "international years" are underway or scheduled, among them:

The International Indian Ocean Expedition will run from 1962 through 1965 and involve 25 nations and about 44 vessels.

Among the ships will be the former Presidential yacht *Williamsburg*, which has been turned over to the National Science Foundation. It will be renamed the *Anton Brun*, in honor of the late Danish oceanographer.

The International Year of the Quiet Sun will be held between April 1964 and December 1965. Observations during this period of minimum sunspot activity will complement those made during the IGY, which was a time of maximum activity.

Cooperation in meteorological research is going on at an increasing rate in an effort to understand more about the world's weather patterns.

Space exploration continues to be the most spectacular area for international cooperation and is being spurred by the United Nations.

The United States and Britain this spring launched a joint satellite called Ariel. At about the same time, a United States-Japanese team collaborated in a sounding rocket project at Wallops Island, Va. An Italian satellite is planned, to be launched by an American rocket.

This cooperation has come about not merely because of the obvious fact that it is physically one world. It is also because scientific knowledge has become so vast and complicated and all-embracing that no one nation has enough brains or wealth to go it alone.

There can be no nationalism or isolationism in science.

Destruction of Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Mark Soifer once wrote:

No matter how often
  I level this weed,
It returns after rain
  As if there is need
To remind men who sever
  Life's delicate string
That destruction is never
  A permanent thing.

The history of the bird and mammal populations, however, do not bear out Mr. Soifer's beautiful observation. Our indiscriminate slaughter of all forms of wildlife has shown species destruction to be a permanent thing. The great auk of the northern Atlantic coast, the Carolina parakeet of the Eastern United States, the labrador duck, the passenger pigeon, and the heath hen—no longer do these birds fly free and wild across the United States. No longer does the seamink inhabit the New England coast. Man has decried the extinction of these species through neglect and wasteful slaughter. Many other species are in serious trouble facing possible extinction: the baldeagle, the Florida Everglades kite, and the whooping crane to name but a few.

The Atlantic City Press has spoken out on wildlife's precarious tenure and observed that this desecration should have something "to do with ideas of beauty, reverence for life, a feeling of kinship with all living things." For this reason, man has erred. What then is he going to do about it? That remains the unanswered question.

I ask unanimous consent to have the July 31 editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is an excellent commentary on our wildlife situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDLIFE'S TENURE PRECARIOUS

Except for the weather and geological upheavals over which he has (as yet) no control, man pretty well runs this planet.

He pretty much bosses all the other living forms which share it with him, and the days are numbered for those species which bother him or which are of no practical use to him.

Man needs cattle, so we have hundreds of millions of them, constantly being improved in the qualities man designs. He doesn't need gorillas or California condors, so the tenure of these animals on earth ranges from doubtful to precarious.

In Africa, the great wild game herds are an increasingly rare phenomenon as wardens and conservationists wage battle with poachers whose thoughtless slaughter endangers even the mighty elephant.

In New Jersey, sportsmen are protesting a proposal for a special deer season which, they say, will further deplete an already decimated herd. Atlantic County sportsmen especially are outspoken against the plan. North Jersey farmers advocate the idea to keep the deer population under control.

Elsewhere in America, the advance of progress threatens birds particularly. Thirteen species are on the point of extinction, according to Dr. John W. Aldrich of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Only six Florida Everglades kites, for instance, are left. Even the national symbol, the bald eagle, is in serious trouble. When one recalls that the last passenger pigeon, which died in a museum in 1914, represented a species which once flocked in billions and broke down large trees by sheer weight of numbers, it is apparent that something like a miracle will be needed to preserve birds like the whooping crane which are counted in tens.

It is not all man's fault. Natural predators threaten many of these birds. But it is man, with his indiscriminate slaughter and, more recently, his use of pesticides, who has brought them to this point.

Who misses the passenger pigeon? Nobody perhaps. They were mostly a nuisance and man had no practical use for them.

Or did he? Some say there is a larger meaning to the word "practical"—something that has to do with ideas of beauty, reverence for life, a feeling of kinship with all living things.

Paper Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD the editorial "Paper Curtain," which appeared in the July 17 issue of the Arizona Republic:

PAPER CURTAIN

Despite the number of newspapers, magazines, and books in the United States, the Federal Government is today the major source of information in almost all fields of endeavor. Yet increasingly the Government has been working to stem the availability of news and information by placing copyright restrictions on the contents of its publications and documents.

Alarmed by this growing paper curtain over news, a number of leading editors and scholars, both liberal and conservative, joined together to protest governmental copyrighting. Such restrictions, they said in a recent ad, now apply to literally hundreds of official works despite the fact that section 8 of the copyright law expressly stipulates, "No copyright shall subsist in any publication of the U.S. Government, or any reprint, in whole or in part thereof." What's more, Government curtailment of freedom of press via copyright is contrary to the guarantees of the Constitution's first amendment—an amendment rendered meaningless, the signatories claim, "when Government officials employ or authorize copyright procedures as a means of placing restrictions on information amassed to promote 'the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.' "

The group pointed out that anyone who has the legal right to copyright, has a legal right to restrict and censor. In attempting recently to justify copyright restrictions on military histories, one general said they were copyrighted "to prevent quoting of material out of context" and another army officer explained that copyrighting has been employed in order to prevent "sensationalizing." What these excuses add up to is an attempt to justify hamstringing the press in the performance of its principal duty, uncovering and reporting the news.

It's understandable that persons who agree on little else would join in their opposition to governmental secrecy, since this threat to freedom of information crosses political and ideological lines. What is at stake is whether the Government shall tell its people what it thinks they should know, or whether the people shall have access to all the news and thus be able to make up their own minds. In a free society, only the second alternative is acceptable.

Address by David J. McDonald at Eagles' Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on August 3, 1962, Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, addressed the Grand Aerie Convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles at Pittsburgh, Pa. As a longtime member of the Eagles, I was extremely pleased to hear of the great success of this important convention. And I am happy to have the opportunity to submit for the RECORD the text of Mr. McDonald's remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY DAVID J. MCDONALD, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, AT THE GRAND AERIE CONVENTION, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, PITTSBURGH, PA., AUGUST 3, 1962

Brothers, I am honored indeed to stand here today and receive this award from the Grand Aerie of Eagles.

I use the term "brothers" with proud privilege and for many reasons beyond the fact that I carry and cherish a lifetime membership in the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

We, in the United Steelworkers of America, have been kindred spirits with the Eagles in our aims and objectives from our inception for we both have been enlisted in the great brotherhood of man.

The term of greeting which I used here today is identical for our major purpose, the good of our land and the people in it, most frequently is identical. And in fact, this close identity is carried on into the membership of both organizations.

As I look out over this convention floor, I know that there are many here who carry membership cards in the same lodge and the same union and with equal pride in the joint affiliation.

So I say, and I am proud to say, that I can salute you as brothers.

I am equally proud to claim the ties of brotherhood with the Eagles because of the good and dedicated purposes they have served, for the help they have extended through moral and financial support in obtaining many of the great social reforms which make our Nation more blessed today.

We, in the United Steelworkers know, as all organized labor does, that the Eagles were stanch and forceful allies in the first drive which led to the social security system which now is the law of the land.

The Eagles have been honest and outspoken advocates of all the great movements toward social and economic progress and have been equally stanch in their opposition to inimical and ill-conceived legislation such as the so-called right-to-work laws.

Like the United Steelworkers of America, they have been outspoken foes of communism and of all other strange and fanatic creeds which rise to menace the precious freedoms they, like our union, hold dearer than life itself.

In many instances the Eagles have stood up to be counted when it was unpopular to do so and in a lodge sense served as the Steelworkers have in a union sense as shock troops for the common good.

The Eagles have been, and I am confident will continue to demonstrate, the heart, the courage, and the will of the common people, for its membership largely is composed of the common people of our land—the muscles and sinews of our Nation.

And it is this common denominator which makes our ties of brotherhood the strongest.

The people in the Eagles, like the people in organized labor, largely are members of the Nation's work force so it is perfectly natural that we should face and be troubled by the same problems.

By this mutuality of interest, we have come a long way together. But there still is a long way to go, and we will need the Eagles' assistance to travel ahead on the road to peace and prosperity we seek jointly.

I doubt if it is necessary to remind Eagles that underemployment and unemployment plagues our work force, since the vast majority of the lodge membership are part of that work force.

I am heartened by the most recent reports from the National Government on employment. But I declare most emphatically that the real "magic number" in such statistics is "zero" on joblessness in our land and an absolute "plus" on job opportunity for all.

We in the United Steelworkers will not settle for less.

Job and income security are the primary objectives of our union and we took a big step in that direction in the most recent contracts we negotiated in such basic industries as steel and aluminum.

We believe a shorter workweek with no loss in income is a necessary step to accomplish our purpose and we feel that the national administration ultimately will recognize the validity of this belief.

We do not seek shorter hours merely to allow man more time to be idle. We believe that shorter hours are required to absorb the impact of automation and to provide the opportunity for the millions of young people who will be added to the work force year-by-year.

There are other means to obtain the maximum employment and security in retirement years which the people of our Nation must have if we are to remain strong at home and in the world.

Some we have initiated into our contracts. Others have come into being as the law of the land, as if in answer to the prayers and pleas we have voiced for years.

And I might add that many of these advances which are accepted as a matter of course met scorn and forceful opposition when they were first proposed.

This is true also in the case of the shorter workweek. Recognition is dawning, however slowly and however grudgingly, in the most unlikely places, that such a change in the work schedules is necessary.

This new support is not unselfish. The fact has hit home, as we knew it ultimately would, that nobody profits if the work force does not have the income to purchase the goods our great industrial machine turns out.

I am sure that the Eagles are troubled, as we are, because any and all efforts to aid the aged to meet the mounting costs of care in time of illness have thus far met defeat.

There can be only one remedial move taken to cure the paralysis caused by the virus of indifference and powerful opposition to such necessary and enlightened legislation.

I did not intend to use this meeting as a political sounding board, but I am certain that the Eagles are fully aware, as are the members of organized labor, that we must in November elect to Congress the type of representation which will support and vote into law the legislation necessary to meet this crying need.

I could go on for many hours in a discussion of our joint aims and objectives, both those we have obtained and those we must bring into being.

But I do not want to intrude into your time too long.

It is sufficient to say that I grow tired, as I am sure the Eagles must, of those who are forever obstructionist and never constructionist.

I hold the view, and I believe the Eagles do also, that this is no time to say it can't be done. The time has come to say it will be done—it must be done.

There has never been a doubt in my mind how Eagles will respond to the needs of man. The record is brilliantly clear in that respect.

I am confident that again, as it was in the past, the Eagles will stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the United Steelworkers of America in support of the drive to eradicate the critical problems our Nation faces.

In fact, I predict now, with no knowledge that the resolutions of this convention on the common problems we face jointly will be in essence the same as the action our union will take at our 11th constitutional convention a month hence.

I am warmed and heartened by this knowledge of our common bond as I accept this award today with a deep sense of gratitude and pride.

I accept it, not for myself nor for the acomplishments you deem worthy of note but in behalf of the entire membership of the United Steelworkers of America.

The award was created in the memory of the late William Green and the late Philip Murray.

When I was privileged to suceed Mr. Murray as president of the United Steelworkers, I undertook the task as a great trust.

I accept this award as symbolic of that trust and I shall ever cherish it as such. Thank you, brothers, and God bless you.

Garden State Parkway Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, an interesting experiment that is designed to solve some of the daily commuter highway problem has been tried by the Garden State Parkway. They have constructed a pilot parking site to encourage car pool arrangements and lighten vehicle traffic on the road itself.

I commend the parkway for their far-sighted actions and hope that their experiment proves successful. Only when our transportation managers try a forward looking idea, such as this, can we hope to begin solving our commuter problems.

The Newark Evening News of July 20 has reported on the parkway's experiment and I, therefore, ask for unanimous consent to have this news article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST LOT FOR COMMUTERS OPENED

WOODBRIDGE.—The Garden State Parkway's first commuter parking lot opened yesterday next to Red Bank Interchange 109, and a dozen drivers took advantage of the toll road's free trial offer.

The paved area, with a capacity of 33 vehicles, was planned as a pilot site to encourage car pool arrangements and lighten the toll road's daily commuter traffic. Parkway officials believe this will make the road more attractive to other riders.

Parking will be free for the rest of this month. Beginning August 1, the rate will be $5 per month for a parking space. The tickets may be used for different vehicles, an official pointed out, so that car pool drivers can share the tickets.

An attendant from the nearby toll booths will check the cars during the day for tickets. "No parking" signs have been posted in nearby areas where motorists have left their cars all day.

MAY BUILD MORE

Should the idea prove successful the lot can be doubled in capacity, and similar sites may be constructed at other points along the parkway.

Congress: It's Not So Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial entitled "Congress: It's Not So Bad," which was published in the Phoenix Gazette of August 9. So seldom does the Congress receive praise, that I thought these words, especially when given after careful analysis, would be a welcome sight.

CONGRESS: IT'S NOT SO BAD

Politicians and pundits are setting out to make a whipping boy out of Congress.

President Kennedy leads the chorus with threats (as after his medicare drubbing) to call upon the people to turn the rascals out. In his case, of course, the rascals are identified as the handful of Republicans who, you are supposed to decide, won't let Mr. Kennedy save America.

The President has Republican company. Some of the country's top GOP leaders are busily trumpeting the doctrine that because Congress has a two-thirds Democratic edge, its record of inaction is a Democratic fault.

Altogether too many people of all political complexions, including not only politicians but columnists and commentators, are blandly assuming without really thinking about it that this 87th Congress does have a bad record. The idea grows from the refusal of Congress to act upon many of the proposals which have been placed before it. This is often erroneously referred to as inaction. It isn't. The same amount of activity goes into disapproving a proposed measure as would go to approving it.

Stated in the positive way instead of in the usual negative terms, the record of the 87th Congress is a good one. For example:

Congress turned back the first large-scale, serious attempt to introduce socialized medicine into the United States. It saved American farmers from becoming virtual serfs to the Federal bureaucracy under a nightmare farm bill. It prevented Central Government empire builders from edging into the management of local communities. The list could be carried on and on.

Of all those who have joined the chorus against the 87th Congress, Mr. Kennedy is the only one with a good reason to complain. Seldom before in history has any President been so rebuffed by the legislators—not of the opposition party, but of both parties. The opposition to Mr. Kennedy's program has not been partisan, but bipartisan.

We believe it has been in the best interests of the American people. We believe the record of this Congress, balancing the good against the bad, has been a very good record. We think most Americans have had their wishes reflected in Congress when it comes to proposals Congress has rejected.

Let's not smear Congress with a do-nothing label when we know very well nothing was the proper thing for Congress to do in the circumstances.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

One Hundred Thousand Handicapped Persons Returned to Productive Employment During Fiscal Year Just Ended—West Virginia Leads Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, news comes from the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, 100,000 disabled Americans were restored to useful employment.

This heartening information, announced by President Kennedy and reported by Rehabilitation Director Mary E. Switzer, is the direct result of imaginative planning, dedication, initiative, education, and just plain hard work by men and women throughout the Nation who are interested and cooperative in a solution to the problems faced by the handicapped.

A major force in this significant achievement has been the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, ably headed by Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, and empowered by act of Congress to coordinate and promote programs of employment for physically and mentally handicapped citizens. As a member of this committee, it has been heartwarming to work closely with General Maas and his effective staff, and to note that progress in this area is real and encouraging. We must attain in the near future the national goal—that of providing rehabilitation for 200,000 persons annually.

Particularly gratifying, Mr. President, was a letter which I recently received from Rehabilitation Director Switzer in which she paid high tribute to the outstanding work being done by the State of West Virginia in rehabilitation and hiring of the handicapped. Miss Switzer pointed out that West Virginia ranked first in the Nation for number of persons rehabilitated per 100,000 population. The Mountain State average of 201 handicapped persons returned to productivity for each 100,000 inhabitants stood one-third higher than the next highest State. Certainly, West Virginians may well take satisfaction in this graphic evidence of their concern for, and active assistance of, handicapped segments of our population.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed certain letters and pamphlets concerning the achievements and goals of the Office of Rehabilitation, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1962.

Maj. Gen. MELVIN J. MAAS,
Chairman, President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MEL: Today we are having a special kind of celebration—a day to mark the first time that the State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation has restored more than 100,000 disabled people in a single year. This record, achieved by the State agencies in the year just ended June 30 is something I want to share with you, for you and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped have helped in a very real and direct way to make this possible.

While this is an achievement of which we are proud, it also marks the halfway point in the goal for our program of rehabilitating 200,000 handicapped persons each year, which would mean that this program and the many fine voluntary organizations, working together, would finally have the resources to restore all the disabled who need help to become active and employed again.

As we set about this new task, I want to thank you and every Governor's committee and the local committees for the splendid job they have done to advance the employment of handicapped people. We have benefited from your work in developing the program to this point, and we will need—and be grateful for—your continued support and cooperation as we undertake the last half of this important goal.

My personal good wishes to you and to Mr. McCahill and the other devoted members of your staff.

Sincerely yours,
MARY E. SWITZER,
Director.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1962.

MEMORANDUM

To: Members and alternates, State chairmen and secretaries.
From: Melvin J. Maas.
Subject: Office of Vocational Rehabilitation Records.

It is a pleasure to share with our coworkers the good news received this week from OVR Director Mary E. Switzer that 100,000 men and women were rehabilitated into successful employment in the fiscal year passed.

Miss Switzer's letter and VLP pamphlet attached belong to all of you, for without you the Committee can do nothing. I have pledged Miss Switzer our continued best efforts to help reach the annual goal of 200,000 rehabilitations, and I know you join me in that pledge.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1962.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JENNINGS: Today the President is announcing an important achievement in the State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation—the rehabilitation of more than 100,000 disabled people in a single year. This means that the public program has passed the halfway mark toward its goal of restoring to activity and usefulness 200,000 disabled men and women each year.

This record is one which I hope will give you satisfaction, for you are one of the people who has worked hard over many years to make it possible. The Randolph-Sheppard Act is a monument to you, yet it tells only part of the story of what you have done to advance the cause of rehabilitation and employment for all handicapped people. I am deeply grateful.

I know you will be pleased to know that West Virginia has ranked with the best in 1962. The West Virginia Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, which rehabilitated 3,710 in 1962, ranked first among all the States in the number rehabilitated per 100,000. With 201 rehabilitated per 100,000, West Virginia stood a third higher than the nearest other State.

For all the fine things you have done to help advance the rehabilitation program, and for your many kindnesses in other ways, my deep appreciation and my best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
MARY E. SWITZER,
Director.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND VIP'S

In the year just ended 100,000 disabled Americans were restored to activity, employment, and dignity through the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program.

We think they are very important people, every one of them. We also think it was an important year for the taxpayer who made it possible—and important for him to know what he got for his money from the vocational rehabilitation program.

Transforming 100,000 disabled people—many of them disabled for years, thousands of them dependent on public welfare—into active people leading useful lives, makes 1962 an important year for our whole country.

Maybe you were one of the thousands who helped. Modern-day rehabilitation through the public program doesn't get done by one person, or by one agency, for that matter. Thousands of people are involved—rehabilitation counselors, physicians, psychologists, social workers, prosthetics experts, and other professional people; plus rehabilitation centers, workshops, hospitals, schools, and other special facilities; plus administrators of public and voluntary agencies who know how to work together; plus Congressmen, Senators, State legislators—yes, and Presidents and Governors—who believe that rehabilitating the disabled is a good investment in people. Plus another VIP—the American employer—the man who made the final rehabilitation decision—the man who said "Yes, I will hire this worker if he can do the job."

In the past year, the American employer said that 100,000 times. He worked with the State rehabilitation agency, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and its State and local affiliates. Management and labor agreed on jobs and people and wages.

The result? Good employees—just as good as the others. It was good business and it was good government.

In this country, we started out with the idea that every person counts. Rehabilitation is a way of demonstrating that it's more than an idea.

Neglected disability can destroy a home, cast children adrift, halt income, exhaust savings, and produce public costs so large and so prolonged as to be almost immeasurable.

Neglected disability costs every taxpayer—in public welfare payments, in lost taxes, in wasted manpower.

Vocational rehabilitation is one answer to a public problem. For example, it cost about $102 million in State and Federal funds to rehabilitate 100,000 disabled people last year. These are some of the returns on this investment:

They are now earning at the rate of about $200 million a year.

They will pay around $17 million in Federal taxes in their first year at work, plus State and local taxes.

Some 16,000 of them had been receiving public assistance payments at the rate of $18 million a year (more than it cost to rehabilitate them).

Yes, this makes economic sense. But the question today is, How long will it take to meet the national goal? The vocational rehabilitation program should be restoring 200,000 persons a year, just to keep up with new cases arising each year. How long will that take?

It can be done soon—if local community leaders, State government, the Federal Government, and voluntary organizations give their full and consistent support in a cooperative effort to rehabilitate every disabled American who needs special help to become active and useful again.

P.S.—In this effort—who is the VIP?—You.

Big Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial, entitled "Big Debt," appearing in August 22, 1962, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times, be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BIG DEBT

The U.S. Treasury announced Monday that the total national debt had reached $300 billion for the first time in history.

There are some who argue that the amount of the Federal debt is not related to the cost of living, or inflation. It is worth noting, however, that the cost of living as well as the national debt is the highest in history. Living costs keep going up at the rate of 1 to 1½ percent a year.

Perhaps it is only coincidence that the cost of living has gone up as the national debt has risen. And it may be only coincidence that if the debt keeps going up, as seems likely, the cost of living will, too. But we don't buy the coincidence argument nor the one that a little inflation each year hurts no one. Financing of the Government debt by the creation of checkbook money which cheapens the dollar over the long run hurts everyone, especially retired people living on fixed incomes. Checking inflation would do them a lot more good than medicare schemes.

Since World War II, the national debt was at its lowest point of $251.6 billion in April, 1949. Since then it has risen 19 percent and the cost of living 26.6 percent.

In his recent speech on taxes, President Kennedy said he would propose tax cuts across the board next January to spur the economy. There seems to be no question in anyone's mind in Washington but that there would be no corresponding cut in Government expenditures to match the reduction in revenue tax cuts would cause. It is assumed that the Federal debt would go higher. This means higher interest charges, already marked down for nearly $9.3 billion for fiscal 1963, or 10 percent of the total budget, and more pressure for even more red ink in the budget.

There seems to be no evidence of concern for prudence in Washington. A symptom of the times is the fact that in the first fiscal year of the Kennedy administration the number of civilian Government employes rose by 77,351 to the highest total since 1953. Moreover, two congressional committees have recommended Federal employees' wages be raised in two stages by from 6.6 to 33 percent, and Congressmen themselves are talking of raising their own pay 33 percent. No inflation?

The Satellite Communications Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three letters on the satellite communications bill, which were published on August 22 in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Charles Percy's (Aug. 16) comparison of the so-called efficiency of A.T. & T. and the Post Office very conveniently overlooks the fact that the telephone companies operate, however inefficient their operations may be, at a guaranteed profit, while the Post Office operates, thanks to the Congress, at a guaranteed loss.

It might be well to point out that the major portion of this loss is due to inadequate charges for junk mail, mail which no one wants to receive but which private business insists on sending. It is therefore the subsidization of private business which causes the postal deficit. It is unfortunately true that the management of private enterprise cannot operate successfully without Government subsidies or assistance in some form, or, like A.T. & T. and its subsidiaries, without a Government guarantee.

Returning to the telephone system, the customer now does most of its work. He is not only expected to dial his local calls but his long-distance calls as well, relieving the company of this burden. We are now given seven numbers to remember rather than an exchange.

This additional inconvenience bothers the telephone company not at all, for, like the railroads, it seems to believe that the path to profits lies in giving less and less service at greater cost.

JOHN F. FUNKE,
Washington.

Does the Washington Post really believe that cloture ever will be evoked against the "Southern contingent," in the Senate, in any future debate on matters concerning civil rights? Can you really be that naive? Or is it that you don't consider civil rights "an important issue"?

One of the aspects of the sad story about the H.R. 11040 debate in the Senate is that the Washington Post has not seen fit to give any pertinent reasons for its support of this gigantic giveaway. You did not answer the specific and well-stated objections to it raised in letters to you from Senator KEFAUVER and Joseph Rauh. Also, you have failed to report and comment upon the substance of the objections raised by the very able, well-informed, and articulate opponents of this bill, both on the floor of the Senate and in its committees.

Apparently you prefer to report and editorialize about the "filibuster" aspect of the debate, and the embarrassment that might be caused to the President by it. In short, instead of telling us that the Senate has been "merely floundering in oratory," why doesn't the Washington Post tell us why it is for the bill, and why you believe that some extremely able Senators are "floundering"? These "floundering" Senators include Senators KEFAUVER, MORSE, LONG, NEUBERGER, among others, and the real "economist" of the Senate, Senator DOUGLAS. The so-called "filibuster" of the past weeks has not been the empty flow of rhetoric that you would have us believe.

FREDERIC A. HEUTTE,
Washington.

The Russian Government proudly acclaims the achievements of the cosmonauts to the world, and to the Russian people whose efforts and taxes made it possible; in future years who will get credit for (and the profits of) the Telstar system, the American people who paid for nearly all of it, or A.T. & T.?

The Congress and the press have almost unanimously supported the administration's bill to put Telstar under the control of a corporation controlled by A.T. & T., and this near unanimity is in itself disturbing. A few Senators, with the courage of their convictions, and former President Truman call the bill a giveaway and the Senators filibustered against it. They may well have been right, and if they had succeeded in killing this bill for this session of Congress the Nation would have been in their debt.

Telstar is a great scientific achievement. Americans also consider it a great propaganda victory. But most of the world fears monopoly capitalism, and surely the control of Telstar by a capitalist monopoly will detract from its propaganda value. And what a field day the Russian propagandists will have with Telstar under such control. To paraphrase, it ain't necessarily so that "What's good for A.T. & T. is good for the country."

J. SAM MEWHINNEY, Jr.,
Arlington.

Food Stamps and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I called the scandalous administration of the pilot food stamp program to the attention of the House. The facts were so obvious they could not be denied. Of 26 congressional districts selected by Secretary Freeman and President Kennedy for this additional Federal subsidy, 25 are represented by members of the Democrat Party, including many members in key leadership positions.

Democratic districts which do not fall in the category of depressed areas—one of the alleged guidelines of the program—were selected for participation while areas of substantial and persistent unemployment represented by Republicans were ignored.

In the State of Pennsylvania alone, eight depressed areas represented by Republicans, including the most depressed area in the entire continental United States—Johnstown, 12 percent unemployment—were disregarded while two other districts in Pennsylvania represented by Democrats were selected.

The pleas for the Democratic leadership to undertake an immediate investigation—however embarrassing it might prove to this administration—have been ignored. The chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture in fact answered one such request with language and curtness hardly expected of one in a position of such responsibility. Perhaps it is no coincidence that his district is among those included for food stamp participation. Apparently it is the intent of the leadership to wave the flag over its alleged charges of misconduct in our stockpiling program, but to bury as long as possible any investigation of matters as reprehensive and irrefutable as the handling of the food stamp program.

Mr. Speaker, one newsman with courage to make an impartial investigation for himself has placed the cards on the table for all to see. His findings make it clear why the administration has refused to answer the charges except with pious statements that they "hope this program will not become a partisan political issue."

I suspect the writer will find himself among those on the "persona non grata" list kept by the White House. He probably will no longer be given the time of day at a White House news conference, let alone any answers to the penetrating questions he has raised. I suspect the New York Daily News will soon join the New York Herald Tribune in the growing list of newspaper with canceled subscriptions to the White House. They have dared to print the truth.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks I call the attention of my colleagues to the following story dated August 22, 1962 by Mr. Frank Holeman, syndicated columnist for the New York Daily News:

Food Stamps and Politics

(By Frank Holeman)

Washington, August 21.—President Kennedy is going to have trouble getting the $900 million public works bill through the House of Representatives. The reason: A lot of Congressmen are afraid he would play politics with the dough.

Whatever gave them such a wild notion as that? After all, the President has said time and time again he would use the money only where it was urgently needed, and where many people are out of work. Who in the world would play politics with human misery?

Well, Representative Durward Hall, Republican, of Missouri, thinks he has caught the administration doing it in the food stamp program, which cost $25 million last year and has been budgeted for $50 million this year.

"The food stamp pilot program being administered by the Department of Agriculture has become a brazen political slush fund," Hall charged on the floor of the House. He urged that action on the much larger standby public works bill be held up, pending a full-scale investigation of the food stamp scheme.

Representative Paul Findley, Republican, of Illinois, a member of the House Agriculture Committee, wrote Chairman Harold Cooley, Democrat, of North Carolina, asking for such a probe. Cooley has just rejected the request with this one majestic sentence:

"Dear Mr. Finley: Your letter of August 10 requesting that the House Committee on Agriculture conduct an investigation of the food stamp program is utterly ridiculous.

"Sincerely yours,

"Harold."

Sylvester R. Smith, administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, which really runs the program, expressed the pious hope that "it will not be threatened by efforts to make it a partisan politcial issue."

Representative Leonor Sullivan, Democrat, of Missouri, has thanked her fellow Missourian, Hall, for having "made a partisan political issue" out of the program because we Democrats could not pick a more clear-cut issue of how the two parties differ in meeting the needs of the American people."

THERE'S A FAINT AROMA ABOUT THE STAMPS

What are the facts? After an impartial investigation, I'm forced to one of two conclusions: (1) Nearly all the needy, unemployed people in the United States live in congressional districts represented by Democrats; or (2) there is some real hanky-panky going on, which should be exposed immediately for the good of the country. Here's why:

The food stamp program was set up in April 1961, on a pilot basis in eight areas of chronic unemployment, selected by Agriculture Secretary Freeman. It so happened that all eight areas were represented by Democrats.

Early this month, the Agriculture Department announced that the pilot program had worked so well it was going to be extended, in 3 stages—October 1, November 1, and December 1—to 18 more congressional districts. All but one of these were Democratic districts. The lone lucky Republican was Representative Alvin O'Konski, of Wisconsin, who got the Duluth-Superior area OK'd while Freeman was fighting his losing battle for the original administration farm bill.

Somehow the Agriculture Department planners overlooked the area that has the highest rate of unemployment in the country, according to the Labor Department—Johnstown, Pa., with more than 12 percent idle.

REPUBLICAN PLEAS FALL ON DEAF EARS

The Johnstown area is represented in Congress by a Republican, John P. Saylor. His pleas to be included in the food stamp program were ignored, as were those of other GOP Members in badly depressed areas.

But the expansion planners did include St. Louis, represented by Mrs. Sullivan, although that city is no longer even on the official list of areas with substantial unemployment.

They also thoughtfully added Nash County, N.C., in Cooley's district, and Choctaw County, Okla., represented by Majority Leader Carl Albert.

The score now is 25 to 1 in favor of the Democrats.

It is quite a feat in any Congressman's cap to have the food stamp program in his district. It means that the folks on relief there are getting more and better food than people on relief elsewhere.

Under the plan, families approved by State and local welfare agencies get food stamps instead of handouts from Government surplus food stocks. They take the stamps to the grocery store and buy a greater variety of food. The grocer redeems the stamps at his bank, which eventually collects from the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Agriculture Department.

FREEMAN IS THE FOOD STAMP SANTA CLAUS

Freeman has complete freedom in picking a test area, under a law left over from the New Deal days. The only criteria are it must be an area of substantial unemployment or eligible for area redevelopment aid, and local officials must be willing to cooperate.

Oddly, those are the same broad criteria for projects to be approved under the pending public works bills. The administration asked for $600 million immediately, plus $2 billion standby. The Senate voted $750 million now and $750 million standby. The House bill, just cleared by the Public Works and Rules Committees, calls for $900 million now with no standby.

This week, House Democratic leaders are quietly polling the Members to see whether they have the votes to pass their bill.

Is it any wonder the Republicans and antiadministration Democrats are closing ranks again to the dismay of Kennedy's lieutenants?

It reminds me of the fishermen who was amazed at the struggling of a fish he caught. "What you squirming for, little fish?" he asked, "I ain't going to do nothing but gut you."

Our Embassies Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Our Embassies Abroad," written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and published in the Editor's Report of the Hearst newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Embassies Abroad

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

San Simeon, Calif.—In Paris just a few weeks ago, July 5 to be exact, in his Embassy, overlooking historic Place de la Concorde, I sat and chewed the fat with my friend slim Jim Gavin, our American Ambassador to France. We've been friends since the war and I have the greatest admiration for him as a lean, tough paratroop soldier as well as a personable and shrewd representative of our country.

So you can imagine that I was surprised and disturbed to learn that General Gavin was resigning from his job at this most important diplomatic post—apparently because he couldn't afford to stay there.

Jim Gavin follows a distinguished line of American soldier-diplomats who've proved the military can serve their country superbly in sensitive oversea posts. In fact, it's a tradition studded with names like MacArthur, Eisenhower, Gruenther, Clay, Norstad, and Ridgway.

Now I, for one, fail to see any connection between a heavy or lightweight bank account and diplomatic skill. And it beats me why anyone else should. In other words, a situation where our representation abroad is in any way related to the ring of a cash register is simply untenable.

Irrespective of what kind of a job an American Ambassador has been doing, such unstatesmanlike procedure is intolerable and an open invitation for qualified State Department personnel to quit in disgust.

During the high pressure, give and take of the 1960 presidential campaign, John F. Kennedy declared this was a situation that required attention. And, in fact, after becoming President-elect, he met with Representative John J. Rooney, a Brooklyn Democrat, to try to give it just that.

Representative Rooney's involvement in the matter is due to the fact that he holds some pretty important purse strings in Congress. He's chairman of a committee that calls the shots on budget requests for the State Department.

After his meeting with the President-elect, Mr. Rooney promised a more "sympathetic" attitude toward these requests would be taken in the future. Now, with the resignation of Jim Gavin, I think it's clear the attitude hasn't been sympathetic enough.

In addition, it's possible President Kennedy hasn't been able to get around to the problem in a manner indicated during the campaign. He has a lot on his mind. But the return of Ambassador Gavin should bring the situation to front and center again.

One diplomatic moneysaving device I have long thought overdue was the more restrained nature of the Fourth of July parties at our Embassies in Europe this year. In the past these have been virtually wide-open freeloads—gatecrashed by crowds of assorted tourists, expatriates and professional Americans abroad. This year, in London as well as Paris, the invitation list was prudently restricted to those having at least something to do with diplomatic and international relations.

While this country is represented by some of the finest diplomats and Foreign Service officers in the world—and I've seen all kinds—I have developed some ideas which may let a few gusts of fresh air blow behind that musty old silken curtain of diplomacy.

Let me begin by pointing out an obvious fact—although it's not always appreciated—that our Embassies belong to the American people, all the people.

Yet in many of our major Embassies—where an American Ambassador rightly and properly wines and dines, and is wined and dined in return—we are too often represented by well-meaning, well-heeled folks, generally bored with living at home, whose financial contribution to the incumbent political-party far exceeds their possible contribution to international diplomacy.

That our Ambassadors in such cases should be restricted to eminent members of families bearing names like Kennedy, Harriman, Whitney and Aldrich—and fine, capable gentlemen and friends they all are—is clearly an anomaly in a democratic society.

Running our magnificent Embassy in the heart of Paris costs money, and plenty of it. As Ambassador, Jim Gavin was getting $27,500 a year and some $26,000 in expenses. It sounds like a great deal of cash—but holding down the Paris job costs an Ambassador that and more out of his own pocket.

Paris is a sparkling and historic capital, and much of the world of art, literature and music worships at her feet. She's a great crossroads of Europe, as well as the world, a city equal in stature to any other. It would be unthinkable if the American Ambassador there had to scrimp and save on expenses, bar the doors of his Embassy to all but the most official of functions and otherwise turn the representative building of our country into a drab, 9-to-5 office structure.

I am convinced, therefore, that the American people must lift bigger and more flexible tabs for such establishments—in the direct interests of our national pride and prestige. It is an obligation we should all be proud and willing to carry.

Our Embassies—without regard to the financial status of the Ambassador—must be adequately, and more than just adequately, equipped with Government-paid servants, chauffeurs and limousines, etc. That's the way the British, the French, the Russians and other major nations treat their diplomats—and we cannot play in their league without a uniform and proper equipment.

In fact, the proletarian Russian Embassy in Washington throws some of the biggest, unproletarian wing-dings in town.

A more flexible and understanding attitude on the part of those who hold the moneybags would enable the President to send overseas the man best qualified to fill the post—with no other criterion necessary. Thus, for example, if it were decided that AFL–CIO President George Meany should take over the plum London spot at the Court of St. James', then Mr. Meany could be on his way without any fingernail biting over whether he could pick up the tab for a diplomat banquet.

The way to accomplish this, it seems to me, would be to set up a special investigative commission to inquire into the overall—and that definitely includes entertainment and such—financial needs of our embassies. I don't think this should be a specifically congressional body. Rather it should be a kind citizens' commission, made up of members of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees, former ambassadors, and qualified laymen.

Then, after the recommendations of this commission are put into effect, Representative Rooney's Appropriation Subcommittee could still exercise its watchdog function to see nobody goes hog wild with Uncle Sam's money. It could be the kind of scrutiny maintained over expense accounts of business executives.

Contrary to general belief, most of these have to justify spending the company's cash. But they're allowed an intelligent leeway and discretion to spend it in a way that's good—that is, profitable—for the firm.

I am convinced that if such a completely bipartisan commission was formed and its recommendations adopted we would see a vastly improved system of selecting ambassadors. And it would be a shot in the arm for able and ambitious Foreign Service officers.

While on this vein, I'll digress somewhat and refer to another—and currently significant—aspect of choosing American ambassadors.

This concerns the sad situation in Peru, scene of a first-class diplomatic fumble on our part. As you know, a few weeks ago a military junta took over the government in Lima. It did it in more or less standard—and regrettable—Latin American fashion.

Then, instead of giving the junta the poker-faced, wait-and-see treatment it called for, the administration broke off relations with Peru and promised an economic squeeze. Today the army regime looks a lot more democratic than a few others south of the border and there are numerous red faces around the State Department.

I know Peru. It's a poor country with tremendous problems. The so-called "40 families" run its economy. On the other hand, about 7 million Indians live in miserable poverty. All of which means Peru's—and many other country's—politics can't be judged by the same standards we apply to politics here, whether to elect a President or a county sheriff. There was a situation where the army just couldn't stomach a certain political party, so it moved in and took over.

Our Ambassador in Lima, James Loeb, a veteran member of the ultraliberal Americans for Democratic Action, was apparently horrified. The next thing we heard was that the United States had broken diplomatic relations with Peru. This was not a statesmanlike act, but rather a political decision.

Mr. Loeb was a political appointee, as many ambassadors have been in the past. He was not appointed on the basis of diplomatic skill or experience. I leave it to you to figure out for yourself upon whose recommendation we acted in our break with Peru.

It is time to ring down the curtain on appointing ambassadors on the basis of their bank account or their politics.

America's Longest National Park?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article from the Dodge News magazine by Mr. Earl Palmer, mayor of Cambria, Va., on a subject of current interest to the Congress.

America's Longest National Park?

(By Earl Palmer)

One dew-sparkled morning last spring I shouldered my cameras and a well-filled grub and sleeping gear pack near Oldtown, Md., and let a path mule teams once walked lead me into a bygone era. I was walking the towpath of a famed waterway, the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, on the northern bank of the Potomac in western Maryland.

In its heyday, as many as 700 gaily-painted, bargelike boats boasting capacities of 100 to 125 tons, and pulled by 2,800 mules, were in service on the meandering 185 miles of the C. & O. Canal between Cumberland and Georgetown. In 1870, more than a million tons of coal, lumber, flour, whisky, and tobacco, rode downstream from Cumberland, in the Alleghenies, to oceangoing ships tugging at their anchor chains in tidewater Georgetown.

Today the once-proud queen of transportation is idle and derelict. The 100-foot-long locks of hand-hewn stone no longer answer to the commanding call "Hey-y-y-y-y lock." Absent from the scene are the lusty canalers and the white-eyed and shying mules they drove along the canal here around the clock, in rain or shine, 7 days per rough-and-tumble week. The gaudy red and green, blue and orange painted boats the plodding but trusty mules pulled have long since rotted away at their final moorings. Shingle-thatched pine and oak cabins of the lockkeepers, close by the monumental locks they faithfully tended night and day, are lonely and hollow eyed and minus the gleeful play of children in their yards, now overgrown with honeysuckle and firecherries. Giant cattails and water lilies flourish in the favorable moisture of the deserted, but once-busy canal * * * a spring-born wind from the nearby Potomac toys with a forest of spreading oaks and stately sycamores fringing the towpath.

Wandering leisurely here along the towpath, drinking in the salubrious and emerald-tinted Maryland sunshine, one captures the feel of a vanished era. The day is still a lamb and night far away * * * you are alone with your thoughts in a sylvan wilderness, a wildlife sanctuary, a place of retreat from an overregimented world.

A groundhog stands his ground dead ahead, nibbling contentedly at the lush pasturage fringing the towpath. Rabbits hop along ahead by the dozens. Every log in the canal's bed is a turtle's solarium. You surprise a muskrat in a sudden bend of the canal, but he swims unhurriedly away. A covey of blue jays do not mind your presence in the slightest—man and wildlife are friends here. Then you think: It was this way on a spring-filled day a century past * * * and you walk down the towpath looking for still other adventures. The tales of what life was like in the "good old days" on the C. & O. are many and equally varied. For most, the stories are secondhand, handed down from generations past, and thus are part fact and part fiction. However, though not legion, there are a surprising number of true old-timers living in the country bisected by the ageless canal who recall indelibly, "Back when I drove a mule team or captained a boat on the canal."

To separate the sheep from the goats and extract fact from legend, I drove to the old canal port and courthouse square town of Williamsport, Md., fast beside the Potomac and splashing Conocogheague Creek, arriving just as the last rays of a May-time sunset lit the well-seamed faces of a gatherin' of the tobacco-chawin' and tall-tale fraternity headed for a night session * * * on well-worn benches, that is.

"Anybody here ever work on the canal?" I inquired, as I walked into their circle.

"Th' feller you want to see," a cross-suspendered and bewhiskered native said, "is 'Hooper' Wolfe. Drove a mule team on th' canal until he met a gal and got married. Operates a store across th' square and is president of our Canal Club * * * knows more about that canal than anybody hereabouts," he further supplied.

Next morning I went to see venerable "Hooper" at his place of business on the square. I found him in an informative and nostalgic frame of mind. Mr. Wolfe, I was shortly to learn, remembered his days at the reins of a mule team, pulling a canal boat, about as well as he knows the names of his fisherfolk customers—or the names of nine Maltese cats he was feeding in his back yard as I approached him for an interview.

"You know," he recalled, "we mule drivers thought nothing of walking 25 to 30 miles them days, rain or shine, 7 days per week, night and day. We made 2 miles an hour downstream (loaded with 120 tons of coal) and 3 miles per hour upstream, traveling without cargo. We made the 185 miles down in approximately 90 hours, and it took about 60 hours to return to Cumberland, Md., for another cargo."

The walls of a well-stocked library in his spacious home presented a tableau of bygone days * * * pictures by the dozen speaking of placid waters, plodding mule teams, busy wharfs, lusty canalers and oxgaited boats in the heyday of the once-proud queen of commerce that basked in the ever-changing spotlight of the long ago.

"Look here," he said, as he opened a cabinet, producing a hand-whittled-to-scale model of a canal boat. "This is an exact replica of *Old No. 57*, the last boat my mules pulled up and down the canal." His eyes sparkled with nostalgia as he hitched the mules to the boat with a pair of "reins" he carried in his pocket. "No better team of mules ever poked their noses into a feed trough," he said, as he sadly gazed on the hitchedup team reminiscent of a happy-go-lucky, bygone era.

Life on the canal was anything but a bed of roses. Because of the small pay boat captains received for hauling a ton of cargo, rigid economy was practiced by all aboard the slow but sure boats. A rabbit or groundhog had little chance for survival when spotted by a member of the crew, for either one made a good cheap meal.

"Quite often," Wolfe tattled, "We would forage a few ears of roasting corn, or a stray watermelon from unsuspecting fields fencing in the canal. We were a roughfeathered band of buccaneers them days."

But whatever the drawbacks, life on the ageless C. & O. had its compensations. There were the neighborly fraternizing visits with crews of other boats—a sort of camaraderie so prevalent between birds of a like feather who shared a common lot. In port, there were the all-night square dances, free-flowing corn likker, hoop-skirted girls, perhaps a swim or fishing party. Despite intense rivalry between the boat captains who sought leadership in carrying the largest and fastest cargoes, and occasional brawls in the taverns of port towns, life on the whole was not too bad, and was punctuated by a high standard of morals.

"We had our best business in the 1870's," historian, Ex-Mule-Driver Wolfe related "Business started slipping in the 1880's as the coal operators in the Allegheníes began using the troublesome and better equipped B. & O. Railroad for their shipments of coal to tidewater.

"The twin floods of May and June in 1889 that ruined Johnstown, Pa., flooded the upper Potomac as well. Newspapers of the time had it that the canal had suffered a knockout blow. Doggedly, the canal's bondholders dredged up another $400,000, repaired the damage, and continued to operate for another 35 years. Then came the flood of 1924. No angel came along this time and the canal closed its locks for good."

Hooper looked far beyond the walls of the library where we sat, the ready flow of words slowed to a whisper: "And so the old canal ended its 96-year life. The mules retired to pastures beside the canal of their labor, the once-gay boats of red and green and blue were tied to their last moorings, and happy-go-lucky canalers left with the winds. Another chapter in American history had closed."

On January 18, 1961, however, the 4,800 acres of federally owned right-of-way from Seneca to Cumberland was established as the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument by Presidential proclamation. And several months later, the Senate favorably passed legislation which would establish the canal area as a national park.

Thus far, the House has failed to take any action on the legislation. Informed congressional sources feel that the reason for the delay may be that the Corps of Engineers has not completed the study of the Potomac Basin, and that there is no sense of urgency now that the canal has some protection as a monument. Meantime, Secretary of the Interior Udall reports that the monument, with only 4,800 acres in Federal ownership, is inadequate for development and use for park and recreation purposes.

Secretary Udall has, therefore, urged Congress to authorize at an early date the establishment of the national historical park and "to provide for its enlargement so that the benefits of its full park potential may be opened to the public."

The proposed plan for enlarging the area would extend the park from Cumberland to Washington, D.C. At 184 miles, this would make it the longest national park in America. An additional 10,200 acres would be added to the present Government-owned 4,800 acres.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Canal property now owned by the Federal Government stretches along the northern bank of the Potomac for 165 miles of the canal's meandering course.

To implement plans of the National Park Service, the additional 10,200 acres will be needed to maintain the natural setting of the old canal, to protect canal structures, preserve habitat for wildlife. Picnic and camping areas will be established, boat-launching docks and access roads built, parking information centers constructed, and many other things needed by a full-fledged national park.

Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, Charleston, W. Va., Honors Senator Joseph S. Clark for Contributions to Improved Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, our able colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK has long been known as a champion of civil rights, equal job opportunity, and better human relations. His efforts to promote an atmosphere of understanding and tolerance among citizens have earned him the deserved recognition and respect of civic groups and patriotic organizations throughout the United States.

For this reason it is fitting that he should have been chosen as the principal speaker at the annual dinner of the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, Charleston, W. Va., on April 12, 1961. Mayor John A. Shanklin of Charleston, and commission chairman L. Leo Kolbecker officiated at the banquet which was attended by West Virginia's Governor, William Wallace Barron, and 1,000 other public motivated citizens of the Charleston area.

It was my pleasure on that occasion to laud the efforts of Senator CLARK and to express tribute to his dedication to the principles of justice and individual equality which are so much a part of the heritage of the United States. Senator CLARK, unable to be present due to airplane difficulties, delivered an inspiring and meaningful message to those assembled by means of a telephone hookup from his residence in Washington, D.C.

It is gratifying to report, Mr. President, that because of his significant contributions to the welfare of all citizens, and his lifelong adherence to the ideals and practices of good human relations, Senator CLARK has been presented with a suitably inscribed plaque by the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations. In a letter to Mr. CLARK, and transmitting this award, Commission Chairman Kohlbecker noted the Senator's efforts in behalf of the city of Charleston, and informed him of additional progress which has been made there in the field of human relations. The plaque is inscribed:

> To JOSEPH S. CLARK in grateful appreciation of your outstanding contribution to the city of Charleston Mayor's Commission on Human Relations to eliminate discriminatory practices in the Charleston, W. Va., com-

munity based solely upon race, creed, or national origin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kohlbecker's letter to Senator CLARK be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF CHARLESTON,
MAYOR'S COMMISSION ON
HUMAN RELATIONS,
Charleston, W. Va., March 15, 1962.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has taken us some time to obtain the plaque commemorating your valuable contribution to our efforts here in Charleston on the occasion of our second annual dinner last year. While you were unable to attend in person, you still were able to deliver your stirring address through the facilities of the telephone company, and believe me, speaking for our citizens here in Charleston, we appreciate your grand contribution to our efforts.

We are sending you this plaque to commemorate this milestone in our progress here in Charleston. You will be glad to learn that all of our major hotels and restaurants now serve all peoples, regardless of race, color or creed. We are now working on the second phase of our objective, and that is the matter of equal employment opportunities for all peoples.

Thanks again, Senator, for your fine contribution to our efforts. Speaking for all of our citizens here in Charleston, we are greatly appreciative of your grand contribution to our work.

Kind regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

L. L. KOHLBECKER,
Chairman.

Congressman Johnson Pays Tribute to Col. Henry Stickney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was advised today by Miss Elsie McNamara, managing editor of the Daily Banner, Cambridge, Md., one of our outstanding daily newspapers, that Col. Henry Stickney, of Cambridge, had passed away and will be buried in Arlington Cemetery, Thursday, August 23, 1962.

Colonel Stickney survived the Bataan death march. He was captured by the Japanese May 7, 1942, and remained a prisoner until August 1945. He is survived by his loyal wife Elinor, who resides in the Parkview Apartments in Cambridge.

I am sure the Members of Congress and all Americans share in the grief of Mrs. Stickney. As long as we have courageous men like Colonel Stickney this Nation will always be known as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

We salute Colonel Stickney and pay our deepest respects to Mrs. Stickney. May our Lord give her strength in the knowledge that her husband served God and country nobly in our most trying hour.

Developing an Intelligent, Aggressive, and Serviceable Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, earlier this month Mr. Merle H. Tucker, president of Kiwanis International, made a fine speech at Osceola, Ark. In his speech he discussed the purposes of Kiwanis International and how these purposes relate to some of the many complex problems facing our Nation today. I commend his speech to my colleagues and to other readers of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPING AN INTELLIGENT, AGGRESSIVE, AND SERVICEABLE CITIZENSHIP

(By Merle H. Tucker)

In a day of power politics and international confusion; in a day when many, it seems, would subjugate the individual to the will of the state; in a day when there seems to be little agreement on major issues of all kinds—it is most refreshing to see a constantly growing evidence that men who proudly wear the K are not limited in their ability to dream of the best for today and the days that lie ahead.

Neither are they lacking in the will and the ability to make their dreams come true.

In the beginning, there was confusion in Kiwanis as to the most important purpose of cooperative effort. Fellowship and business favoritism, these two alone, simply could not make the infant idea endure. It is heartening, indeed, that the ideal of service—service to others—became the dominant concept to be followed.

By 1924 Kiwanis was able to state dramatically, in its six constitutional objects, the basis for its existence—the purposes toward whose accomplishment the organization would strive continually.

And what purposes those are. They fire men's imagination today just as they did in Denver so many years ago. "To give primacy to the human and spiritual, rather than the material things of life." And the rest of them—unselfish, challenging, satisfying, yet purposely difficult to achieve.

For 47 years this has been so—in agriculture and conservation—from the simplest of projects to the major impact of the rural-urban relationships program called farm city, in which Kiwanis coordinates the efforts of over 150 of the top businesses, industries, and organizations on the American scene.

In boys and girls work, from simple aid to a few needy to millions of youths in recreational facilities—to thousands of boys in nearly 2,500 Scout units—to guidance of youth in sports teams and in boys clubs throughout the land.

In support of churches in their spiritual aims, from a concept of giving of primacy to the human and spiritual over the material values of life to activities which have dramatized the efforts of individuals and clubs through a standing committee of equal stature to all of the others in which Kiwanians give their time and devote their efforts.

These efforts and thousands of more are excellent. They fill needs. But, such is not enough.

If mankind would live in a free society, each individual's concern for the economic, social, and political structure must be more clearly demonstrated than ever before.

Without doubt, no area of Kiwanis concern had received more lipservice and less constructive and concentrated effort than that involving public and business affairs.

We say we believe in free enterprise.

We say we believe in government of, by, and for the people.

We say we believe in individual responsibility.

And yet, day after day we find ourselves living to an ever increasing degree under government by default. Yet, government by default—not by law, not by edict, even, but default on the part of the very people who are governed.

Who's responsible when self-seeking machines take over city hall? Who's responsible when tickets are fixed, police are dishonest, and there's graft in high places and in low? Who's responsible for archaic State governments—like the one in Illinois which is trying to live on a revenue structure set up almost a hundred years ago?

The 10th amendment to the Constitution says, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Yet year after year the States transfer their own responsibilities to Washington. Whose fault is this? Socialists? Communists? subversives? They may have helped. But the real guilt is ours—yours and mine. We simply do not practice what we preach. We talk about good government—we do little about it ourselves. So fools—smart fools—rush in where angels dread to tread.

In a recent newspaper article describing a metropolitan survey, the following facts revealed an almost incredible condition: Only 4 persons in 10 could name any area-wide leader, yet they were the electorate. Only 33 percent took any part in community affairs defining that activity very modestly. But most shocking of all, only 2 percent considered interest and participation in community affairs something of which to be particularly proud.

By what sense of purpose are we really living?

Our age is one of deep and widespread ferment. A revolution in politics, in economics, in our attitudes toward our fellow men is very much apparent. Some leaders believe, and they are saying very forcefully, that our achievements and our strengths have outrun our goals—at least in some areas of our lives.

This is much more than just a paradox. There is great peril in such a situation. For any nation operating through its established groups, which cannot shape events because of its own sense of purpose, may well be engulfed in events shaped by others.

What is the essence of this social structure which we are dedicated to defend and enrich?

To me it is our belief in the individual as the supreme fact of life. His material and spiritual well-being is the greatest test of the way a society operates. Therefore, the attitudes and the concern of the individual take on added meaning. Our society cannot escape the fact that it reflects the strengths and weaknesses of its people as they participate in the day-to-day activities of their businesses or professions.

In our land, confusion has been inevitable. When we were children, our parents taught us the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount. Generosity, love, helpfulness, a desire for knowledge, and industriousness. These were the virtues that we learned about. Then we went forth from our homes—into the world of business.

We learned that it was dog-eat-dog—and not the Golden Rule. We learned that sentiment and softness had no place in the marketplaces of the world. We learned that we should get all we could—because business had a different code of ethics. And why did this discrepancy exist?

When the country was young, its men worked hard. They achieved success in business. They built our towns, our schools, our churches, the Government under which we live. To their stalwart characteristics some added other traits—shrewdness, selfishness, greed, conceit. These men—and they were few in number became the robber barons.

Some so antagonized the people with deceit and selfishness that the injured public set up a shout, "There ought to be a law." And there was. The Federal Trade Commission, the Clayton Act, the Sherman antitrust laws, and many others.

The message filtered through. Business leaders found that honesty, fair dealing, and high mindedness brought peace, personal satisfaction, and happiness. But, most of all these things were right. These were the things on which true national health could be based. People learned that honesty could not be legislated. The learning was long and hard. The process is not complete.

As in government, and the other facets of our lives, the final responsibility for what is right rests with the individual. He must set up his own standard of conduct. He must make himself an ethical man if his way of life is to carry on.

Our Kiwanis code of ethics calls upon him to do just that—encourages him to seize his own opportunity to make of himself a better, more important citizen in this democracy of ours.

That code calls upon us to promote higher social, business, and professional standards; to recognize God as the Supreme Ruler and to abide by His immutable laws; to seek individual perfection; high ethical practices to insist upon fairness in competition; to improve relations between employer and employee; to exemplify good citizenship; and to regard kindness and fairness more highly than goods and prices and profits.

Really, what we are asking for is a personal measurement of the quality of the individual.

Business depends upon it. The survival of our free enterprise system is completely wrapped up in it. The continuation of a totally free society rests upon the concept of the acceptance of individual responsibility.

Can we, and will we, develop an ever-increasingly intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship?

What we want, I believe we can have. But a study and an understanding of the total structure and the part everyone must play become fundamental. Only freemen can manage the complexity of our social structure. Only freemen can have the opportunity for the spiritual, moral, and the intellectual growth that our times require. Only freemen can develop that deep consensus of mind and spirit that gives strength and continuity to the society they create and which, in turn, serves their purposes.

So we must concentrate on making the business structure that has made us great survive. It must be more virile, more serviceable, more dramatic in its appeal to youth than it was even to our forefathers.

Can we make this possible by depreciating its qualities? By damatizing its weaknesses? By demonstrating the acceptance of no adequate ethical code in its operation?

Why must we cringe at the terms "free enterprise" and "profit"? Why is it wrong for a man to reap the benefits of his own hard work, provided he interferes with no one else? Why is the dim goal of security more attractive to many than the bright challenging goal of success? Why do we advertise—nay, seem to gloat—over our problems, when we above all peoples on the earth, are really trying to solve these problems by ourselves? Why have we allowed other goals, other ideals, other ways to sell themselves as more attractive than those things which have made us at once the most favored, the most human, the most spiritual nation that the world has ever known?

In our society, the role of the state and of all its institutions—political, economic, and social—is to serve the individual. The citizen must not be their servant. But the individual, in his turn, must recognize that he, himself, in cooperation with others, is the servant of the greater ideals and values of human worth.

And so it logically follows, our institutions—political, social, economic, and cultural—must be constantly examined to determine how well they are serving the individual's real needs, his pressing demands, and his supreme purposes.

Are there some guidelines, are there some standards by which to judge where we stand at any time?

Among many, here are a few ideas:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.

You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

You cannot help keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.

You cannot further brotherhood of men by enticing class hatred.

You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative.

You cannot really help men by having the government tax them to do what they can and should do for themselves.

Do yon know who said those things?

Not a robber baron, wearing an enormous white vest marked with dollar signs. Not an ultraconservative, not a Rockefeller or a Carnegie.

A man of the people said those things. One of the greatest men to come from our great land. His name, as you probably have guessed—Abraham Lincoln.

Is there no hope? Are we destined to destroy ourselves? Will subservience of the individual to the state be the answer?

Clear-thinking Kiwanians do not believe so. They never have—why should they give way to such thoughts now?

Someone has said: "The darkest night the world has ever known did not put out the stars." There is a tremendous philosophy packed into that single sentence. It is the essence of all the progress that mankind has ever made and it is a brave line. It speaks of the faith and the hope of those souls who stumble and fall and get up again and go on and lead the world forward.

No organization is a success because it is right in its basic concepts.

No depth of understanding is possible just because the need for it has been clearly pointed out.

Only as the individual raises his sights, increases his CQ, if you will, can be hope for a greater concentration of effort directed toward the best for all. An increasing acceptance of individual responsibility, combined with dedicated individual and cooperative action, make up the backbone of a continually expanding society.

I leave with you the thought of the late Charles Kettering: "Nothing ever built, arose to touch the skies, unless some man dreamed that it should, and some man willed that it must."

The Reds Orbit While We Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has called my attention to the following article by Ruth Montgomery, the well-known Washington correspondent.

We Americans have a strange unwillingness to face unpleasant facts. We are like children who turn their heads away so as not to see something they fear and believe that it will disappear. But, alas, it never does.

The strikes in our defense plants are something with which we should come to grips, and that right soon. We cannot afford to make a sacred cow of either capital or labor at this hour of peril.

It is quite true, as Miss Montgomery states, that—

> The world does not "owe" America its glorious place in the sun. We have to work to keep it.

Yes, indeed, and that glorious place in the sun is not going to be kept on a 35-hour week.

The greatest self-made man I ever knew once told me: "No man has ever been a success on an 8-hour day." How about 7 hours?

The article follows:

THE REDS ORBIT WHILE WE STRIKE

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Is it really so surprising that Russia far excels us in the space race? Do we honestly wonder that we may be losing the battle for men's minds?

In this late summer of 1962, the face that America is presenting to the world is something less than pretty.

While the Soviets have been electrifying all mankind with their marvelous new space triumph, Americans were wallowing in an orgy of maudlin sensationalism.

At the same time that Russians were making television history by actually watching their two brave cosmonauts orbiting a hundred miles above the earth, American televiewers were being treated to reruns of blood-and-thunder westerns, or pictures of their vacationing First Lady.

The single-minded devotion of the Russian people to national goals can be a lesson to all of us. Certainly we scorn some of their methods, but what is so admirable about some of ours?

For instance: Every Russian citizen, including young mothers, is feverishly at work to "catch up to and surpass" American technology. Coincidentally, the AFL–CIO which dominates U.S. labor, has launched an all-out drive to cut the American workweek from 40 to 35 hours.

So eager are the Russians to forge ahead that labor is in desperatley short supply.

By contrast, our own economy is so sluggish that more than 4 million are unemployed, and unions force outrageous featherbedding practices on a spineless people. A Federal court order requested by five brotherhoods prevents the Nation's railroads from inaugurating an efficiency drive that would gradually eliminate 65,000 jobs no longer needed because of technological advances.

An important segment of the airline industry has been on strike because modern jet planes obviate the necessity for so many flight engineers. Ghost orchestras are forced on the entertainment field. Similar examples of wasteful and expensive featherbedding are almost limitless.

While Russia forges ever farther ahead in the space race, workmen at our own missile sites repeatedly walk off the job in illegal, jurisdictional disputes that have cost us hundreds of thousands of lost man-hours and millions of dollars.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration recently moved its manned spacecraft center from Langley, Va., to Houston, even after Director Robert R. Gilruth warned that to do so could delay the manned space program by a year. It may be a coincidence, but Texas is the home State of Vice President Johnson, Chairman of the President's Space Committee, whereas Virginia's Senator Byrd did nothing to help elect the Kennedy-Johnson ticket.

What has happened to America? Are we determined to demonstrate that freemen cannot wisely meet the challenge of the atomic age? Must we deliberately fall behind because we are so saturated with our overabundance? Why don't we get to work?

Why should unions demand increased wages in this time of national peril, unless productivity is increased accordingly? Why do they stage prolonged strikes, which in the current profit squeeze results in mergers or bankruptcy, and inevitable job loss?

Is there any reason why industries, instead of merging with each other, do not merge their mutual interests with unions instead?

The world does not owe America its glorious place in the sun. We have to work to keep it, just as our forefathers worked to earn it for us. What a pity if we throw it all away.

The Trade Expansion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State of Columbia, S.C., has printed on its editorial page of August 21, 1962, an excellent editorial and also an eloquent statement by Congressman L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina's distinguished Representative from the First District, on the subject of the trade expansion bill. The editorial is entitled "Deadly Threat to State" and the statement by Congressman Rivers carries the following headline: "Rivers Sees Socialization in Trade Act—Threat to South Carolina Payrolls, Congressman Says."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these articles be printed in the Appendix to the Record because I feel they merit the attention of the Members of this body as we prepare to consider the trade expansion bill and the many amendments which are being offered to this legislation.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Aug. 21, 1962]

Deadly Threat to State

South Carolinians with the continuing progress of their State at heart should read the statement on this page today by Representative L. Mendel Rivers. And they should read also the text of the advertisement which appeared in Monday's issue of the State signed by two leading textile producers.

Both the statement of the Congressman and of the textile men are on the subject of the Trade Expansion Act, especially as it would, in their opinion, affect industry in the South and in South Carolina. Both deal with the possible fate of the jobs of thousands of Southern workers—and the stake the South has in these jobs being maintained.

II

Mr. Rivers envisions not only a "deadly threat to the State's biggest payrolls," but fears the trade expansion plan would lead to "a world government before Americans know what is happening." He warns of excessive international agreements. He pictures the possibility that we may become so enmeshed in treaties that "we literally could not defend ourselves without the help and cooperation of our allies."

In the advertisement signed by Roger Milliken and Charles A. Cannon, two of the largest textile manufacturers, is the reminder that the administration so far has not lived up to its promise to hold down texile imports.

"We were told," their statement says, "that the Geneva agreement would hold imports at the level of 1961, but actual imports for the year to date indicate that the volume of cotton textile imports for 1962 will be up 30 percent over 1961."

The Cannon-Milliken statement included eight proposed amendments to the Trade Expansion Act which would provide safeguards for American industry. They are amendments proposed by Senator Prescott Bush, Senator Strom Thurmond, and a bipartisan group of six other Senators.

III

Messrs. Milliken and Cannon support these amendments and ask that citizens telegraph or telephone Senator Harry F. Byrd, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee which is considering the bill. They also suggest that one's own Senators be urged to support the protective changes in the bill. (It has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now in the Senate committee.)

IV

Citizens consideration of the complexities of such a matter may not come easily, but none would fail to feel the impact of the serious blows which men in a position to know say might come to South Carolina's chief industry and its value to the State if the Trade Act is not changed.

The State has sought to keep an open mind on the problems embodied in international trade. It has sought to understand the merits of maintaining the friendship of nations selling goods in the United States. But none can overlook the warnings of Messrs. Rivers, Thurmond, Milliken, Cannon and others. The matter has been brought home to South Carolina and it is grave. The protective amendments now before the Senate committee are of the utmost importance to the welfare of the entire State of South Carolina.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Aug. 21, 1962]

Rivers Sees Socialization in Trade Act—Threat to South Carolina Payrolls, Congressman Says

(Note.—Congressman L. Mendel Rivers of the Second District, has issued a new and forceful statement in opposition to the Trade Expansion Act, now before the Senate. The text of his statement is published below.)

The Trade Expansion Act can be the fatal step in a calculated move to enmesh our Nation irretrievably in a world government before Americans know what is happening.

It has been rightly called the most important piece of legislation before the Congress this year.

Never in my 22 years in Congress have I seen a more dangerous piece of legislation designed to give the President almost unlimited authority over the life and death of our economic way of life.

I fought this measure on the House floor, voting to recommit it to Ways and Means Committee, and when this motion was defeated, I cast my vote solidly against it. The measure now awaits action in the Senate.

The drive to put the United States into an international Socialist system is being spearheaded on three broad fronts—political, military, and economic.

The political thrust plays on fear of nuclear warfare. The one-world propaganda expounds on the theory that war threatens to annihilate mankind, therefore the only way to prevent war is to subject all nations to an overriding international authority.

The one-worlders military technique is to entangle America into so many international defense treaties and agreements that we literally cannot defend ourselves without the help and cooperation of our allies.

When we reach this point of dependency, then the people would be told that we must surrender our Armed Forces to international control.

I assure you as long as I have breath in my body I'll fight this one-world philosophy which erodes at the basic concepts under which our Founding Fathers created the greatest nation on earth.

The real danger lies in the economic phase of this scheme—the trade program. The naive may think this bill will enable our industries to compete better with those of the European Common Market. But I fear it predisposes the destruction of the economy of the United States, and in particular will hurt South Carolina.

I have in mind now the deadly threat to the biggest payrolls in our State, the textile industry, which is locked in a life and death struggle with the Japanese industries.

Such a bill could destroy entirely some of our industries and cripple others by making them subject to economic and political decisions by international and foreign authorities.

Under the bill, the President has sweeping powers to eliminate tariffs on some commodities and slash others up to 50 percent, not just on a commodity-by-commodity basis, but on broad categories of goods. Through exercise of this power, it is obvious some domestic industries can be ruined and many left jobless.

Another objectional provision is special payments for workers who lose their jobs because of imports, business leaders believe. I believe such allowances could upset present State unemployment compensation systems and lay the groundwork for federalization of the program. Such payments are included in the trade-adjustment section which carries various aids for companies and employees damaged by import competition.

Such adjustment assistance would mean Federal subsidy. More subsidy would mean greater Federal control and ultimately higher taxes to pay for such subsidies.

I ask you where will this money come from? I can quickly tell you—right from the taxpayer's pocket.

The only logical conclusion I can draw from the present trade bill is that socialization of industry must be the inevitable result if we embark on this avenue of dealing with foreign nations.

Add B. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I insert, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from one of Philadelphia's daily newspapers, the Philadelphia Inquirer, as a eulogy to the late Add B. Anderson, who was secretary and business manager of the Philadelphia School Board in our city for the past 28 years.

The citizens of Philadelphia owe a great debt to the late Add B. Anderson, who spent the better part of his adult life managing the business affairs of its public school system.

His purpose in life was dedicated to serving youth in the field of education. How well he succeeded is reflected in the fine educational system he left the Philadelphia School Board.

He was a man of great integrity, possessing the highest ideals, and one who never lost sight of the fact that he had responsibility for spending a substantial portion of the citizens' tax dollars.

Despite changes in municipal government over the years, with its varying policies, he always managed to move steadily forward in building one of the finest and most efficient school systems in the United States. For the money expended by him, he received full dollar value and carefully guarded the assets of the school system as if it were his own property.

His death was a great loss, and an irreparable loss to the field of education, and we in Philadelphia will miss the guiding hand of Add B. Anderson in the education of our youth.

The editorial follows:

ADD ANDERSON

The expression "dedicated" has been employed so often to describe an individual displaying an unusual zeal in his work that it has become hackneyed from overuse.

But it fully fits Add Anderson and his devotion to the Philadelphia public schools, which he managed with extraordinary skill and authority for the last 28 years as secretary and business manager of the school district.

He left Central High School in his third year to take a $5 a week job as office boy in the board of education. That was in 1915 and, until his death, on Tuesday, working for the schools was his sole, and full-time, occupation.

There was disagreement at times on the power he held and how he exerted it; he was crticized for his frugality in his supervision of the school board finances. But there was no question ever raised about his integrity, his scrupulous devotion to a balanced budget, and his quiet competence.

He got along well with politicians, a talent that proved invaluable over the years as the Philadelphia School Board had to go to Harrisburg periodically, hat in hand, to seek more appropriations or higher tax rates.

The Philadelphia school system, now a $118 million-a-year operation, owes much to this modest and energetic gentleman who made public education literally his life's work.

The Satellite Communications Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the satellite communications bill, written by Robert G. Spivack, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of August 19.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELSTAR—THE FINE PRINT

(By Robert G. Spivack)

Whenever this country makes a move in foreign affairs these days someone is sure to ask, "What will the neutral nations think?"

No such sensitivity was demonstrated, however, when the U.S. Senate voted to impose cloture in the debate on the communications satellite. No one rose to ask, "What will the American Negro think."

The U.S. Senate for the first time in 35 years—an entire generation—moved with all deliberate speed to shut off debate where property rights, rather than human rights, were concerned. It has yet to do the same when Dixiecrats filibuster against civil rights.

This bit of legislative inconsistency will not be lost on American Negroes, nor, I dare say, on observers abroad. Southerners and conservative Republicans have always insisted that protecting the rights of "minorities" by the filibuster was a matter of principle. Somehow they managed to rise above principle where the interests of a giant corporation are involved.

The big question really was not whether now was the time to shut off debate but rather, "What's the rush about adopting this legislation?" That's what the Kennedy administration and the Dirksen-Mansfield coalition should explain.

Press coverage of the debate has been limited, for the most part, to stories about the humor of antifilibuster liberals "filibustering." Actually not many people know what is in the bill. What the Senate liberals tried to do was alert the country to the fact that there was something wrong; they chose a talkathon as a sure-fire method of accomplishing that objective.

The leader in the fight, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, is used to fighting alone. His attempts to get reforms in the drug industry were scuttled by the Kennedy administration until the thalidomide episode. Then the White House got into the act. Now KEFAUVER is waging a battle in the national interest, as he sees it, along with a handful of other distinguished Senators such as JOHN CARROLL, of Colorado; WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and a few others.

As the underworld learned 11 years ago KEFAUVER stands his ground. He has now prepared an analysis of what he feels is wrong with the Kennedy satellite bill. You can obtain copies by writing to him at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

What are some of his principal objections?

When proponents of the measure say that bill provides for 50-percent ownership by the public and 50-percent ownership of the satellite by A.T. & T., KEFAUVER says they are kidding the public. What the bill provides is that 50 percent of the initial offering shall be offered the public.

It's possible, he says, and quite likely that the satellite corporation might be financed in a variety of other ways than by issuance of voting stock.

The public, he contends, is defenseless should it be financed through nonvoting securities, bonds, or debentures. What is more, he contends, after the "initial offering" there could be subsequent stock offerings from which the public would be excluded.

Although the taxpayers have underwritten the huge satellite development program there is no provision in the bill for the Government or its agencies to receive lower preferential rates when using the satellite system. Edward R. Murrow, of USIA, testified that his agency might not be able to use the facilities at the commercial rates.

Where other Government research is made available to private companies, such as atomic energy, many corporations can compete for it. But under this bill the Government is furthering a "private monopoly," without reimbursements. When Telstar was launched A.T. & T. paid only for the cost of getting it off the pad, a fraction of the cost of the research that went into its development.

There is a great deal of additional fine print in the satellite bill. When the details are made known then the public can decide whether or not it is a "giveaway." But even now it is becoming clear why the bill's sponsors are in such a hurry.

Administration Response to Representative Zelenko's Request for Action on Anti-Semitism in Argentina and Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, I communicated with President Kennedy requesting the withholding of funds under the Alliance for Progress to Argentina and Uruguay because of the widespread acts of anti-Semitism.

On August 17, 1962, I received a response to my request, which follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 17, 1962.

Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZELENKO: The White House has asked the Department of State to reply to your telegram to the President of July 30 concerning reports of anti-Semitism in Argentina and Uruguay.

The Department of State with the assistance of our Embassy at Buenos Aires has for a period of 2 years been following closely the manifestations of anti-Semitism in Argentina. Our information regarding these manifestations has been supplemented by periodic receipt of data from organizations in the United States directly concerned both with threats to human rights and the welfare of Jewish communities throughout the world.

On the basis of the information available to us, it seems that most if not all of the anti-Semitic activities are attributable to small, largely covert and somewhat amorphous groups which appear to be ultranationalist in nature and to have chosen anti-Semitism as one vehicle for the expression of their personal and social dissatisfactions. The groups construe themselves as quasi-political but it cannot be said that general public opinion in Argentina dignifies them as such. We are advised by our Embassy that the Argentine populace seems genuinely horrified by the recent violent acts and deplores the activities of those responsible for them.

Officers of the Embassy were apprised some time ago of the importance of the evidence of anti-Semitism in Argentina and were instructed to make use of suitable opportunities to point out to responsible Argentines the unfavorable world reaction to be expected from pronounced anti-Semitic activities. Following the attacks in June, our Ambassador discussed the matter with Rabbi Israel Goldstein of New York, a member of the World Jewish Congress. You will appreciate that since no American citizens have been involved the Ambassador was not in a position to make formal representations to the Government of Argentina. However, he reports subsequent conversations with officials of the Government who recognize that the activities of the anti-Semitic groups do not accrue to the credit of the nation and expressed the intent of the Government to cope vigorously with the outbreaks.

On June 25, 1962, a statement was issued by the Presidency of the Argentine Republic expressing the "Executive power's forceful repudiation" of the acts and pledged its decision to "suppress with the full force of the law incidents of this nature which do grave injury to the social structure of the Nation." This sentiment is shared, we are informed, by the Minister of Interior who is responsible for police forces in the Nation. It would thus appear that Argentine authorities are fully aware of the need to take firm measures in the present circumstances. I can assure you that as suitable occasions arises, we and our officers in Buenos Aires are prepared to discuss informally with members of the Argentine Government the concern of all decent men whenever minority groups are subject to unlawful acts.

Our Embassy at Montevideo has provided us with the following information respecting the incidents that have occurred in Uruguay: The Uruguayan Minister of the Interior informed the Uruguayan House of Representatives on July 31 that measures have been taken to prevent recurrence of incidents. These included establishment of street patrols by the police reinforced by Uruguayan Army troops, highway patrols and 100 police normally assigned to the interior of the country, as well as police raids against the headquarters of organizations suspected of involvement in the incidents.

The Uruguayan public and press have become very concerned at these unfortunate incidents, which are thought to be the work of very extremist members of a society. It would appear this concern is reflected in a vigorous effort on the part of their governmental authorities to halt this series of criminal acts.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Address of Harrison F. Houghton, Chief Economist, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives, on "Revelations and Paradoxes of Recent Antitrust Decisions," Presented August 20, 1962, at Annual Meeting of American Farm Economics Association, Held in Storrs, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern about antitrust policy. Congress has reiterated its faith in a competitive free enterprise system and has entrusted the fostering of this type of system largely in antitrust laws. From time to time it is important that we review the effectiveness of our antitrust program.

In this connection, the annual meeting of the American Farm Economics Association, held at Storrs, Conn., this week, devoted a session to antitrust. One of the papers presented at this meeting was by Harrison F. Houghton, chief economist of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives. Mr. Houghton's paper suggests a number of important revelations and paradoxes in recent antitrust decisions and notes that the weakest area in present antitrust enforcement relates to dominant firms in highly concentrated industries. As he points out:

> This throws competitive adjustments onto the small business and farm sectors of the economy, who sell to or buy from the concentrated sectors, and brings about pressures for antitrust exemptions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD the text of Mr. Houghton's address:

REVELATIONS AND PARADOXES OF RECENT ANTITRUST DECISIONS

(By Harrison F. Houghton, chief economist, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives)

Recent antitrust decisions, not only in the United States but also in Europe, yield many revelations and numerous paradoxes.

The first of the revelations—most interesting to the economist, if not the lawyer—is that the Supreme Court, in the Brown Shoe case,[1] has used the word "oligopoly" without quotation marks.

Perhaps the second most significant revelation, produced by the electrical cases,[2] is that oligopolists will resort to conspiracies to set prices.

A third significant revelation (again from Brown Shoe) is that the thrust of the antimerger statute extends not only to the augmentation of existing oligopolies, but even to the level of incipient oligopolies.

The first of the paradoxes is: How can we explain the proliferation of quasi-monopoly in the face of the reiterated declaration of the Supreme Court that: "The heart of our national economic policy long has been faith in the value of competition.[3]

And: "the Sherman Act was designed to be a comprehensive charter of economic liberty aimed at preserving free and unfettered competition as the rule of trade."[4]

This paradox becomes an enigma when we read in the London Economist that: "The United States—which is often accused in Europe of having an exaggerated animus against monopoly * * * has a policy that quite often works."[5]

A second paradox is that it is now evident that there is a clear inverse relationship between "power to restrain trade" and the antitrust statutes which forbid such restraints.

A third paradox is that the energing antitrust programs abroad, far from profiting from American experience, seem to be descending into fresh pitfalls that we have avoided.

The significance of these revelations and the key to understanding the paradoxes may be appreciated by considering three structural pillars of antitrust: (1) Market dominance; (2) incipient market dominance achieved through mergers; and (3) loose-knit agreements. I refer to these as "structural because each has in common the elimination of independent competitive action of significant factors in the market.

Antitrust prosecution has always been most successful in challenging the so-called loose-knit agreements. This may have been because both the intent and the effect of such agreements were so clear. Thus, when competitors have been found joining together to fix prices, or to divide sales territories, or to engage in group boycott, the courts have taken a no-nonsense view that these were per se violations. Yet good economics was also involved, as displayed in the classic condemnation of price fixing in the Trenton Potteries case,[6] where the court said: "The power to fix prices, whether reasonably exercised or not, involves power to control the market and to fix arbitrary and unreasonable prices. The reasonable price fixed today may through economic and business changes become the unreasonable price of tomorrow."

It didn't matter that conspirators might fall out, that agreements might be short-lived, ineffective, or limited in application—nor did it matter that small firms might try to attain ends that their bigger rivals had already achieved; the strongest condemnations were applied.

Congress, in passing the Sherman Act, observed what Galbraith would call the conventional wisdom and directed the antitrust statute against single firm monopoly or combinations and conspiracies, the recognized techniques of restraining trade or monopolizing. The ubiquity of competition was so widely assumed that even economic theory would treat monopoly only as an occasional aberration.

Efforts to employ the Sherman Act to check the great merger movement of the 1890's foundered on legal niceties. In the first Sherman Act case to reach the Supreme Court, an effort was made to prevent the creation of the sugar trust, representing a merger of firms controlling 96 percent of the industry. Not only was the monopoly power clear, but its exercise was reflected in the fact that prices were immediately advanced following the merger. There was no question of the monopolistic purpose or intent, and competition in the industry had been completely suppressed. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court denied relief on the ground that control had been achieved of manufacturing, as distinguished from interstate commerce.[7]

---

[1] *Brown Shoe Co.* v. *U.S.*, 370 U.S. 294 (1962).

[2] *U.S.* v. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.*, Criminal No. 20399, and other cases (E.D. Pa. 1960).

[3] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Trade Comm'n*, 340 U.S. 231, 248.

[4] *Northern Pacific Railway Co.* v. *U.S.*, 356 U.S. 1 (1958).

[5] London Economist, "No Policy for Mergers," Feb. 3, 1962.

[6] *U.S.* v. *Trenton Potteries Co.*, 273 U.S. 392, 397 (1927).

By the time the Supreme Court had receded from this extreme position, the merger movement had given "to American industry its characteristic 20th century concentration of control."[8]

Congress tried to remedy the situation by including section 7 in the Clayton Act, directed not merely at monopoly but at incipient monopoly. But that act was ineffective in stemming the merger movement of the 1920's because the much discussed loophole permitted acquisitions of assets to go beyond challenge.

The merger movement of the 1920's firmly set an oligopoly structure in most basic industries. By 1950, in the midst of a burgeoning merger movement, Congress closed the loophole with the Celler-Kefauver Act, and made amply clear its intention to prevent increases in concentration through horizontal, vertical, or conglomerate mergers.

Antimerger efforts, thus, while impotent during the first 60 years after the Sherman Act was passed, have now become strong law, but not quite as strong as the per se rule against loose-knit agreements.

This leaves the Sherman Act as the sole weapon with which to challenge existing concentration of economic power, yet it is the weakest in the three major antitrust pillars. It still suffers from its original drafting with emphasis on single-firm monopolization, and has not been utilized to reduce oligopoly. To the extent that competition in price is eliminated among oligopolists the Sherman Act thus far has proved useful only with proof or overwhelming presumption of combination or conspiracy.

Existing concentrations achieved at earlier cycles of merger activity are left untouched. The weight of antitrust falls on smaller members of concentrated industries attempting to attain through merger the size of dominant firms, and also on members of nonconcentrated industries attempting to become oligopolistic.

Meanwhile, per se violations by dominant firms may cause economists to reassess their earlier convictions that price control can be achieved by oligopolists without conspiracy. Some may think of the electrical cases as an aberration from general theory on the ground that the price fixes were on custom-made products, not easy to price uniformly. But the facts do not support this conclusion, since the conspiracies embraced not only such custom-made items as steam turbine generators, large power transformers, and power switchgear assemblies, but also shelf items, such as instrument transformers, meters, and distribution transformers.

As we look abroad we note a revival of interest in antitrust. The Treaty of Rome includes a two-pronged antitrust provision for the Common Market, divided into (1) dominance and, (2) restrictive agreements. A massive registration of restrictive agreements, under pain of sharp penalty for failure to report, is underway, but requests for delay in meeting the registration requirements are reminiscent of the course of litigation in this country. There seems to be a disposition in the EEC, as in most European countries, to take a rule of reason approach to agreements which would run afoul of per se rules here, the justification being that those engaged in agreements, say to set prices or divide territories, are merely doing what their large rivals have already achieved by merger. There seems to be no major attack developing in Europe, either against existing dominance or mergers aimed at dominance.[9]

The British antimonopoly program instituted after World War II, like the American policy, is designed to strengthen the forces of competition. But, according to one commentator, it is "diametrically opposed in character" to ours. The distinction is that the "lively spirit of condemnation of monopoly still inspires American policy," but British legislation is "based on the belief that suspected cases of monopoly or agreements should be carefully examined and the practices scrutinized prior to any condemnation or subsequent action."[10]

Two recent British cases vividly illustrate this difference. When the merger between Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd., and Courtaulds, Ltd., was proposed—this would have brought together 95 percent of the synthetic fiber market and 75 percent of the paint market—the Monopolies Commission took a wait-and-see attitude. According to Mr. Frederick J. Erroll, president of Britain's Board of Trade, it had been the policy to judge monopolies by their actual effects in practice and not to attempt, in his words, "to reach conclusions on the possible effects of any particular monopoly before it has come into existence and there has been practical experience of its working."[11]

In the second British example, the Restrictive Practices Court has just recently approved a minimum pricing and a technical pooling agreement for the Permament Magnet Makers' Association, whose members are responsible for 75 percent of the United Kingdom's production. The court accepted a plea that the cooperation in innovaction and research was not only beneficial to the public in itself but could not exist without price fixing, and held that members' prices were on the whole reasonable. As the London economist noted: "It appears to be luck as much as good management that has in the past kept the agreed magnet prices at 'a reasonable level,' since costing was in most cases done on very inadequate information. As a result of the case a more thorough and accurate method of self-knowledge is to be worked out, and as in the cement makers' case, this will be the basis on which the registrar of restrictive practices will in future be able to check that this particular price agreement remains a well-behaved animal."[12]

Thus, in regard to market dominance achieved by merger, the British are thrice removed from us, in that: (1) They distinguish between good and bad monopolies while we forbid all; (2) we prohibit incipient monopolies; and (3) incipient oligopolies. The first Government case[13] under the Celler-Kefauver Act prevented the steel industry from being transformed into what the Court termed a tripoly. In the Brown Shoe case, the Court prevented a merger which may have set into motion a trend toward a level of concentration similar to that which already existed in the steel industry.

In the case of restrictive agreements, eschewing the Trenton Potteries doctrine, the British are willing to continuously review restrictive agreements to determine whether the fixed prices are reasonable.

These examples suggest the necessity of maintaining equally strong pillers in each of the three structural facets of antitrust policy. One weak pillar tends to undermine the whole edifice. The weakest pillar in American antitrust is the inability to reduce existing market dominance. This throws competitive adjustments onto the small business and farm sectors of the economy, who sell to or buy from the concentrated sectors, and brings about pressures for antitrust exemptions. The European experience indicates that weakness in curbing or preventing market dominance even extends to lax control of loose-knit agreements.

Weakness in any of the three structural pillars of antitrust impairs the other pillars, and leads to a sacrifice of the economist's prime objective of consumer sovereignty in favor of his bête noire, protectionism.

---

[7] Milton Handler, "A Study of the Construction and Enforcement of the Antitrust Laws" (T.N.E.C. Monograph No. 38, pp. 46–47).

[8] Paul T. Homan, "Trusts: Early Development," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, vol. XV, p. 114.

[9] Corwin D. Edwards, who has studied the antitrust programs in each of the major countries, comments: "Most countries in Europe take concentration of economic power for granted. Countries that are concerned about big business express that concern in a concept of abuse of economic power and in measures designed to prevent such abuse. To this end, they may take action against discrimination, exclusion of rivals from a market, refusal to sell, exaction of excessive prices, and other acts thought to be abusive; but they characteristically make no effort to curb the accumulation or possession of power."

The Conference Recorder, "Public Policy Toward Competition: New Antitrust Directions," National Industrial Conference Board (1962), p. 17.

[10] Paul H. Guenault and J. M. Jackson, "Control of Monopoly in the United Kingdom" (Lonemans Press, London, 1960, pp. 2–3).

[11] New York Times, Jan. 31, 1962.

[12] London Economist, "Magnets Hold Fast," June 9, 1962.

[13] *U.S.* v. *Bethlehem*, 168 F. Supp. 576 (S.D. N.Y. 1958).

Choked to Death by Government Redtape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following Associated Press story indicates the overwhelming, strangling pressure of Federal Government redtape upon every business and every citizen in America.

The chains of slavery are being fastened around our citizens by bureaucratic absurdity. The Congress is their only hope of freedom.

The following appeared in the Times Democrat, Orangeburg, S.C., August 17, 1962:

BUSINESS CLOSES REDTAPE SNARL

RENSSELAER, N.Y.—The proprietor of a nursing home which was praised by State officials has closed her business because, she said Thursday, "I was choking to death in Government redtape."

"I just couldn't keep up with the papers and forms and serve my patients well," said Mrs. Earl Gundrum, who had operated the Sharpe Homestead Nursing Home for 10 years.

"There were 18 State and Federal agencies constantly flooding me with forms, questions, and statistical requests—medical reports, census figures, social security, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, withholding taxes—all too much to handle."

Mrs. Gundrum said operating expenses had jumped from about $30,000 in 1952 to $60,000 last year.

"I wasn't trying to make much money," she said. "But last year I found we had cleared about $1,000 after taxes."

The home had 21 patients, men and women ranging in age from 45 to 95, she added.

She said she had been able to place all of them in other nursing homes near here but:

"They didn't seem to understand. We were small enough to have a family atmosphere. They thought they would be here a long time."

Mrs. Gundrum opened the home in 1952. In 1958, C. Randolph Wilson, an official of the State social welfare department, called it "a shining example to nursing home operators."

And in June 1961, the Welfare Department told Mrs. Gundrum in a letter: "Your staff and yourself are to be commended for the excellent services offered the patients entrusted to your care."

Mrs. Gundrum said that while her expenses had doubled in 10 years, her rates had changed only slightly. The rates in 1951 ranged from $45 a week for most patients to $75 for those requiring special treatment, she said. The range this year was $55 to $80 weekly.

Paperwork mounted with the costs, she said.

"In one form they asked me if I had any dealings with a labor union. I checked 'No.' They asked me if I received gifts from, or gave any to, the union. I left that blank figuring if I didn't deal with a union we naturally didn't exchange presents. But they sent the questionnaire back telling me to fill in the blanks."

Mrs. Gundrum, a graduate of Russell Sage College, said her husband, a building contractor, had expressed some misgivings when she opened the home. When she closed the business, however, she said he was very upset.

She said she and her husband were concerned over the effect on the patients of a change of homes. Closing of the home also meant loss of jobs for the 14-member staff.

Mrs. Gundrum said she might convert the century-old house into apartments.

"My children are grown up and it's too big for just me and my husband," she explained. "We'd just rattle around here."

The Satellite Communications Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Florence Dies, of Kerrville, Tex.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KERRVILLE, TEX., *July 18, 1962.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: I understand that the bill to turn over the entire Telstar development to the A.T. & T. has passed the House and will now be before the Senate. I have read an article in a recent issue of the Nation on this matter, and I also heard you in the short debate on TV.

I am a widow, and a substantial part of my income is from A.T. & T. stock, but I do not feel that this proposed giveaway is fair or just or to the best interest of our country. There has been too much of this sort of generosity already.

Of course, the proponents of this measure say it is not a giveaway, but when you say it is and the Nation says so, too, I have no doubts about it. It is too bad we don't have more men like you looking after the interests of the country, rather than the interests of special groups.

Yours very truly,
MRS. FLORENCE DIES.

Great for What They Do—Or Don't Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial entitled, "Great for What They Do—or Don't Do?" appearing in the Peoria Journal Star of August 22, 1962, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GREAT FOR WHAT THEY DO—OR DON'T DO?

How do we measure greatness?

In 1962, the answer is obvious. We conduct a poll.

So Arthur Schlesinger, Sr., polled 75 historians on the "great Presidents," and there you have it.

And AP Analyst James Marlow wrote a "think piece" on great Presidents and less than great ones—great Congresses and "unimpressive" ones, published on the Evening Journal Star editorial page yesterday.

It has long been obvious that White House correspondents find those Presidents "great" who make the most headline stories, and the same for Congresses. Historians tend the same way.

Yet, George Washington was truly great not because of what he did as President, and not because he led us to military victory as a general, either—but because of what he did not do. He was great because he refused to be a king, because he was big enough to set a significant precedent by quitting the Presidency after two terms, and because he submitted to opposition and public criticism when he could have smashed it—and generally established by his example a working Republic rather than merely a theoretical one.

Lincoln was truly great because on the eve of victory he proposed to lay down the power of his Office to dominate the defeated South and restore self-government and representation, immediately—regardless of the effect on his own political party.

(They took care of that very quickly, after his demise.)

What a great man Fidel Castro would have been had he eschewed personal power under a free and democratic system in Cuba after the revolution—as he had promised to do.

In history and in life, there is a time for action and a time for restraint—the difference between a Cincinnatus, a dictator in defense of direct assault on Rome who returned to the farm after the crisis, and a Caesar who started Rome on the road to ruin.

How do we measure greatness today?

Not by the example of Cincinnatus, or Washington, or the Lincolnian precept of "a new birth of freedom, that government of the people, for the people, by the people shall not perish."

We seem to lean more to the Caesarian and Napoleonic models.

It isn't a particularly healthy sign.

Will the Public Works Acceleration Bill Help?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, within a short time, the House of Representatives will be considering the public works acceleration bill, H.R. 10113, which is specifically designed to provide jobs in the distressed areas of this Nation through the construction of badly needed community facilities. This program, so vitally needed, both to alleviate the severe distress caused by unemployment and combat the stagnation of distressed areas, has been subjected, recently, to a series of organized attacks on the grounds that it will not solve all of our economic ills. This attitude, as is apparent from the editorial which follows, is certainly not acceptable to the people in the distressed rural and urban areas which would be eligible for assistance under the bill. The unemployed workers of this country are not so naive as to believe that this program will provide them lifetime jobs. They are definitely aware, however, that it will provide them with gainful work while the long-term redevelopment of their community goes forward. They also know that providing them jobs through the construction of needed public facilities not only is a productive expenditure, unlike unemployment compensation and welfare payments, but also is a means for making their communities more wholesome places in which to live and that it holds out the possibility that business and industry will thereby find them to be more attractive locations for their plants.

The unemployed cry for compassion; the unemployed cry for income-producing jobs which will help them to maintain their dignity and standing in the community. The small businessmen in distressed areas understand that their existence depends upon customers who have purchasing power—and that their future depends upon keeping those customers in their community until economic regeneration can be achieved.

We in the Congress will be judged by the extent of our efforts to help relieve the severe unemployment in over 1,000 distressed areas in our Nation—in some places the unemployment rate reaches as high as 35 percent. Construction of needed community facilities is the wisest means for providing immediate assistance to the unemployed in these areas bypassed by the recoveries from the 1958 recession and the 1960–61 recession.

I recommend this excellent article written by an outstanding journalist, Miss Veda Ponikvar, to all Members of the Congress as an accurate reflection of how people living in distressed areas feel about the public works acceleration bill.

The article follows:

[From the Chisholm (Minn.) Tribune Press, Aug. 14, 1962]

BUT IT WILL HELP

Within the next few days, the Congress of the United States will begin debate on the $900 million public works bill, which if passed and then signed by the President, will make available moneys to the depressed areas for much needed public facilities.

The public works bill, whether it is this one, or some other version of its purpose and intent, is not the answer to our economic ills. But, for the immediate moment, it can and will provide jobs for the jobless, and worthwhile construction and installations can be completed. Proponents of this measure are fully aware that this is only a temporary stopgap that will alleviate the long-drawn-out work stoppage in areas where people are willing and anxious to be gainfully employed. This is not a handout program, as some congressional leaders contend, as each community, availing itself of this program, will have to contribute 50 percent of the moneys sought, and whatever project will be inaugurated, must be approved and completed according to formal plans and specifications.

There are numerous communities in the hard-hit economic areas that are in dire need of water systems, sewage works, streets and alleys, hospitals and public buildings. If we provide these facilities and give men on unemployment compensation and on the relief roles gainful jobs, we are helping ourselves and our communities and the Government. There will be those who will point to our taxes and complain of heavy Government spending, and yet, Federal appropriations have been made so many times to places and people and for things without any appreciable return, and often times to our chagrin.

Within our own State, we have witnessed another year of aggravating lull and inactivity in northeastern Minnesota. This is one time bipartisan support should and must be given, and if we are all truly sincere in building our State; if we are dedicated to a program of expansion; and if we are concerned about getting men off of the relief and unemployment roles we will, regardless of political affiliation, band our forces and work as a team.

The area redevelopment program is gaining momentum in Minnesota, as well as in other States where it has been established. Oftentimes, the organizational procedures are detailed and lengthy, but once the mechanics are in gear, new and expanding industries find that this is a most worthwhile source of assistance. It then seems strange that when the ARA was up before Congress, five of the six Minnesota GOP Congressmen voted against it. Major bills in Congress are always a matter of compromise and keen analysis. When congressional authors of legislation from our own State approach other State's congressional leaders, they are puzzled when asked for support, knowing full well that Minnesota's solons are rifted by petty jealousies and party politics. This is one time when we can show by united effort that we are in accord and promoting for the good of the State. It makes little difference to which political party the authors may belong. This is legislation we need to lift the northeastern section of the State out of the doldrums.

From Minnesota's Governor, on down through the State legislature and senate, and the community councils, as well as among all of the people, there should be a determined effort and an unceasing initiative to work for the passage of the public works bill. On the iron range alone, there could be well over several thousand men put to work.

Those who oppose the legislation, need only to visit northeastern Minnesota to become quickly convinced that the time has come for compassion, yes, but more than that, some unified action and political party cooperation.

Our Eighth District Congressman has left no stone unturned in getting the public works bill out of the powerful Rules Committee. Any piece of legislation created by the human mind has its failings, and yet a study of this measure will reveal that all party lines have been cast aside; there is a broad approach to the needs of hard-core areas; and there are governors attached to alleviate corruption and missue of public funds.

If we, as a State, and communities are genuinely interested, we will shelve political pettiness and muster a unified support that will unequivocally convince the entire Minnesota congressional delegation that the public works bill is not the whole answer to our floundering economy—but it will help.

Test Ban Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. William C. Foster of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND
DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1962.

The Honorable WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD: In view of the Discussion in the press of the new test ban proposals the United States is submitting to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, I thought you might be interested in hearing more about them.

There have been two key technical developments on which the new proposals are based. The first establishes a better capability for long-distance detection of earth tremors caused by nuclear explosions or earthquakes, and makes it possible to propose a simpler and more economical system of internationally supervised long-range detection stations, manned largely by the country where located.

The second is that an earlier estimate of the number of tremors from earthquakes which might be confused with tremors from nuclear explosions has been shown by actual observation and research to be several times too large. Since there are fewer earthquakes which produce tremors similar to those of an explosion, the number of onsite inspections needed to identify the cause of the tremors is less. However, on-site inspections are still essential.

These developments have shown the way to a control system which would cost less to construct and run, which would be simpler to manage, which could begin operation in a matter of months from ratification of a treaty, and would in no way jeopardize our national security.

The new proposals were developed by this Agency in cooperation with other agencies. They were approved by the President on the unanimous recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, the AEC, the Director of CIA, and the Secretary of State as well as this Agency. The executive branch is strongly of the view that an adequately verified ban on all nuclear weapon tests is in the national interest.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

The 225th Anniversary of the Founding of the Borough of Bath, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune this past Saturday to be a participant in very impressive ceremonies in the Borough of Bath, Pa.

This energetic little community observed the 225th anniversary of its founding. Highlighting the day's activities was the formal dedication of the Bath Post Office and a parade that attracted participants from all sections of the globe.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an ode to the American flag, "I Am the American Flag," which was delivered by Miss Janice Schlegel, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Luther Schlegel, of Bath, who will enter Kutztown State Teachers College next month:

I AM THE AMERICAN FLAG

(Ode to American flag by oratorical student before flag presentation to color guard)

Since the time of my birth many stories have been told about me. Now I feel it is my duty to tell you what I am and for what I stand.

Born during the Nation's infancy, I have grown with it, my stars increasing in number as the country has grown in size. The domain over which I wave is now expanded until the sun on my flying now never sets.

I am not only an emblem showing the authority of the United States, indicating supremacy when flying over land, possession when flying over Government buildings, power when displayed by troops—I mean much more than that. I represent the ideals and traditions, the principles and institutions, the hopes and aspirations which constitute what is to mankind the greatest nation in the world, the American Nation.

Stirring are the stories of my stars and stripes. My 13 red and white stripes recall the history of that long, bitter 8-year struggle in which the Thirteen Colonies fought and stood side by side for freedom, exemplifying the principle that "In union there is strength."

Each of my stars tells the story of a great and sovereign State which has entered the Union.

Filled with significance are my colors of red, white and blue into which have been woven the courage and strength of Americans.

The red in my stripes proclaims the courage that inspires men to face danger and to do what is right. The strength and courage of American manhood from the conquest of the wilderness by the pioneer through the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and in the Korean conflict has done more than anything else to make the Nation over which I fly the greatest and most wonderful in the world.

My white stripes mark me as the emblem of the land of the free, the country in which the oppressed of the world may enjoy equality and liberty.

The blue in my field of stars stands for loyalty. It is the true blue. It tells the story of thousands of men and women who have been loyal to their country through suffering and hardships.

I signify the law of the land.

I stand for the Constitution of the United States.

I represent the Declaration of Independence, the birth certificate of the American Nation.

I stand for peace and good will among the nations of the world.

I control the strong, protect the weak, relieve suffering, and do all I can for the betterment of mankind.

I stand for tolerance toward men of all creeds and races.

I reflect the wealth and grandeur of this great land of opportunity.

I tell the story of the achievements and progress of the American people in art and science, culture and literature, inventions and commerce, transportation and industry.

I am the badge of the Nation's greatness and the emblem of its destiny.

I am whatever you make me, nothing more, I am your belief in yourself, your dream of what a people may become. I am fear and song, struggle and hope.

I am no more than what you believe me to be, and I am all you hope that I can be. I am the American flag.

Medical Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the membership to the letter dated August 14, which has been sent to the President by the National Association of Retired and Veteran Railway Employees, Unit No. 59, Pittsburgh, Pa., concerning the defeat of the medical aid bill.

I believe this letter should be read by all the Members as it portrays the thinking of a national organization representing our elder retired citizens.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATES OF RETIRED AND VETERAN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES UNIT NO. 59,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 14, 1962.

Hon. J. F. KENNEDY,
President, United States of America,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is to advise the National Association of Retired and Veteran Railway Employees Unit No. 59, located in Pittsburgh, Pa., share your grief because of failure of U.S. Senate to approve your medical aid bill.

Reports indicate that the American Medical Association spent more than $6 million which no doubt were extracted from the sick and deceased, and resorted to every known method, including vicious false propaganda to defeat medical aid for the aged.

The AMA as well as some Congressmen stated they opposed H.R. 4222 because it did not cover medical and surgical. Our lodge had a general discussion regarding this entire subject, and request that medical and surgical be inserted when medical aid bill is again reintroduced, and further request that benefits become effective immediately following passage if possible.

It is true that some of our senior citizens who were lucky and lived very conservative were able to buy a little home and save a few dollars during their 30 to 50 working years, therefore, we feel it is absolutely unfair for unscrupulous members of the American Medical Association to fleece us from our small savings when we are ill with their exorbitant fees, and reduce us to paupers so that we may be placed on the public assistance rolls, after which time we can apply for benefits under the Kerr-Mills law, providing of course if the recipient should live in a State which has implemented same.

Thanking you very kindly for interest manifested in behalf of senior citizens, we are,

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST R. STANLEY,
President.
S. J. GRAHAM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The CED Report: Dark-Age Remedy for Farmers' Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in recent hearings the House Committee on Agriculture was privileged to hear from various citizens throughout the Nation on the program recommendations for agriculture suggested by the Committee for Economic Development.

For the benefit of those Members who may not be acquainted with the CED, it is an organization of business executives who have come up with a series of recommendations to solve the problems of agriculture. Your Committee on Agriculture heard representatives of the CED on their proposals; also farmers and their representatives who appeared before the committee to comment on the CED proposals who were strong in their disdain of the CED proposals.

One farm expert that I hoped would have appeared before our committee is Mr. Leland DuVall, who is the agricultural editor for the Arkansas Gazette. Mr. DuVall was not one of those to testify, but he has written on the hearings and on the CED proposal, which he terms a "Dark-Age Remedy for Farmers' Ills." Because of its excellence, I recommend it as fine reading to the Members.

The article follows:

THE CED REPORT: DARK AGE REMEDY FOR FARMERS' ILLS

(By Leland DuVall)

The Committee for Economic Development, composed of serious and presumably conscientious men, has written a prescription for the ills of agriculture. Last week, a congressional committee heard arguments on both sides of the question—and a few witnesses who obviously were a little uncertain about what they believe.

A key ingredient in the formula is a forced reduction—over a 5-year period—of one-third of the farms and farmers in this country. By that time, it was reasoned, there would be no further need for price supports and production controls, since the capacity of agriculture would just about balance market demands.

The CED apparently reached this conclusion by following the line of reasoning that led doctors in the Middle Ages to "bleed" their weak patients in an effort to restore strength.

Any attempt to find a solution to the problems of agriculture must be based on acceptance of one simple fact: America has become a Nation of surpluses and surplus capacity. In most fields, this is understood and regarded as a source of pride but in agriculture it is listed as a liability.

We have no trouble in accepting the fact that industry can turn out more goods in a given year than the market will absorb at any price. Quite correctly, we regard this surplus capacity as an asset and we exhibit it proudly as proof that our economic complex is superior to other systems.

We resort to the 40-hour week to overcome the ill effects of a surplus labor pool and we boast that our workers are so efficient that they can supply the needs of the market and have plenty of time for recreation.

At the same time, we argue that the surplus capacity in agriculture should be forcibly "retired" because the market will not absorb its flood of commodities.

Industry and labor have learned (with help from the government) how to deal with their surplus capacities. The CED, and others who follow the same line of reasoning, would destroy the surplus capacity of agriculture in an effort to solve the marketing problems.

One oversimplified test of the proposed remedy can be applied by asking the "doctors" in the CED if they would be willing to take their own medicine. In fact, one of the congressmen at the hearing last week toyed with this idea in questioning Theodore Yntema, chairman of the Research and Policy Committee of the CED. Yntema is a vice president of Ford Motor Co.

"You could sell a lot more Fords if you reduced prices," the congressman suggested.

"We could sell some more," the executive admitted.

If the CED theory were applied to industry it would mean that Ford Motor Co., General Motors Corp. and all the other car makers (as well as all other producers and manufacturers) would turn out their products as rapidly as possible and offer them at whatever price they would bring in a "free" market. The process would force the weak companies out of business and the remaining companies working at full capacity, would be able to meet market needs at prices determined by the supply-demand balance.

There is little likelihood that any member of the CED would offer this plan seriously as a solution to the profit squeeze about which they have complained loudly. Traditionally, the method proposed for solving a problem of industry is reduced production and higher prices—with relatively little effort to increase efficiency.

(The last statement should be challenged immediately, since the United States has built a reputation for efficient production. The average industrial output, relative to the number of workers, has increased at 2 percent a year since 1950, but does anyone believe seriously this was the maximum possible rate? During recessions, when corporations "trim the fat" from their operations, the rates rise much faster. By the same yardstick, farm output during the period increased at an average annual rate of 6.5 percent or more than three times the industrial rate. Farming is a lean, hard business while industry tends to operate at a more leisurely pace. The reason, of course, is that competitive conditions are not the same, but this does not change the fact that industry and labor have lagged behind agriculture in the matter of increasing efficiency.)

The idea that American industry is embarrassed by the high efficiency of farmers is a little too far out in right field to be accepted but the remainder of the statement provides a fairly accurate picture of the way we have learned to deal with surpluses in certain areas.

Steel producers, for example, have a capacity estimated at 160 million tons a year and it could be much higher if a simple new process were added at more plants. Last year, the market absorbed only about 98 million tons. Even at that low rate, almost all the well-situated companies posted profits but the rate was not as high as they thought it should have been. The accepted theory from the viewpoint of the men who sponsored the CED report was that steel prices should have been increased to a point that would have returned an adequate profit on the entire plant—not just the part needed to produce 98 million tons. The price should be high enough, they reasoned, to take care of the fixed costs of the cold furnaces (including such expenses as depreciation, which is a part of the cash flow into the treasury) as well as the expected dividends on the whole plant.

Texas, a king-size Alamo of resistance against interference from the Government, has been able to rationalize a system for the control of petroleum production. The Texas Railroad Commission surveys market needs and well capacity and determines the number of days each pump will be allowed to run each month. Through an interstate agreement with other control commissions, a similar system is used in other States. On the present schedule, Texas wells are pumping 8 days a month but no one has come up with the suggestion that the weak wells should be plugged.

Farm tractors, automobiles, and many other major industrial products are turned out by so few companies that there is no need for a legal assist from the railroad commission or some other Government agency to balance supply with demand—at the predetermined profitable price. All that is needed is a generous interpretation of the antitrust laws.

Another Year, Another Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Berne Witness, Berne, Ind., of which Mr. Menno Lehman is the editor, deals with the problem of the Federal Government deficit for the last fiscal year. It seems to me that this article brings the matter into proper focus and also establishes its relationship to the question of a tax cut.

Because of general concern over these matters, I hope that the editorial may be widely read:

ANOTHER YEAR, ANOTHER DEBT

The Federal Government in the year ending June 30 came out $700 million better than President Kennedy predicted last January. He guessed then there would be a deficit of $7 billion for the year. Instead, the deficit was only $6,300 million.

We're glad. But it is a restrained sort of joy. If someone knocked a hole in our roof and the man said it would cost $700 to fix it, and then presented a bill for $630, we would be glad it was smaller instead of bigger. But we still would not feel really good about the whole thing. It is the same with the Federal deficit.

This is 1 more deficit year to rack up, making 7 in the last 10 years. It bring the net for these 10 years—gain and loss combined—to a total of 40 billion added to the national debt.

It makes 1 more year added to a dismal stretch of years in which a profligate Government has persistently refused to face fiscal responsibility.

Meanwhile the pressure is mounting for a substantial tax cut. On almost every side now it is conceded that the heavy burden of taxation is depressing the economy, smothering efforts to spur increased activity and stimulate employment. But there is a lot of worrying about what happens if taxes are cut. Will the deficits get even bigger?

Just as a point of interest, Federal taxes could be less right now by a whopping 8 or 9 billion, and the Government would not even have to economize on pencil stubs to do it—if we just did not have that national debt. That is how much it takes—10 cents of every Federal budget dollar—merely to pay the interest on the debt. But that is just dreaming. The debt is there.

Taxes could actually be cut by 5 billion, and the Government would be no worse off by following the recommendations of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. That group put 17 committees to work analyzing the budget for the coming year and these committees suggested 90 places where cuts could be made, adding up to more than $5 billion.

There would be a double benefit if a worthwhile tax cut can be pushed through, and the sooner the better. One benefit will be to the people's well-being and the general economy. Tax relief is needed. The other benefit will be that a tax cut will force some spending discipline on the Government.

The country needs both a cut in Government spending and a cut in taxes. Maybe the best way to get one is to start with the other.

The Food Stamp Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the RECORD the interesting and thoughtful column by Frank Holeman which appeared yesterday, August 22, in the New York Daily News:

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Frank Holeman)

WASHINGTON, August 21.—President Kennedy is going to have trouble getting the $900 million public works bill through the House of Representatives. The reason: A lot of Congressmen are afraid he would play politics with the dough.

Whatever gave them such a wild notion as that? After all, the President has said time and time again he would use the money only where it was urgently needed, and where many people are out of work. Who in the world would play politics with human misery?

Well, Representative DURWARD HALL, Republican, of Missouri, thinks he has caught the administration doing it in the food stamp program, which cost $25 million last year and has been budgeted for $50 million this year.

"The food stamp pilot program being administered by the Department of Agriculture has become a brazen political slush fund," HALL charged on the floor of the House. He urged that action on the much larger standby public works bill be held up, pending a full-scale investigation of the food stamp scheme.

Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, a member of the House Agriculture Committee, wrote Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, asking for such a probe. COOLEY has just rejected the request with this one majestic sentence:

"DEAR MR. FINDLEY: Your letter of August 10 requesting that the House Committee on Agriculture conduct an investigation on the food stamp program is utterly ridiculous.

"Sincerely yours,

"HAROLD."

Sylvester R. Smith, Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, which really runs the program, expressed the pious hope that "it will not be threatened by efforts to make it a partisan political issue."

Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, has thanked her fellow Missourian, HALL, for having made a partisan political issue" out of the program because we Democrats could not pick a more clear-cut issue of how the two parties differ in meeting the needs of the American people."

THERE'S A FAINT AROMA ABOUT THE STAMPS

What are the facts? After an impartial investigation, I'm forced to one of two conclusions: (1) Nearly all the needy, unemployed people in the United States live in congressional districts represented by Democrats; or (2), there is some real hanky-panky going on, which should be exposed immediately for the good of the country. Here's why:

The food stamp program was set up in April 1961, "on a pilot basis" in eight areas "of chronic unemployment," selected by Agriculture Secretary Freeman. It so happened that all eight areas were represented by Democrats.

Early this month, the Agriculture Department announced that the pilot program had worked so well it was going to be extended, in three stages—October 1, November 1, and December 1—to 18 more congressional districts. All but one of these were Democratic districts. The lone lucky Republican was Representative ALVIN O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, who got the Duluth-Superior area okayed while Freeman was fighting his losing battle for the original administration farm bill.

Somehow the Agriculture Department planners overlooked the area that has the highest rate of unemployment in the country, according to the Labor Department—Johnstown, Pa., with more than 12-percent idle.

REPUBLICAN PLEAS FALL ON DEAF EARS

The Johnstown area is represented in Congress by a Republican, JOHN P. SAYLOR. His pleas to be included in the food stamp program were ignored, as were those of other GOP members in badly depressed areas.

But the expansion planners did include St. Louis, represented by MRS. SULLIVAN, although that city is no longer even on the official list of areas with substantial unemployment.

They also thoughtfully added Nash County, N.C., in COOLEY's district, and Choctaw County, Okla., represented by Majority Leader CARL ALBERT.

The score now is 25 to 1 in favor of the Democrats.

It is quite a feat in any Congressman's cap to have the food stamp program in his district. It means that the folks on relief there are getting more and better food than people on relief elsewhere.

Under the plan, families approved by State and local welfare agencies get food stamps instead of handouts from Government surplus food stocks. They take the stamps to the grocery store and buy a greater variety of food. The grocer redeems the stamps at his bank, which eventually collects from the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Agriculture Department.

FREEMAN IS THE FOOD STAMP SANTA CLAUS

Freeman has complete freedom in picking a test area, under a law left over from the New Deal days. The only criteria are it must be an area of substantial unemployment or eligible for area redevelopment aid, and local officials must be willing to cooperate.

Oddly, those are the same broad criteria for projects to be approved under the pending public works bills. The administration asked for $600 million immediately, plus $2 billion standby. The Senate voted $750 million now and $750 million standby. The House bill, just cleared by the Public Works and Rules Committees, calls for $900 million now with no standby.

This week, House Democratic leaders are quietly polling the Members to see whether they have the votes to pass their bill.

Is it any wonder the Republicans and antiadministration Democrats are closing ranks again to the dismay of Kennedy's lieutenants?

It reminds me of the fishermen who was amazed at the struggling of a fish he caught. "What you squirming for, little fish?" he asked. "I ain't going to do nothing but gut you."

To Raise New Currents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a copy of a speech delivered by Dr. Harold C. Case, president of Boston University, at that institution's annual summer commencement exercises last week.

Dr. Case has a compelling message, and because of its important overtones I commend it as must reading to every Member of the Congress.

The speech follows:

TO RAISE NEW CURRENTS

For many years officials representing the Governments of Canada and the United States of America have discussed harnessing the tides of the Bay of Fundy to generate electrical energy. In that narrow pass the tides rise as much as 70 feet and, properly directed, represent an enormous source of energy for our industrial civilization.

The interesting thing about this situation is that these tidal waters have been rising and falling with the regularity of the cosmic timeclock for uncounted years, without generating a single kilowatt of electricity. Only if the genius of man takes hold of the power of the tide, can the wires carry electricity to users in two nations, perhaps changing the economic standards for millions of people.

One is reminded of Jacques Maritain's words about human responsibility, when he advised each one of us to "raise new currents in the flood of circumstance."

The tide of the ocean or of the moods of men cannot be stopped. They rise and fall with regularity. Emerging peoples have heard the summons to enjoy plenty and to move from scarcity. Their experiments with freedom are costly, and often wasteful They are rounding the corner from colonial rule to self-determination before they are actually competent to assume leadership. But none of them is suggesting turning back to the old days of empire.

A popular west African song describes this resistless urge. This is from their "high life," which corresponds to our "rock and roll." The African girl sings wistfully of the man she hopes to find. She asks: "O what shall I do to find a man of that type, one who is a been-to, car-full, and fridge-full, O what shall I do to find a man like that?"

Translated, this song means that she wants a "been-to" man who has been to college, has traveled, and knows the world. "Car-full" means that he owns an automoile, and "fridge-full" means that he has a refrigerator. What more could any girl want?

No person or group is powerful enough to block the forward progress of such an urge. However, it is possible to direct the flood of circumstance.

No previous age has known the sense of foreboding that hangs over the modern world. There were earlier catastrophes. Cities were sacked by vandals. Towns were destroyed by volcanoes. Yet for the majority of people the low pitch of expectation refused to promise much, and the limited area of disaster produced little excess of fear.

In the recent past men breathed the confidence that the future would be better than the past. Continuous progress, enlightenment, and the belief in inevitable improvement were universal.

Within our generation, complacency has been shattered. Two world wars have demonstrated with graphic piles of debris and millions of dead the extent of the damage man could inflict on men. Hiroshima was tragic enough, but the geometric increase in the explosive power of hydrogen and other bombs, the window-on-the-world opened by 44 orbits at 17,000 miles per hour, the prospect of space stations, moon landings, and the experience of instant audiovisual communication by the Telstar satellite have ushered in a special kind of confusion, and have shattered confidence in an unprecedented way.

Our task is to find the interaction between what is conditioned and what is free in human affairs. This is the dual character of history. Where men react blindly or passively to the great vitalities of existence, to the pressure of the tribe, to the urge for survival, to physical hunger, society will wear an aspect of uniformity. There is a sad similarity to civil strife. The struggles between the Greek city-states in the war between Athens and Sparta, the alliances, betrayals, shifts of loyalty, have kinship with modern movements in the Congo.

When, however, men transcend their material urges by reason, by enlightenment, and by their search for the ideal, the blind power urges are held at bay. The dance of puppets on strings ceases to be the summary of social movements. The breath of freedom blows, if faintly at first, still perceptibly. The fatalities are reversed. Hope grows; bloodshed ceases; conferences are convened; opponents reason with each other; both give a little; a middle position is outlined, and, as recently, one day a treaty is signed which comes out of Dutch-Vietnamese negotiations for more than 12 years. A new chapter in the history of man is written.

In this struggle between blind forces that control and enlightend forces that reshape, it is easy to believe in necessity. Our vision of the influence of the material universe and its conditioning has been vastly increased by the internal combustion engine, the electric generator, the jet plane, the electronic computer, and their technological relatives. In an age of science, change is so vast and so violent, that it is easy to become obsessed with the results and to forget either the goals or the minds back of them.

Still, admittedly all of these scientific achievements and others to come are really worthless if they do not contribute to increased well-being, serenity, peace, and humaneness of mankind.

If, as I believe, we are irreversibly part of a worldwide human community, are we not obliged to discover and apply the safeguards of a civilized society? In this Nation we live under law. There are many lawbreakers, some unsocial enough and with the brilliant daring to intercept a mail truck and disappear with more than a million dollars. But they represent the sickminded one-tenth of 1 percent. The others, living in all the ways open to them—from "lives of quiet desperation" to lives of vivid inspiration—take part in promoting the general welfare. They share some sense of national purpose. They are loyal. These are the minimum conditions of a civic life, or of any humane society.

These are still lacking in our international world. The introduction of the minimum institutions for such humaneness should be the first aim of our world policy. This, in my judgment, is more important than the landing of a man on the moon.

We require political inventiveness which in some way matches the scientific inventiveness of this age. How can we tolerate a world in which everything changes—every measurement, all communication, explosive power, outer space travel, and only civic life remains unchanged, to founder because it cannot cope with its environment?

In the main, we miss the central issue in foreign policy. We do not pursue the general welfare. We do not focus on a world under law. We do not make universal disarmament a primary dedication. Instead, we center on national security, in "souping up" our arms and space races.

I speak today for concentration of planners' time on the central aim—building a civilized world for the animal, man. We need to create the patterns of conversation, the network of worldwide family institutions, the decencies, and the dedications which will make it possible, with planetary suicide in sight, to avoid disaster, and instead to build for a comelier, more cultured, more inspired and better life on earth.

The aim of living as neighbors under law, with mutual respect, may be high and vast, but it is better than the lethal consequences of the way of violence for the human race.

Human well-being is not the product of a single discovery, a single policy, a single conference, but of a continuous quest, of unending conversation, of small gains, of occasional losses, and of forward progress.

In the second place, education has an unprecedented responsibility for "raising new currents in the flood of circumstance."

Educational theory should include, along with its recognition of the paramount importance of scientific methods, a strong conviction about desirable ends. It is easier to delineate effective methodology than it is to formulate the goals for which that methodology is indispensable. To attempt to convert society to the doctrine of ends and purposes that dominated earlier eras is unsuitable and impracticable.

Look with me at the possibilities for reconstruction of education to achieve these results. Suppose the first 2 years of a college curriculum were organized to find answers to the questions: What are the most basic characteristics of our society? What is the best possible kind of society? How do we behave in order to promote that goal?

Then lectures would be largely replaced by cooperative investigation, by individual study, and by original proposals. Gifted students could work on more advanced concepts; average students could feel the stimulus of freedom to inquire. Minority and majority opinions would be weighed; philosophy would bring values for weighing conclusions.

Students would deal with the meaning of history and the presence of atomic energy, with the levels of truth and the discovery of the most important values. Centering on goals to be attained in the future, students would become intimately acquainted with the goals of the past and of the present. Experimentalism would be neither repudiated nor worshipped, but used where it had value.

The irrational forces that thwart progress would be studied intensively, and students would face the realities of prejudice, ignorance, defeatism, hatred, incompetence, and insecurity, without yielding to them as inevitable, or smiling in their presence and assuming that they no longer existed.

College would cease to be a pleaant interlude before the serious business of living, and would become a thrilling adventure for all who are privileged to associate with specialists, their faculty members. Research would begin early, and continue late. It would be the result of the stimulus to find new ways to perform in an unprecedented era, and would lead to inner urgency, not to the more quest for greater income for work done.

Has such a concept a chance in American higher education? Is civilization worth the price? If so, yes, the keen insights of faculty members, most of whom are dedicated educators, can design ways to recruit much, much more independent effort, with far more impressive educational results.

Finally, the world we inhabit asks of us more rapid and improved maturity. The whole issue of human destiny comes back in the end to the quality of the individual. A maturing person is one who has not achieved a level of competence and stopped, but rather is linked with life through growing contacts and new knowledge. A mature person is not one who knows many facts, but who grows steadily in knowledge and in the wisdom concerning its use. He is not a person who has a certain number of friends in a certain neighborhood, and there he has stopped; but rather, he knows how to live in many kinds of environment, and he is constantly adding to the number of persons with whom he has real fellowship.

How can we improve our conduct to "raise new currents in the flood of circumstance"?

We can maintain, and help to create, higher expectations about human life. "Dying back of the brain," as William Sheldon called the deterioration of middle age (William H. Sheldon, "Psyche and the Promethean Will," p. 3), is as artificial as self-assurance of all knowledge by a self-confident teenager.

Middle age and old age should not reveal a dampening-down, a letting-go, a making-the-best of a boresome bargain. Rather, they should bring the fruits of the quest, eager exhilaration, and increasing fulfillment.

Life can continue to grow in power and happiness, as it continues to inquire, to learn to link itself productively with other people and projects.

Every situation offers an opportunity for mature responses. We do not require special occasions. There is a family argument. The members either go wordless and angry to bed, or some member introduces relaxation, and they reexamine their deeper loyalties, and retire, relaxed and renewed. Someone makes a mistake. It is either treated as something beyond repair and disgraceful, or as a learning experience, not to be repeated, and hence useful.

Out of small immaturities, great frustration comes. From small maturities growing adequacy is built.

Immature people hide the real issues. Mature persons discuss them. On a tablet in front of the Old South Meeting House here in Boston are words that describe our revolutionary forefathers as "worthy to raise issues." If they were worthy to do that, they were mature enough to grapple with problems. They could detect the important and separate it from the unimportant.

Perhaps the most important clue to maturity is association with persons and groups that promote maturing. I am impressed by the number of faculty members who have studied in New England, have gone to other regions in these United States, and now desire to return to this intellectual center. When asked why they are prompted to do this, they usually reply that whatever may be the deficits here, climate, salaries, situations, the association with minds likely to prompt them to grow intellectually and spiritually is of greater value.

One sure test of a person is his habitual association. Does he associate wholly with groups that perpetuate immaturities, groups that are snobbish and exclusive, that deal with people, not ideas, that are devoted to self-interest instead of social interest, that are always partisan rather than critical in thought? Then he remains immature.

Or does he deliberately associate with groups that seek to overcome prejudice, that encourage the mind to be alive on critical issues, that deal with great ideas, that practice citizenship by active work for community improvement. Then he is maturing.

Learning should be continuous. Contriving a plan for growth of mind is essential to greatness, and to satisfaction in living. Creating, self-giving, researching, socializing, recreating, fit a pattern.

If we can produce a generation determined to design goals for man's best life on this planet, if we can educate a generation capable of achieving these goals, if we can keep our eye on the individual and his mental, social, spiritual growth, we may "raise new currents in the flood of circumstance," and, who knows, we may harness high tides, to the great good of people yet to be born.

At the end of a recent much-praised play by Ionesco, the hero proclaims that he, himself, all alone if necessary, will refuse to turn into a rhinoceros. This resolution is a good one, for us all.

Are We Being Brainwashed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the utter fallacy of conferences with Stalin, Malenkov, Bulganin, Khrushchev, or any Russian leader; negotiations with their henchmen over disarmament; or any agreement with Communist gangsters should have dawned upon free world leaders when the Russian Communists and Hitler jointly invaded Poland in September 1941.

The following article, which appeared in the Family Weekly, August 5, 1962, indicates that we are being completely brainwashed by the Russian Communists:

ARE WE BEING BRAINWASHED?

(By George F. Sutherland, M.D. with Curtis Mitchell)

One month, Nikita Khrushchev is hurling threats of atomic annihilation at us. The next month, he is cooing cozily about peaceful coexistence.

It simply does not make sense. Or does it?

I think it does. I believe the seemingly erratic movements of Soviet diplomacy may not be erratic at all. Instead, they seem to be carefully planned to create neurosis on a global scale.

Over the years, I have gathered and analyzed records of hundreds of such twists and turns, and it becomes more and more obvious that there is an underlying timing for each.

A problem is raised; and at first the Russians seem to want a peaceful settlement. But when a solution seems near, they lose interest and raise new objections which make a settlement of the problem impossible.

For instance, throughout 1961 the Russians insisted that we and they discuss banning nuclear weapons in conjunction with our talks on total disarmament. Although we preferred another course, we finally agreed—whereupon they reversed themselves, asserting that our acceptance was a capitalistic trick and that they would no longer agree with their own proposal.

This zigzag technique in diplomacy parallels the methods used by the Red Chinese in brainwashing American prisoners during the Korean war.

In his book, "Battle for the Mind," William Sargant describes how brainwashers subject a victim to alternating positive and negative attitudes. For a time, the victim is treated in a friendly manner—and then, for no apparent reason, he becomes an object of utmost disdain. As the process continues, he grows progressively more and more bewildered. Finally, he will grasp at the slightest promise of relief. In this condition, he is likely to fall for any type of indoctrination.

Although the Red Chinese are the most notorious practitioners of brainwashing, the foundations for it were laid by a Russian doctor and physiologist, Ivan Petrovich Pavlov (1859–1936). In 1904, he won the Nobel Prize for physiology and medicine. During later studies, he discovered how to alter the attitudes and behavior of laboratory animals to the point of producing nervous disorders in them.

When the Communists came to power in 1917, Nikolai Lenin thought so highly of Pavlov's talents that he awarded the scientist double rations, a country house, an expanded laboratory, and the perpetual use of an apartment.

Lenin hoped to apply Pavlov's psychological techniques to alter the attitudes and behavior of humans. Since then, Pavlov's principles have been used extensively in Russian child training and in the Soviet brand of psychiatry.

By contrast, the Western world has failed to grasp the deep significance of Pavlov's theories. In consequence, we do not understand what may be happening to us. Instead of responding rationally, we often react compulsively to Soviet propaganda.

Why should this be? Students of Pavlov advance the theory that a person who is bewildered in attempting to deal with a situation will accept any strong suggestion without question.

Before the first sputnik, most Americans were convinced of our superiority over the Russians. But when the Russians space vehicle roared into orbit and ours remained grounded, it confused and shocked us. Their success suggested strongly that we had been wrong. Our self-confidence changed swiftly to self-doubt and anxiety, and we have never entirely recovered.

To a psychiatrist, this persistent feeling of apprehension is a symptom of the sickness called psychoneurosis.

A variety of techniques will produce this neurosis in an experimental animal. But all of them involve presenting a succession of alternating positive and negative signals calling for opposite responses. The more difficult it becomes to distinguish between the signals, the more disturbing the routine is likely to be.

In my own investigations, I used hogs as subjects. On one day, the interruption of a continuous tone signified that the animals would be fed. On alternate days, the same interruption signaled that they would receive a light but unpleasant electrical shock. After several months of this alternation, two of the three animals used in the study developed neuroses.

In men as well as in animals, such reflex behavior develops almost without the victim being aware of it. A pedestrian jumps at the warning sound of an auto horn before he considers its meaning. He has become conditioned.

Faced with the possibility that the Russians are using this technique to brainwash us, can we save ourselves?

Remedial measures are akin to lifting ourselves by our own bootstraps. The first step is to comprehend the mechanism: the alternating current of sweet talk and threats.

A French physician who survived 3 years of brainwashing in a Chinese prison said: "You are exhausted, and you are annihilated. You can't distinguish right from left. You just wonder when you will be shot—and begin to hope for the end. Finally, you do whatever they want."

Three conditions, if maintained long enough, are expected to create an experimental neurosis in a human being.

1. A continuous state of unpleasant anticipation.
2. Lack of means to combat the situation.
3. Mounting anxiety under inescapable pressure.

Ask yourself: Do you dread the next Soviet threat? Do you have doubts about our ability to fight back? Do you feel we can only sit and wait for the inevitable?

If you have these feelings, reach fast for your bootstraps.

The primitive medicine man controlled his subjects only as long as they failed to see through his "magic." Likewise, once we view the Soviet smile-and-snarl as a kind of "medicine," we can judge it realistically and refuse to be stampeded.

Knowledge is power. In psychotherapy, it is a fact that if a person learns what is wrong and can understand what threatens him, he will make an effort to protect himself.

I believe that an understanding of Pavlov's principles is a key to our national self-defense. But this is merely a first step. We need more knowledge. I suggest three steps:

1. Read more about the threat itself.
2. Dig behind the crisis headlines.
3. Set your sights on an ultimate goal and don't be distracted or diverted from attaining it.

Digging behind the daily headlines, you will discover that Kremlin leaders are possibly more dilemma-ridden than we are. After 40 years, their rate of growth is still inferior to that which "dying capitalism" has provided for Japan, France, and West Germany. Soviet agriculture has never fed its people adequately, while ours produces surpluses.

You will also see through the myth of Soviet "solidarity." Long ago, Yugoslavia rejected Khrushchev's leadership. In Africa, southeast Asia, and Cuba, Red China is openly competing with Russia for supremacy. Even in Russia itself, the Communist Party seems to be deeply divided.

Most of us want to live peacefully in a community of nations. If you subscribe to this goal and arm yourself with the facts, your thinking and your actions can assume a realistic direction. You will have an objective which will prevent the undermining of your courage, wisdom, and faith.

When the chips were down, astronauts John Glenn and Scott Carpenter were able to survive both the nerve-racking postponements and the emergencies that threatened their earth orbits. They had the facts. They knew their objective. Their faith held.

Most of us can be equally strong in our own way. As long as we live, Soviet smiles probably will alternate with snarls, threats, and shoe-pounding. But if we recognize these gestures for what they are, we will not panic. We will be resolute in working toward our goal—a world where men can live in peace and freedom.

Columnist Looks at Faubus' Latest Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. David Lawrence, one of America's most widely read and respected newspaper columnists, commented on the recent Democratic primaries in my home State of Arkansas. The editor of the Paragould Daily Press, Mr. Fred Wulfkuhler, made the article his lead editorial in his issue of August 13.

The comments of Mr. Lawrence emphasizes the fact that our citizens have a high regard for courage and strong conviction. I commend Mr. Lawrence's statements to the attention of the Members:

COLUMNIST LOOKS AT FAUBUS' LATEST WIN

Columnist David Lawrence recently wrote his observations of Gov. Orval E. Faubus' successful campaign for an unprecedented fifth term:

"The people of Arkansas have spoken—at least the Democratic Party which is in the majority there has spoken. And the result is that Gov. Orval Faubus in effect has been reelected to a fifth term.

"Thus, three times since the fateful episode of 1957 when Federal troops were ordered to Little Rock, the people have by their ballots endorsed the man who struggled to preserve the constitution as he conscientiously interpreted it.

"He believed that the States have the right to police their own disorders and prevent riots, and that Federal intervention is constitutional only if the State requested such aid.

"To this day there is a serious question as to whether Federal troops were legally employed in trying to enforce a Federal court order. The present U.S. Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, said in speeches during the 1960 campaign that he thought Federal marshals should have been sent to Little Rock instead of Federal troops.

"But the fine points of law are often disregarded by an emotional public. Few people realize, for instance, that the 14th amendment, on which the Supreme Court based its 1954 desegregation decision, was fraudulently inserted in the Constitution in 1868, though the record of history plainly points out the shameful behavior of the emotional radicals in Congress who forced that action.

"Seats in Congress were denied Southerners, and State legislatures which had already adopted the 13th amendment were suddenly deprived of their right to pass on the merits of the 14th. The Supreme Court has never dared to pass under the validity of the arbitrary method used to 'ratify' the 14th amendment.

"Throughout the length and breadth of America, moreover—and, indeed, overseas—Governor Faubus, who ventured to protect his people against public disturbances arising over a court order based on the 14th amendment, was pilloried as some kind of an ogre who had mangled the Constitution.

"This correspondent attended an integrated public high school and would do the same if he were of student age now. But illegality cannot be condoned and distortion of the Constitution cannot be justified in order to suit the emotional whims of the times, no matter how meritorious the objective. For the rule of Machiavelli that 'the end justifies the means' has been relied on by many a dictator in the past and is the basis today of much of the capricious behavior of the Communists throughout the world.

Unless there is a government of law, a free society cannot endure and human rights are eventually lost.

"Governor Faubus stood his ground courageously.

"He decided that vindication could come only through the votes of his fellow citizens. He ran this year against five candidates, all reputable and well known in the State. Unquestionably virtually all of them would have been acceptable to the people of Arkansas on the segregationist issue.

"But the people preferred to tell the world that they still believe in Orval Faubus and that they are convinced he did not get fair treatment by the outside public in the 1957 controversy. They, therefore, gave Mr. Faubus more votes in the Democratic primary than the combined total of all five of the other candidates for Governor.

"Incidentally, Arkansas is one of those 'one party areas' to which President Kennedy has referred the other day at his news conference. He seemed to think it was useless for a President to intervene in such areas even to assist the candidacy of a Member of Congress from his own party.

"He implied that there is no contest in those areas and hence he could not take sides. Actually, there are plenty of contests in the 'one party areas,' as this week proved, but the battles are in the party primary and not in the final election.

"The Faubus victory shows that the people are loyal to a man of courage in politics who dares to speak his convictions.

"The European press, which at times superficially discusses American politics, would do well to examine the Arkansas primary and take note that a Governor has been renominated there and in November will be elected to a fifth term—unprecedented in State history—just because he ventured to stand up for the Constitution as it had been interpreted for decades and as he still believes it should be interpreted today when a question arises concerning the dispatch of Federal troops to enforce a Federal court order.

"He obeyed the order, but neither he nor the people of Arkansas agree today that the method used was constitutional."

Imperatives for the United States in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the other day I had the opportunity of reading a thought-provoking speech on American involvement in Africa.

By request, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this

speech, as given here in Washington, D.C., before a regional meeting of Lions Clubs. The speech was prepared and delivered by Dr. Hermann Ficker, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, who not only is an outstanding economist in international finance and trade, but is also a congressional consultant on African affairs.

The speech follows:

IMPERATIVES FOR THE UNITED STATES IN AFRICA OR AFRICA KNOCKS—ITS CHALLENGE TO US AND OUR INVOLVEMENT

(By Hermann Ficker, congressional consultant on African affairs, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

As an introduction to my statement on Africa and one which portrays only my own views, I want to quote something which the late Dag Hammarskjold pointed out to the Security Council of the United Nations in July 1960:

"We are at the turn of the road where our attitudes will be of decisive significance, I believe, not only for the future of this organization, but also for the future of Africa. And Africa may well, in present circumstances, mean the world."

The late Secretary General of the United Nations used these words in describing the explosive situation in the Congo, in advocating that a strong stand be taken by the United Nations to resist Soviet involvement in the Congo. His significant and prophetic words were uttered scarcely a score of months ago, yet it seems as if the world, partly because of events deep in the heart of darkest Congo, of all places, is closer to the brink of destruction than in all of her war-ridden history.

In the short time at my disposal may I give you a brief summary of our involvement with the emergent Africa of today, with its heritage of colonialism, with its surging nationalism, with its insistent drive for independence, with the confusion in the resultant clash of nationalities and races and eager political leaders, and with the place this new Africa is to occupy in our turbulent world. If ever the free world needs imaginative leaders, educated judgment and vision in meeting the challenges of the rising nations of Africa, then that time is now. If we cannot meet the challenge and the opportunity presented to us on such a grand scale in Africa, then the Sino-Soviet colossus will certainly step in to entice or maybe force Africa into its orbit. Drift and delay in the cold war may well lead to the sowing of seed problems, which like dragon's teeth may emerge in a host of difficulties to plague us in the future. Thus, it is not only the future of Africa, but the fate of the free world that actually hangs in the balance insofar as our present actions in that continent are concerned.

I said our actions, but what I mean by that is the actions of the free world also, especially the metropolitan powers of Europe who have such direct connections with their former African dependent areas. On all sides one hears the new chant how deeply the United States is involved in Africa, a reiteration that seems to imply that the future of Africa depends on us. If it comes to a nuclear war, where we must offset the Sino-Soviet bloc so as to keep this vast continent from being added to the Communist hegemony then one might possibly agree. The real fact is that England, France, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and Germany—all of industrialized Western Europe—are much more heavily involved than we are presently. In fact, if all the nationals of these European countries had suddenly to depart; if all their business connections had to be abruptly discontinued; if all their cultural influences had to be eliminated; their medical, educational, and social institutions to be superseded, Africa would present a woeful spectacle indeed. Our total involvement would be just as serious. Why? Simply because we do not have the manpower, education administractors, trained teachers, doctors, agronomists, engineers, and multitudes of other professional men to take the place of the departing Europeans. I may ask a simple question—just how many people who can speak French do we have in the United States who could go into just the French-speaking areas? Yet we pride ourselves that we teach French in our schools here at home.

There is one consolation in this sad picture. If we with our culture, so closely allied or based largely on the Western European pattern, can scarcely hope in the foreseeable future to step in and replace the former so-called colonialist powers, how much less will Russia be able to do it? I have merely to point out to you the enormous difficulties the Russians are experiencing in Egypt where they are helping with the Aswan Dam. In spite of contact with the Arabic language for a hundred years or since the heyday of the Ottoman Empire, Russian technicians have great difficulty at present in conveying their instructions to the Egyptian workmen. In Guinea, where Russia is assisting in many sectors of the economy, the problem has been intensified because of the language barrier.

But, even as the scarlet thread that is to be found in all the cordage used in the Royal British Navy to prove British ownership of such rope, even so you will find the evidences of the U.S. involvement, tenuous as they may be, yet symptomatic of an interest in African affairs similar to the interest we have in our own heritage and hope for the future.

Our involvement in Africa stems from the hope that the nations in Africa will remain free to control their own destinies and achieve some semblance of the good life even as we have done. Here is where our help will be most effective and most appreciated.

Today there are over 30 sovereign states, carved out of the French and British Empires as well as the former trust territories held by France, Britain and Italy. The only other major nation to relinquish her suzerainty was Belgium, and even here Belgian technicians are still indispensable to the active running of the Congo's industries. Today there are still 30,000 Belgians working in the Congo.

Many people speak of the dissolution of these oversea empires, but, in reality, this dissolution was largely foreseen and it cannot be denied that England and France did more than a little to prepare their territories for eventual self-government. In spite of what is being said of the colonialist repression and exploitation, the very fact that the Sudan, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanganyika and the other areas have parliamentary governments and stable administrative and fiscal systems bespeaks much for the former colonialist regimes and their tutelage towards independence. Certainly one can wish that much more had been done, on a much larger scale, but at least sound foundations have been laid. Most of the newer independent governments have asked many of their former colonial administrators and civil servants to stay on, till such time as indigenous replacements can take over. Many of these so-called European expatriates have assumed citizenship in the new states; instead of going "home" they have adopted Africa as their home. No longer do they feel that they are there to rule, rather have they remained as fellow developers of their new nations.

The very near future will doubtless see the evolution of at least half a dozen additional new entities in Africa. Here we Americans especially should accept a word of caution.

Because most new African nations derive from a colonialist base it is too often assumed that they are of the same order of development; whereas these individual states are often highly divergent with distinct characteristics and individual hopes and plans for themselves. These divergencies may be the very factors that will militate against an overall pan-African union or federation. One has but to speak to many of the newer leaders of the various nationalities to sense their intention of maintaining their own national existence as free independent units rather than submerging themselves in a more encompassing union.

We are involved in Africa's independence because independence is something which we as a nation achieved and is an aspiration we wish for all other men. Today, more than ever we feel that dependent peoples everywhere have a just right to be free, to live in dignity and to work out their own destinies in a manner that suits themselves. It is our expressed purpose and in line with our own national interests that we do everything possible within our means to ensure that stable governments result, that subversion not follow to the detriment of their own national good, and that somehow we assist them to participate with us in working for a better future.

Initially we were slow in realizing the pride Africans displayed in being free at last, not always of oppressive exploitation, but free to decide for themselves what manner of government they could assume. Having arrived at the dignity of nationhood, these newer states have wished for recognition. Our response is presently quick and official recognition is afforded.

Another signal indication of their newfound freedom has been their acceptance as members of the United Nations. Here we are involved also for we have welcomed them into the comity of free nations.

Again, we are involved, for as members of the free world community it has been our policy to assist in creating a solid and enduring basis for cooperation to our common benefit. Since 1958 we have enunciated a much more clearly defined foreign policy than before; namely, recognition of the just aspirations, interests and drives of peoples heretofore denied the fullest expression of such aspirations.

Again a word of caution. We are not trying to supersede the former colonial influences, rather we hope to enhance, expand, and assist wherever the former metropolitan governments have encouraged the just aspirations of their formerly dependent peoples. France and England especially are spending large sums in Africa that will help their previously subordinate peoples attain viable economies. Former overlords have emerged as friends bent on granting necessary aid. The French fides funds and the British colonial development and welfare funds are powerful instruments toward the establishment of basic development plans. We are involved in this aid. Increasingly as justification arises for diversified programs and development we are standing ready with our technical know-how and machinery to supply immediately some of the most pressing of their basic requirements.

We are involved because it is to our own interest that we give the new African countries a helping hand in their evolution toward responsible nationhood.

We are involved because the Sino-Soviet bloc has begun a drive to entice the newer governments by immense offers of aid, trade agreements and assistance in various fields. The Communists have been quick to capitalize on unsatisfied needs, expressed wants, and lack of certain facilities. By spectacular efforts in certain countries they have succeeded in enticing some of the more flamboyant politicians to state that Russia is their best friend. Sometimes we have had to be more responsive in extending temporary assistance because of Soviet blandishments and offers to some of the more impressionable leaders. We are involved because our aid should never be merely in response or opposition to Soviet aid. Neither should it be in competition. At best such response is only temporary.

France and Britain have long-term assistance projects. Maybe it is time for us to reappraise our aid efforts in Africa, to satisfy some needs not because we are placed on the spot by importunate demands from political leaders or in response to Russian counteroffers. Rather our aid should be offered only after deep and searching study has been made, as by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Here I would suggest that the State Department invite responsible commercial and industrial leaders with interests in Africa to form themselves into an official consultative committee on Africa to advise our governmental study groups.

We are involved in Africa as a strategic base in the support of the free world. This concerns bases for supersonic aircraft, missile tracking stations, meteorological observation posts, and harbors for refueling, repair, and transition. Now that international struggles may take place on African soil it is to our interest to have nations friendly to us because their and our survival interests coincide.

We are involved because of common bonds of population. One-tenth of our own people here are descended from involuntary immigrants from Africa. There is an affinity between our colored citizens and Africans. Africans seem to be particularly interested in finding out how their brethren in the United States are being treated in a free democracy.

But again a word of caution. We are not involved only with the black man. We are also involved with the white man—the white man who brought about the new revolution in Africa; first, by starting its economic exploitation and development; second, making the continent habitable for both black and white; third, educating the black man; and, fourth, in many areas giving him a responsible share in government. What about the other white men who regard Africa as their home? Must they be sold down the river, as it were? Europe will not allow that—nor can we afford to do it. The white men brought law and order and he intends that those who take over also follow codes of law for all citizens and safeguarding the rights of all.

We are deeply involved because our actions in race relations, on segregation and on various forms of discrimination or our own so-called apartheid policies can have profound repercussions in our future political relationships with African nations. As the leader of those nations fighting for the rights of man, the success of our overtures to African nations may depend in large measure on the success of our efforts to overcome discrimination based on race, color, and creed here at home.

We are involved because we cannot assume the former colonialist views on the superiority or at least the dominance of one race over another. Our domestic policies must be enlightened so as to engender confidence in our leadership among the dark-skinned people of the world.

We are involved with Africa because we need her raw materials. Among these are cotton, coffee, cocoa, rubber, pyrethrum, sisal, timber, diamonds, gold, bauxite, copper, cobalt, chrome, and iron ore. International commodity agreements for some of these products may be essential not only on the basis of price, but also of supply and demand. We agree that the African workman who picks coffee or pyrethrum or cotton, who digs copper or gold, who cuts lumber or grows peanuts should have more than a mere subsistence wage.

We are deeply involved in trade and tariff considerations with those formerly British and French territories that may join the European Common Market and the European free trade area. Presently our trading totals with Africa are not large, but they may diminish unless statesmanlike negotiations are undertaken on a broad reciprocal basis.

We are involved because our agricultural know-how and productive facilities are the best in the world and Africa needs both. We can supply agronomists, seed, cattle, soil and water experts to help undernourished Africa stimulate its production of nourishing foods, and so make possible an increase in its per capita calorie intake. Irrigation, reclamation, rehabilitation of poor and misused soils, scientific crop rotation, introduction of productive farming methods, new seeds, timber exploitation, insecticides, and other aspects for the supply of sufficient food for poorly fed Africa are areas where we can help. It is still true that an empty stomach is not conducive to the indoctrination of democratic principles.

We are involved in Africa's health. Many of the finest mission hospitals and industrial clinics throughout Africa were started by Amercans. Our nurses, doctors, and sanitary experts can help rid Africa of crippling leprosy, yaws, sleeping sickness, malaria, bilharbia, liver, fluke, and other tropical and debilitating diseases. In tropical Africa practically everone is unwell from the day of his birth to his death. This prevents him from doing too much about his poverty or his ignorance.

No one will deny that we are deeply involved in Africa's literacy and educational problems. In cooperation with African governments our new Agency for International Development is making increasing sums available for varied types of training, and teachings in such areas as medicine, agriculture, public health, fiscal administration; and for other types of necessary educational facilities. Our Government agencies and many of our great universities are participating in these educative programs in Ghana, Nigeria, the Congo, Uganda, Kenya, Tanganyika, Southern Rhodesia and many other areas. We are assisting in the start of several universities and training colleges. But much more remains to be done.

We are being increasingly involved in the requests for dedicated young men and women of varied skills to be sent to Africa through the new Peace Corps. In fact, so many are the requests for assistance that we are finding it hard to get the educated type of young people asked for.

We are involved with the newer leaders of Africa. Several of them have been educated in this country, others have visited here or come over under various grants. They have met our leaders, discussed some of their great problems with us, such as the exchange of students, foreign aid, investment and trade. We Americans had not even heard of most of the new African leaders 5 years ago, yet—now they have become familiar to many of us. Just listen to this list: Luthull, Nkomo, Kaunda, Banda, Nyerera, Mboya, Kanyatta, Kasavubu, Tshome, Mobutu, Kiano, Ngala, Olympia, Nhrumah, Toure, Balewa, Awolowe, Azkiwe, Wachuku, Margai and many, many others. These are the new leaders, each a distinct personality but all driving ahead toward complete independence for their own nations. The African bloc in the United Nations is formidable; they may have little by which to enforce their demands but their combined vote is powerful. What is most important is that the world at least listens while they present their case.

We are involved in international communism and African nationalism. We know from experience, especially from happenings in the Congo how under very active Russian guidance the aggressive Sino-Soviet bloc is now directing a subtle effort toward influencing the burgeoning African nationalist independence movements. Naturally, our State Department has been cognizant of this problem facing all newly independent areas, and not merely those in Africa. Former Secretary Dulles stated that newly created nations face a particularly formidable task. In Africa, especially, as they seem disinclined toward alineing themselves either to left or right, they have been marked out by international communism as special prey. It is classic Communist doctrine, enunciated by Lenin, that communism should initially stimulate "nationalism" in order to break the ties between colonized areas and the colonial [metropolitan] areas. Then communism should move in to "amalgamate" the newly independent peoples into the "Communist bloc."

It is especially notworthy that the diversified Soviet tactics employed in Africa today are designed to promote identification with emerging nationalist elements and also to further reduce Western influence in the newly independent or still emerging states by rapidly establishing political and cultural relations and by signing economic and trade agreements. What should concern our statesmen, is to prevent a transition from colonialism to the harsh dictatorship of international communism, with at best a brief interlude of precarious independence.

That is why we are vitally involved in the Congo. It is not so much at the moment the assistance to oust an already-established and alleged Communist group, but rather to forestall the establishment of such a Communist beachhead. The Congo must be unified in a federal state or it will disintegrate into various parts, many subject to Communist subversion. We are similarly involved in Angola. We do not wish to deny the rights of our NATO friends. Maybe the time will come when Portugal will put Angola and Mozambique under U.N. trusteeship.

As noted in the beginning, it is our national expression of interest in the self-determination of peoples that should be stressed. We have to restress our basic faith in the right and capacity of the new national entities to govern themselves; even if they seem to follow a form of government that appears to be foreign to our ideas of how a democracy should be constituted. We not only have to maintain our faith in that expression of free government, but we should firmly resolve to help the new nations to solve their problems in freedom.

However, I also feel that we cannot stand idly by if we should see any one party subverting the nation with Communist help. We must stress our responsibility not to let that possibility arise. It is our responsibility to exercise every influence possible in and out of the U.N. for a viable democratic form of government. Whether Communist interpenetration in Africa labor unions, youth groups, and nationalist organizations will increase depends largely upon the attitude of the West or free world. Should the West falter in its determination and its ability to show steady progress in problems which concern our relations with Africa, the Communist exploitation will prove more and more successful.

In touching on these various phases of our involvement in Africa the question arises as to what part the United States must play in Africa in the future?

It is very easy to assume a prophetic stance, make majestic pronouncements and hope for the best. This I am disinclined to do. There are certain imperatives for us as a nation. Briefly they are:

1. We must avoid an arms race in Africa. Our concern should be that internecine warfare be eliminated and to prevent power buildups from taking place.

2. We must see to it that the Sino-Soviet bloc does not build up the military potential of some of their friends in Africa. The

interjection of the cold war into Africa must be avoided.

3. Our support of the United Nations and its effective instrumentalities must be increased. This includes a U.N. police force to step in to create order, such as is happening in the Congo. Impartial U.N. intervention for order but not conquest is essential. African leaders understand this and support our stand.

4. The United States speaks for the rights of men. This means that Africans expect us to condemn racial discrimination policies in Africa. Our great influence must be exerted to see that justice is done. Our own policy toward minority groups in this country must be enlightened and just.

5: We have to support Africa's desires for trained personnel. The vast cadre of former colonial administrators and civil servants must be expanded to meet the dynamic requirements of our jet age. We must supplement the efforts of other industrialized nations. Above all we must work through the United Nations to supply administrative and technical personnel to African governments and to train indigenous people to run their own countries.

6. No matter how large our unilateral assistance to individual African countries, we must continue to work through the United Nations technical assistance programs and the special fund. Experts should be recruited internationally to assist in planning and executing programs in health, education, transportation, communications, industrial development, and other fields. If the Soviets refuse their participation in this international cooperation then African nations will note who their real friends are.

7. We should keep a hands-off policy in the internal affairs of the new African nations.

8. We must stress again and again, in the United Nations and elsewhere our deep interest in the orderly and peaceful evolution of the African countries. This includes the rights of minorities, black or white, racial equality, and equal opportunities for all.

9. In the orderly development of economic evolution, miracles can scarcely occur overnight. Such development takes time, men, means, and judgment. We can assist but the initiative must come from the new African nations themselves.

In summary, may I say that as Africa is busily engaged in refashioning her image, and as a new vibrant, dynamic and politically articulate Africa evolves and begins to take her stand on the world stage, the United States must also recognize the challenges of the hour in our relationship with Africa as a whole. These are equality, justice, mutual understanding, partnership and forbearance. Africa is knocking on our door like the famous mailman. If we do not listen and open the door I wonder if the postman will ring again. I am sure you will agree with me that the answer lies in our response at the present time to Africa's insistent knocking.

Bringing American Culture to the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of our most famous New York personalities will shortly be visting the Soviet Union in cooperation with the American National Theater and Academy and the Department of State.

Mr. Earl Wrightson, one of our Nation's finest performers, will shortly become an integral part of our country's people-to-people program, but his main objective in a concert tour of the Soviet Union will be one that has long been overlooked by other personalities, as well as by many of our own officials. Heretofore they have visited, primarily, the larger cities, particularly Moscow. Mr. Wrightson's tour will, of course, include the large cities, but concentration will be on the small outlying districts where the people of Russia themselves can hear the music of America and see an American perform.

Mr. Wrightson and his distinguished costar, Miss Lois Hunt, formerly of the Metropolitan Opera, are well known to the Members of Congress, particularly because of their most admirable recent appearances at the Shoreham Hotel here. In the upcoming weeks they will be guests on the "Bell Telephone Hour" and the "Voice of Firestone" on television.

What is of particular interest here is the fact that Mr. Wrightson, in volunteering to visit the Soviet Union, is paying his own way. This is not a tour that the Government will sponsor financially. Mr. Wrightson is such a success that he can well afford to pay his own way. What is important is that he volunteered to do so at his own volition. This seems to me to be a step in the right direction. If more of our equally famous personalities and equally talented stars were to take this step, our cultural program with the Soviet Union would be increased a thousandfold and would be of immeasurable help in bringing our culture and way of life to the people of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Wrightson and his company are to be congratulated for their thoughtfulness and patriotism.

One Way To Perk Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly emphasized the practicality of removing the wartime imposed excise taxes as as long overdue form of tax reduction. This type of tax reduction would be a practical stimulant to the economy.

I am pleased to note considerable editorial opinion concerning this view, and submit for the RECORD an editorial entitled "One Way To Perk Sales" from the La Grange Citizen, La Grange, Ill., of August 16, 1962, which effectively presents the case.

The editorial follows:

ONE WAY TO PERK SALES

President Kennedy has stated his opposition to a tax cut in 1962. Although as a person this editorial writer would welcome, as would anyone, a reduction in taxes, it was an illusion to believe that taxpayers can escape paying the bill.

As a comment, I accept with skepticism the President's promise that there could be a tax cut in 1963. This sort of prediction would require for fulfillment the election of the "right minded" Congressmen and Senators this coming November. Campaign ammunitions is what the 1963 tax-cut promise should be termed.

There is a tax cut which is long overdue, and although it seemingly would benefit but a few actually would benefit many. This is the elimination, or reduction, of the Federal excise taxes introduced during the war years and which have fastened on the ship of state impeding progress as a coating of barnacles do to a real ship.

These taxes on toiletries, handbags, cosmetics, and other so-called luxury items were adopted to discourage purchase of these items, as much as to increase the Government revenue. It is logical to believe that if they did discourage buying during the war, rescinding them at this time would encourage buying.

Joseph T. Meek, president of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, has been a diligent and energetic battler to have the excise taxes repealed. If he had the support which his continuing campaign deserves the tax would have been rescinded long ago. If every time a shopper resisted buying a handbag, a bit of jewelry, or bought a lower priced perfume or cosmetic, because of the tax, sat down and wrote his Congressman the tax would have been off the books long ago.

Also, every storekeeper and clerk involved in the sale of items subject to the tax should carry on a constant campaign against it. I realize the bad sales psychology of reminding the customer about the tax, but it would be better to lose a sale now to gain many sales in the future.

In a letter to Senator DOUGLAS commending him on his consistent stand to have the excise taxes revoked, Meek suggests ways to make legislators and other Government officials aware of false conceptions regarding the excise.

"Just how much is obtained from these levies which represent such a deterrent to purchases, when a 10-percent reduction in price over such a wide variety of goods would have such a stimulating effect on the economy?" Meeks asks the Senator.

"The Senate committee should ask exactly what it costs to collect these taxes. We feel certain the cost in money when matched by the cost of interpretation, the consistent spending of funds to make the regulations partly understandable, and the loss of funds through income curtailment otherwise reflected in income tax returns, would actually be more than the amount collected," Meek points out.

A Worthwhile Cultural Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the city of New York, the activities of our entire State are of interest to me. A project has recently come to my attention, undertaken by our neighbors in Long Island, the citizens of Nassau County. I make record of it now, for the project is of such interest that other cities and communities may well want to put it into effect in their own areas.

County Executive Eugene Nickerson, one of the Nation's most able civic administrators, has just appointed the noted industrialist, Mr. Norman Blankman, as chairman of the Long Island Cultural Center. This is a nonpolitical committee composed of outstanding citizens of Long Island. They are banding together, under Mr. Blankman's leadership, to produce what will become one of the most unusual projects of its kind in the country.

Slated to begin this summer, they are forming their own symphony orchestra, their own pops concert band, a huge summer festival which will equal the one held annually in the city of New York. They are organizing their own ballet and putting together one of the most valuable and extensive collections of famous paintings and art work in the country.

The citizens of Long Island and of Nassau County are fortunate, indeed, to have men and women of this caliber ready to serve their community. Mr. Nickerson's forthright appointment and his demand that this committee and this idea remain nonpolitical in every way is certainly to be admired and commended. Mr. Blankman's tireless efforts to put his idea into successful being is, likewise, commendable.

May I take this opportunity to wish our neighbors in Long Island continued success in this most worthwhile project.

Hometown Pharmacy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has issued a directive to end on September 30 of this year the 16-year-old program of handling the administrative details in filling veterans' prescriptions through State Pharmaceutical Associations. This program, which is known as the hometown pharmacy program, was enacted by Congress in 1946 to provide convenient and prompt medication to veterans with service-connected disability. It has been highly successful. And judging from the fact that in California the cost of administering this program is 31.3 cents per prescription as opposed to a cost of 48 to 70 cents in the welfare program, it has undoubtedly meant a savings to our Government as well.

I have received the following resolution from the California Pharmaceutical Association opposing termination of this program. I call this to the attention of my colleagues as an expression of opinion from an industry which is most important to my district, to California, and to the well-being of veterans throughout the United States.

RESOLUTION NO. 10—VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOMETOWN PHARMACY PROGRAM

Whereas the Veterans' Administration hometown pharmacy program has been in operation for approximately 16 years and has been beneficial to the veteran, the U.S. Government, the taxpayer, and the health profession; and

Whereas the veteran has been provided with immediate service for his health needs in his community with a free choice of practitioner at a minimal expense in administration; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has expressed satisfaction with the services provided by the California Pharmaceutical Association; and

Whereas the California Pharmaceutical Association is not a participant in pricing arrangements but merely performs administrative functions as a clearinghouse for its members in California at an economical savings to the U.S. Government and taxpayers; and

Whereas we have been notified that this successful arrangement for a 16-year period is being terminated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California Pharmaceutical Association in convention assembled this 27th day of June, 1962, at the St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., urge the continuance of the contractual agreements between the Veterans' Administration and the California Pharmaceutical Associations; and be it further

Resolved, That all Veterans' Organizations, Members of Congress, the U.S. Attorney General, and other health professions be appraised of the proposed changes which may result in the deterioration of the services to our veterans in that it may restrict his freedom of choice of pharmacy; and be it further

Resolved, That an analysis be made of the hometown pharmacy program as it now exists in California compared to that which would be required if individual contracts should be made with each pharmacy and to determine the effect termination of this agreement will have upon convenient pharmaceutical services to Veterans' Administration beneficiaries.

The Great Lakes Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring attention of all Members of the Congress to an excellent speech, entitled "The Great Lakes Today," delivered by an outstanding public servant, Brig. Gen. T. DeF. Rogers, north-central division engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

In very interesting form General Rogers describes what is being planned for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin and what has already been accomplished in the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, such as the connecting channels projects, the hydroelectric power projects and water supply. It has been my pleasure to be associated with a great deal of the legislation authorizing the work which General Rogers describes in so lucid a fashion. I am very pleased with the competent and expeditious way in which the Corps of Engineers has carried out the dictates of this legislation—an achievement resulting in large part from the industry and foresight of men like General Rogers. I again recommend the speech which follows as an excellent progress report on the activities of the Corps of Engineers in the Great Lakes Basin:

THE GREAT LAKES TODAY

(Remarks by Brig. Gen. T. DeF. Rogers, division engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, north central, at semiannual meeting of Great Lakes Commission at Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, Mich., July 24, 1962)

Chairman Van Ness, members of the Great Lakes Commission, I'm very happy to be with you here today not just because of the pleasant associations and the beautiful setting, but most of all for the opportunity to talk with you on the activities of the Corps of Engineers so closely interrelated with your objectives. I assure you that the entire Corps of Engineers is and will remain grateful for the help and understanding that you have given us, and is and will remain proud of its association with your commission.

Mr. Fast in his letter to me required of me a progress report on our lake level study. This I shall give you. However, the entire problem that we in the corps are dealing with on the Great Lakes has always seemed so dramatic to me that I think of it sometimes as a great drama. Therefore in my talk this morning I would first like to set the stage, and then describe our leading actor, then talk a bit about the requirements of the script that we have been and are writing, and then describe to you the gaps and shortcomings in the existing script.

So now let me set the stage. For many, many decades the goal of the Corps of Engineers has been to develop basinwide, comprehensive, long-range master plans for each and every major basin in the United States. What would such a plan be? First, it would give full consideration to every square foot of land and every cubic foot of water in the basin. Second, it would consider its impact on other basins and on the Nation as a whole. Third, it would recognize the problems peculiar to subbasins. Finally and most important it would consider and reconcile the interests of all water users. In the broadest sense I think that is all of us.

Perhaps by three examples I can be more explicit. The Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River Basin had much of the character of a basinwide comprehensive master plan giving as it did consideration to navigation, power, irrigation, and flood control. Another example, historically most interesting, is a plan worked out at Washington's home at Mount Vernon in 1785 (3 years before the Constitution) between representatives of Virginia and Maryland, a plan primarily related to navigation of the Potomac-Chesapeake Waterway. The most recent example I can give you is the Delaware River plan which is now under active consideration by the Congress. This plan was developed under the initiative of the Corps of Engineers but with many great contributions by other Federal, State, municipal, and private agencies. It is comprehensive in every sense of the word and almost certainly will result in a pact between several States. It is something of a pattern for what we are trying to do in all major basins.

President Kennedy's administration has given great impetus to the concept of basinwide comprehensive master planning. Indeed, a timetable has been established for completing these plans by 1970. Moreover, the President has approved a new policy on the formulation of projects, a policy applicable to all Federal agencies. Further, the President has appointed a water resources council which must report to him in the near future on how to best implement this concept. Finally, the fiscal year 1963 budget contains a very significant amount of money to actually initiate basinwide master planning. The north-central division will play a large part in starting this program.

So much for the scene. Now let us look at the leading actor or interest to you and me—the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. Here is truly a great actor. The Great Lakes in total represent the greatest body of fresh water on the surface of the earth. The drop from Lake Superior to the Atlantic Ocean is over 600 feet. In general the area of land which drains into the lakes is a narrow strip bounding the lakes, but the area served economically is so large I hesitate to define it. The special interests of water users are great in number, tremendous in importance, and frequently conflicting.

There is our great actor. He is like none other in the world, but like all actors has his own peculiarities and limitations.

Now let us consider the script for our great actor. Here I will talk about what we have already done and about what is reasonably defined in our present planning to make our actor do as we wish. The script must satisfy many requirements. Let us take them up one by one.

First of all let us consider the requirements of navigation. The seaway, by the joint efforts of Canada and the United States, is complete and operating. The connecting channels project, so closely related to the seaway, is nearing completion. Last year I promised you that by this month (July 1962) we would have a 27-foot depth available in all of the channels. We have kept that promise. There remains to be done some work in the downbound Livingstone Channel, the removal of certain shoals and reefs which reasonably can be bypassed today, and the construction of compensating works in the St. Clair River. This latter item must await international agreement, negotiation of which is proceeding satisfactorily. Intimately related to the seaway and the connecting channels is our Great Lakes harbors program. This program, important as it is, involves too much detail for me to discuss them at this time. However, I have obtained copies of an excellent article on this program which appeared in the May 31, 1962, issue of the Engineering News-Record. These copies are here available.

The next requirement of our script involves hydroelectric power. I'm sure you know of the great Canadian plants in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence—Beauharnois in particular, operated by Hydro-Quebec. You also know of the two big plants in the international section of the St. Lawrence operated by Ontario-Hydro and the Power Authority of the State of New York. The same two agencies operate great plants at Niagara Falls. On St. Mary's River, the outlet to Lake Superior, three hydroplants exist. Subject to possible refinement in the regulation schemes, these plants have a capacity to generate practically all of the power in the system available to the United States.

Another possible requirement of our script might be irrigation. However, within the foreseeable future there seems very limited need for irrigation, and there seems little possibility of satisfying further requirements assuming no further diversions from the system.

Another requirement of our script, and perhaps an overriding requirement, involves water supply—both as regards quantity and quality. I must mention here that the question of diversions from the lake system is now before the Supreme Court of the United States. To the extent that the United States is concerned, the Department of Justice is watching after the Federal interests. Obviously, therefore, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss the pros and cons of this question at this time.

As regards the quantity of water available in the Great Lakes, it may seem to many as greatly in excess of any conceivable need for water supply. This can be true only if the good quality of the water is maintained. In this regard the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, more specifically the Public Health Service, is engaged in a long-range study, part of which has already been funded, the objective of which is to determine what need be done to prevent pollution of one of the most important resources in the world—the fresh waters of the Great Lakes.

It may interest you to know that the Corps of Engineers is a very active partner in this program. Working as what may be described as a contractor for the Public Health Service, we, the Corps, have designed, built, and are operating a pilot model of the extremely complex low-velocity current metering equipment for measuring deep water currents in the Great Lakes. The corps is also furnishing to the Public Health Service voluminous records of levels and flows, data accumulated by the corps over the last 100 years. We expect to contribute more and more to this Public Health Service program in the future.

Another requirement of our script is related to flood control. The problems here fall into two categories: (1) Damage due to high lake levels coupled with storms and wave action, and (2) damage due to flooding on the tributaries which feed into the lakes. Our lake level study has dealt and will deal with the first category, and our local flood control studies authorized by Congress will deal with the second category.

Another requirement of our script is that it give due consideration to conservation. Only for the purpose of this talk, I shall consider the problems of fish and wildlife, beach erosion, and protection of riparian shorelines as problems of conservation. Our fish and wildlife activities in the past have been largely, but not exclusively, a matter of coordination with other agencies, Federal, State, and local. Our activities on beach erosion control have been more direct, resulting in several Corps of Engineer projects on the Great Lakes. The problem of preserving riparian shorelines is being dealt with directly in our lake level study.

The last requirement of our script is one of such growing importance that few people, if any, can today recognize its magnitude. This is the requirement for recreation. The corps has always been active in this field as evidenced by the harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes and the increasing number of small boat harbors. In addition, many of our structures and reservations have been provided with public access facilities permitting their enjoyment by millions of Americans.

Part of the script is the lake levels study. Confining myself now to engineering terms, our lake level study has for its purpose the development of plans of regulation that will best serve all of the many interests. Regulating the levels and flows of a great body of water is simple in concept but complex in execution. Please consider your bathtub. If you can at your discretion control the amount of water that flows into the tub, and can also at your discretion control the amount of water that flows out of the tub, you can then at your discretion control the level or the depth of the water in the tub. This simple concept is the foundation of all plans of regulation. Necessarily it becomes complicated by consideration of such things as evaporation, the movement of the earth's crust, manmade diversions, the unpredictability of rainfall and snowfall, the unpredictability of thaws, variations in runoff factors, costs as compared with benefits, fish and wildlife problems, and conflict of the several interests concerned.

Now let us start with Lake Superior and work downstream considering our lake level study as we proceed.

For Lake Superior there exists an International Board of Control, which board has developed and follows a plan of regulation. For Lake Superior we cannot predict with great precision, not far in advance, just how much water will flow into the lake. However, we can control with great precision the amount that flows out of Lake Superior. This is so because the channels in St. Marys River have been enlarged to a capacity greater that that which existed in nature, and because of the several manmade structures placed across this river which permit us at our discretion to change the outflows over a great range. We can therefore today control at our discretion and within reasonable limits, the levels of Lake Superior. Our present plan of regulation is a good one but not necessarily the best, and part of our present effort on the lake level study is to devise a better one—one which would afford benefits to Lake Michigan and Lake Huron without detriment to Lake Superior. I'm sure that you recognize that any change in the present plan of regulation for Lake Superior would eventually require international cooperation.

Coming downstream, let us consider Lake Michigan and Lake Huron as a single body of water—which from a hydrologic point of view they are. In this case that part of the inflow from St. Marys River is accurately known and predictable for a month or so in advance. However, over a long period of time, St. Marys River contributes only about a third of the total inflow. The remainder of the inflow cannot be predicted with precision. The outflow from these two lakes is through the St. Clair River-Detroit River system. This outflow system has a natural control, a natural bottleneck, which today we cannot influence at our discretion. We do recognize that because of the several navigation projects in the St. Clair-Detroit River system we have increased the natural outflow, thereby effecting a significant lowering of the levels of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. This we must compensate for, and part of the connecting channels project involves the compensating works as I mentioned earlier. Even so, completion of these compensating works will not permit us at our discretion to control the outflows from Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. They will merely correct a deficiency which we have created in the interests of navigation. At least in that sense they are beneficial to Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. At the present time our lake level study gives no reason for hoping that a discretionary control structure plus the necessary provision for increased channel capacity in the St. Clair-Detroit River system is economically feasible. Nevertheless we continue to seek such a solution.

Now come downstream with us to Lake Erie. Here the inflows cannot be controlled at our discretion but are predictable a month or so in advance. The outflows through the Niagara River system can neither be controlled at our discretion nor predicted with great accuracy. The reason for this is that the actual control of the outflow from Lake Erie is that of nature—a bottleneck section in the upper reaches of the Niagara River. In this case we are concentrating much effort of our lake level study on the possibility of enlarging the bottleneck created by nature, constructing a gated dam by which we can at our discretion control the outflows, and developing a plan of regulation which will benefit navigation, riparian shoreline interests, and the hydropower interests at Niagara Falls. Such a plan of regulation would of course be subject to international coordination and must give extremely careful consideration to preserving the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls. In addition it must be coordinated with our survey on the "all-American" canal.

Finally on our journey downstream we come to Lake Ontario. We can reasonably predict a month or so in advance the inflows out of Lake Erie. These inflows amount to about 85 percent of the total supply to Lake Ontario. The remaining 15 percent of the inflows are difficult to predict. The outflows on the other hand can be controlled with great precision and at our discretion because of the manmade structures across the St. Lawrence River in the vicinity of Messena and because of the manmade increased capacity of the channels through to Galop Rapids reach. This discretionary control is very strictly dictated by the terms of a plan of regulation, recently revised, and called 1958–C. This plan of regulation, having the approval of the International Joint Commission and both the American and Canadian Governments cannot be changed except by international coordination. It is a good plan. It may not be the best. The International St. Lawrence River Board of Control is constantly endeavoring to refine this plan in the interests of navigation both upstream and downstream, in the interests of power generation both Canadian and American, and in the interests of riparian owners both upstream and downstream. This plan, of course, can be altered only through international coordination.

All of the features of the lake level study that I have mentioned so far should be completed by the end of this calendar year.

Now let us ask, What more need be done to develop a truly comprehensive basinwide master plan for the Great Lakes? In other words, what are the gaps and shortcomings of our script?

This question can best be answered by going back and reviewing the requirements. First of all consider navigation. The work that has been done and the work for which our planning is reasonably underway (this includes the lake level study, the new Poe lock, and the survey for the All American Canal) should serve the major requirements of navigation based on the best predictions we can make at this time. The same is true as regards power, keeping in mind that our several plans of regulation are subject to constant refinement. There is no foreseeable requirement for extensive irrigation assuming that no further diversions are permitted. It is when we consider water quality that we recognize a shortcoming in our present planning. The present studies of the Public Health Service will almost certainly lead to a requirement for water quality planning far beyond that which we have done or are doing. The requirements of flood control planning are being met in part by the lake level study and in part on a piecemeal basis by our surveys of local areas on certain tributaries. However, the sum of these pieces does not equal the whole and our comprehensive master plan must consider flood control planning on all tributaries. As regards planning for conservation, the corps has been active in cooperation, but probably must become more active in coordination. As regards planning for recreation the corps is surely moving in the right direction, but I question whether we are moving fast enough. Finally there is a requirement which I have not so far mentioned explicitly—and that is the requirement to integrate the entire plan so as to best reconcile the conflicts that are bound to arise between the special requirements that I've already discussed.

In short, we already have many important pieces of a good master plan, but we don't have all of the pieces and they haven't been put together.

It has been a pleasure to be with you and I am most grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to present a progress report on the activities of the Corps of Engineers in the Great Lakes Basin. I know we can count on your help in the development of the basinwide comprehensive master plan for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

Thank you.

Crusade Against Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, David Schulte, a distinguished New Yorker who has served his city and State in public life for many years and who now holds office on the city's board of correction, has long been a leader in combating crime and corruption in all walks of life. He has recently returned from an extensive trip to Europe where he studied the elements of crime and its effect on the societies of other countries and how their experiences can be put to use in solving our problems here in the United States.

Mr. Schulte also brought back with him an unusual idea which is now being put into effect in the city of New York. It is the "Citizens Crusade Against Narcotics," a program that is enrolling every interested citizen in a huge organization spread throughout the city with each member acting as a watcher, keeping an alert eye for the dope pusher and peddler as well as for the addict himself. It is hoped that every citizen of New York will eventually become a member of this crusade to help wipe out this scourge.

Mr. Schulte has asked the advice of such distinguished personalities as Mr. Kingsbury-Smith, publisher of the New York Journal American, a newspaper which many months ago was instrumental in beginning an all-out attack on the narcotics problem. The Journal American and Mr. Kingsbury-Smith should be commended for their forthrightness and distinguished public service.

I am also happy to serve on the board of advisers of this crusade along with other public officials of the city of New York. The crusade is in its beginning and may prove a most effective way of helping to stamp out this menace. Mr. Schulte should be commended as well for his courage in this undertaking.

I take note, also, of the Special Conference on Narcotics which the White House has scheduled for September 27 and 28. I hope the Attorney General, who is serving as General Chairman of this event, will make it a point to call upon Mr. Schulte to be present and to be a member of this distinguished Conference. His experience will be invaluable.

The Public Works Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the public works employment bill, H.R. 10113, will come before the House next Tuesday and give us all a chance to cast a clear-cut vote on the problem of unemployment and show whether or not we are willing to do something to help our 4 million jobless men and women.

This bill is designed to provide a prompt expansion of employment in those areas suffering from the most serious economic problems. It would do this by authorizing the appropriation of $900 million to build Federal projects which have been authorized by the Congress and to make 50-percent grants for a wide range of local community facilities. These grants could be used to help finance water and sewer facilities, public buildings, streets and sidewalks, and in fact practically any local construction project except schools provided that the project, in the language of the bill, "meets an essential public need."

This bill will have a prompt effect on the economy because of the great number of projects fully planned and ready to go in eligible areas. An indication of this backlog is given by the list of local public works which have been planned or are now being planned under the 702 program of advances for public works planning. There are hundreds of projects under that program which could be aided under the public works bill. One of the great advantages of H.R. 10113 as an economic stimulant is that it not only provides a substantial amount of employment and provides it promptly but at the same time adds to our national wealth by creating urgently needed public facilities.

I am particularly pleased that a large number of projects under this program are in my own State of Alabama and elsewhere throughout the South. As the table below shows, the benefits of this bill would not be confined to a few large cities but would be spread throughout the country in small towns and rural areas as well as cities of every size. I would like to point out that the benefits of this bill are not confined solely to the areas in which the projects will be undertaken. Through the demand for construction materials and equipment which these projects will require and through the spending and respending of the additional income created by the bill, the entire country will benefit.

Mr. Speaker, the projects planned under the 702 program represent only a small part of the great number of facilities which could be aided under this bill but it is clear evidence that there is a backlog of projects which will make it possible to create employment quickly. Naturally, it is not certain that each and every one of these projects will receive grants under the public works bill. For example, it may be some of them are too large to meet the requirement that the bulk of the employment be created within 12 months though even in the case of these larger projects, it is often possible to separate them so that some part can be aided by grants. In my judgment it is safe to assume that the overwhelming majority of these projects would be fully eligible and I insert the list in the RECORD:

PROGRAM OF ADVANCES FOR PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING

Projects planned or being planned in areas eligible for aid under H.R. 10113, June 30, 1962

ALABAMA

City	County	Type of project	Estimated total cost
Gadsden	Etowah	Sewer	$4,500,000
Haleyville	Winston	do	612,000
Tuskegee	Macon	do	365,000
Collinsville	De Kalb	do	167,000
Athens	Limestone	do	375,000
Arab	Marshall	Water	792,000
Chickasaw	Mobile	Sewer	385,945
Do	do	do	240,579
Mobile	do	Water	3,809,800
Do	do	do	6,297,700
Bayau La Batre	do	Sewer	792,334
Birmingham	Jefferson	do	6,875,000
Do	do	Grade separation	5,000,000
Glencoe	Etowah	Sewer	115,000
Jasper	Walker	do	123,000
Ragland	St. Clair	do	55,000
Oneonta	Blount	Streets	386,794
Phenix	Russell	Sewer	320,408
Vincent	Shelby	do	110,171
Repton	Conecuh	Water	48,500
Selma	Dallas	Sewer	383,000
Do	do	do	224,000
Do	do	do	148,000
Luverne	Crenshaw	Street	73,967
Do	do	do	71,259

ALASKA

Cordova		Sewer	$1,000,000
Fairbanks		Water	1,796,000
Do		do	6,000,000
Kenai		Sewer	424,000
Do		Water	622,000
Kodiak		do	271,000
Nome		do	1,200,000
Seldovia		do	197,000
Cordova		do	314,000
Fairbanks		do	2,380,000
Ketchikan		Power	1,283,440
Kodiak		Sewer	125,050
Seward		Water	375,444
Wrangell		Seawall	160,000

ARIZONA

Eager	Apache	Sewer	$215,127
Springerville	do	do	139,804
Holbrook	Navajo	Public buildings	57,704
Do	do	do	91,815

ARKANSAS

Calico Rock	Izard	Water	$84,000
Do	do	Sewer	195,000
Oxford	do	Water	70,000
Perry	Perry	do	45,000
Ashdown	Little River	Sewer	176,000
Jasper	Newton	Water	100,000
Yellville	Marion	Sewer	130,300

CALIFORNIA

Keys	Stanislaus	Sewer	$200,000
Laytonville	Mendocino	Water	93,000
Turlock	Stanislaus	Sewer	1,525,000
Stockton	San Joaquin	Police station	1,668,050
Do	do	Library	1,038,271
Hollister	San Benito	Sewer	781,000
Coalinga	Fresno	do	300,000
Fresno	do	Storm drains	5,509,000
Santa Monica	Los Angeles	Pedestrian mall	397,000
West Covina	do	Storm drains	257,000
Do	do	do	161,000
Do	do	do	135,000
Montclair	San Bernardino	Sewer	3,273,000
India	Riverside	Grade separation	1,151,000
Carlsbad	San Diego	Sewer	2,090,000
Chula Vista	do	Water	4,169,000
Weaverville	Trinity	Public buildings	270,000
San Diego	San Diego	do	494,123
Willets	Mendocino	Streets	273,371

CONNECTICUT

City	County	Type of project	Estimated total cost
Bristol	Hartford	Municipal building	$1,629,815
Do	do	Flood control	661,500
Norwich	New London	Water	513,250
Simsbury	Hartford	Firehouse addition	31,680

GEORGIA

Clarkesville	Habersham	Water	$280,000
Hartwell	Hart	do	643,605
Lavania	Franklin	do	468,000
Cumming	Forsyth	Sewer	265,000
Macon	Bibb	Coliseum	2,918,000
Warm Springs	Meriweather	Streets	52,498
Do	do	Sewer	39,187
Do	do	Water	19,373
Manchester	do	Library	22,333
Luthersville	do	Water	45,281
Bowman	Elbert	Sewer	56,832
Toccoa	Toccoa	City hall	78,974
Arlington	Early	do	33,000
Davisboro	Washington	Sewer	74,952
Baldwin	Habersham	do	92,610
Blairsville	Union	do	106,990
Royston	Franklin	do	174,446
Do	do	Water	67,072
Clayton	Rabun	Library	63,247
Barien	McIntosh	Water	89,896

HAWAII

Hawaii	Hawaii	Water	$457,340
Do	do	Sewer	747,500

IDAHO

Coeur d'Alene	Kootenai	Hospital	$1,913,000

ILLINOIS

Arthur	Moultrie	Water	$415,000
Lovington	do	Sewer	388,000
Valmeyer	Monroe	Water	179,800
Do	do	Sewer	205,850
Ava	Jackson	do	169,400
Bartelso	Clinton	Water and sewer	81,000
De Sota	Jackson	Sewer	160,000
Lacon	Marshall	do	614,000
Cairo	Alexander	do	694,000
Do	do	do	729,000
Centralia	Marion	Water	1,520,000
Danville	Vermilion	Sewer	860,000

INDIANA

Terre Haute	Vigo	Sewer	$2,826,000
Michigan City	La Porte	do	2,340,000
Cannelton	Perry	do	99,000
Marengo	Crawford	Water	88,600

IOWA

Mystic	Appanoose	Water	$182,000

KANSAS

Pittsburg	Crawford	Storm drains	$2,813,000
Do	do	Police and fire station	94,000

KENTUCKY

Flatwoods	Greenup	Sewer	$838,000
	Floyd	Courthouse	595,000
Prestonburg	do	Sewer	843,000
Hopkinsville	Christian	Municipal building	633,025

PROGRAM OF ADVANCES FOR PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING—Continued

Projects planned or being planned in areas eligible for aid under H.R. 10113, June 30, 1962—Continued

KENTUCKY—Continued

City	County	Type of project	Estimated total cost
Paintsville	Johnson	Sewer	$1,212,000
Clinton	Hickman	do	142,000
Clay City	Powell	Water	175,000
Georgetown	Scott	Sewer	704,000
Hindman	Knott	Water	143,000
Bowling Green	Warren	Sewer	4,346,000
Monticello	Wayne	do	524,357
Hazard	Perry	do	116,600
New Haven	Nelson	do	85,114
Pewee Valley	Oldham	Water	174,661
Earlington	Hopkins	Sewer	169,659
White Plains	do	Water	68,600
Pikeville	Pike	Public buildings	66,650
Glasgow	Barren	Streets	41,382
Sebree	Webster	Sewer	83,252
Irvine	Estill	do	116,412
Do	do	Streets	87,985
Senton	Marshall	Sewer	52,080
Cumberland	Harlan	Water	63,904
Do	do	Sewer	180,426
Somerset	Pulaski	do	456,089
Crofton	Christian	Water	97,000
Irvington	Breckinridge	Sewer	288,968
Paintsville	Johnson	do	370,000

LOUISIANA

Church Point	Acadia	Water	$244,000
Morse	do	do	120,000
Plaucheville	Avoyelles	do	189,000
	do	Hospital	1,465,000
Pine Prairie	Evangeline	Water	107,000
Lafayette	Lafayette	Airport	1,700,000
Do	do	Streets	4,493,000
Do	do	Storm drains	600,000
Do	do	City buildings	500,000
Do	do	Park	250,000
Abbeville	Vermilion	Storm drains	395,000
Delcambre	Vermilion and Iberia	Road	277,000
Do	do	Sewer	450,000
Leesville	Vernon	do	400,000
Leonville	do	Water	93,000
Hammond	Tangipahoa	Streets	380,000
Roseland	do	Sewer	200,000
Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Dock	14,250,000
New Orleans	Orleans	Police facility	8,440,000
Do	do	Storm drains	11,450,000
Do	do	Sewer	14,526,000
Do	do	do	4,399,000
Abbeville	Vermilion	Harbor	1,066,000
Basile	Evangeline	Sewer	460,000
Bogalusa	Washington	Park	139,934
Mamou	do	Water	129,000
Do	do	Sewer	43,354
Provencal	Natchitoches	Gas	85,000
Winnsboro	Franklin	Sewer	465,000
Youngsville	Lafayette	do	175,750
Sunset	St. Landry	do	211,396
Melville	do	do	300,000
Opelousas	do	do	731,000
Hammond	Tangipahoa	Water	575,000
Do	do	Sewer	668,000
Bunkie	Avoyelles	do	18,872
Do	do	Roads	39,573
Do	do	Sewer	110,000
Cottonport	do	do	77,098
Do	do	do	153,550
Do	do	do	27,815
Eunice	St. Landry	do	214,154
Independence	Tangipahoa	Public buildings	24,216
Kaplan	Vermilion	Sewer	257,000
Mansura	Avoyelles	do	98,963
New Orleans	Orleans	Bridges	4,872,993
Bogalusa	Washington	Viaduct	492,676
Opelousas	St. Landry	Sewer	396,198

MAINE

Wiscassett	Lincoln	Sewer	$460,000
Limestone	Aroostook	do	535,000
Do	do	Water	131,000
Millinocketi	Penobscot	Sewer	1,417,000
Calais	Washington	do	600,000
Biddeford	York	do	2,336,000
Sace	do	do	2,448,000
Lubec	Washington	do	58,600
Patton	Penobscot	Water	222,950

MARYLAND

	Dorchester	Water	$430,000
Crisfield	Somerset	Sewer	329,537
Do	do	do	300,000

MASSACHUSETTS

City	County	Type of project	Estimated total cost
Brockton	Plymouth	Water	$2,179,000
Chicopee	Hampden	Sewer	2,986,000
Holyoke	do	Water	2,946,986
Adams	Berkshire	Sewer	3,035,000
Lowell	Middlesex	Fire alarm building	72,100
Do	do	Sidewalks	107,500
Abington	Plymouth	Sewer	306,000
Newburyport	Essex	do	536,000
Dracut	Middlesex	Water	432,600
Do	do	Sewer	279,080
Do	do	do	488,900
Do	do	do	387,700

MICHIGAN

Pentwater	Oceana	Sewer	$139,000
Ishpeming	Marquette	do	297,500
	Macomb	Storm drains	12,335,271
	do	do	5,754,902
	do	do	7,560,301
	do	do	2,690,786
	Oakland	Sewer	16,503,000
Oak Park	do	do	384,417
Pontiac	do	do	2,336,000
Waterford Township	do	Water	12,756,516
Alma	Gratiot	Sewer	600,000
Norton Township	Muskegon	do	2,050,000
Empire	Leelanau	Water	27,000

MINNESOTA

Chisholm	St. Louis	Water	$1,462,000
Cass Lake	Cass	Sewer	128,000

MISSISSIPPI

Tchula	Holmes	Water	$239,000
Potts Camp	Marshall	do	184,000
Bude	Franklin	Sewer	1,900,000
Leland	Washington	do	330,000
Okalona	Chichasaw	Water	156,000
Do	do	Sewer	220,000
Yazoo City	Yazoo	do	1,610,000
Biloxi	Harrison	Water	1,121,000
Bay Springs	Jasper	Sewer	103,400
Shelby	Bolivar	do	99,300
Mize	Smith	Water	26,500
Lexington	Holmes	Streets	99,169
Hazelhurst	Copiah	Sewer	322,688
New Hebron	Lawrence	Water	40,840
Summit	Pike	Sewer	111,771
Shaw	Bolivar	do	120,829
Ruleville	Sunflower	do	105,000
Mound Bayou	Bolivar	Streets	26,390
Dekalb	Kemper	Sewer	86,000
Lo	Simpson	Water	25,000

MISSOURI

Pilot Knob	Iron	Water	$83,358
St. Genevieve	St. Genevieve	Courthouse	603,000
Potosi	Washington	Sewer	116,900

MONTANA

Ronan	Lake	Sewer	$163,000
Hamilton	Ravalli	Storm drains	240,000
Ronan	Lake	Streets	109,144
Do	do	do	83,624

NEVADA

Caliente	Lincoln	Public buildings	$36,400

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic City	Atlantic	City yards	$2,788,973
Englishtown	Monmouth	Water	315,000
Little Silver	do	Sewer	1,590,000
Long Beach Township	Ocean	Water	260,468
Long Branch	Monmouth	City hall	510,000
Passaic	Passaic	Roads	2,825,137
Do	do	Bus terminal	176,370
Do	do	Roads	587,395
Pompton Lakes	do	Sewer	1,725,000
Totowa	do	do	705,900
Do	do	do	233,800

PROGRAM OF ADVANCES FOR PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING—Continued

Projects planned or being planned in areas eligible for aid under H.R. 10113, June 30, 1962—Continued

NEW JERSEY—Continued

City	County	Type of project	Estimated total cost
Wanaque	Passaic	Water	$42,980,000
Wayne Township	do	Sewer	1,929,360
Wildwood	Cape May	Incinerator	500,000
Do	do	do	500,000
Pleasantville	Atlantic	Sewer	731,000
Lakehurst	Ocean	do	428,000
Little Falls	Passaic	do	359,000
Jersey City	Hudson	Administration building.	1,285,000
Paterson	Passaic	Sewer	294,450
Woodbine	Cape May	do	338,577
Milford	Passaic	Townhall	265,000

NEW MEXICO

Central	Grant	Sewer	$205,000
Gallup	McKinley	Airport	1,000,000
Mountainair	Torrence	Road	187,500
Raton	Colfax	do	190,000
Do	do	Sewer	94,000

NEW YORK

Beacon	Dutchess	Incinerator	$523,250
Do	do	Sewer	1,152,000
Newburgh	Orange	Incinerator	830,000
Brasher	St. Lawrence	Sewer	355,000
Chaumont	Jefferson	Water	296,500
Cloversville	Fulton	Sewer	2,194,525
Heuvelton	St. Lawrence	Sewer	400,600
Niskayuna	Schenectady	Sewer	1,640,850
Stockholm	St. Lawrence	Sewer	230,000
Tupper Lake	Franklin	Sewer	997,041
Do	do	Fire station	59,800
Westport	Essex	Sewer	544,000
Jamestown	Chautauqua	Administration building.	2,864,000
Plattsburgh	Clinton	Water	435,000
Norfolk	St. Lawrence		257,000
Jamestown	Chautauqua	Sewer	120,460

NORTH CAROLINA

Henderson	Vance	Sewer	$926,500
Hot Springs	Madison	do	89,000
Spruce Pine	Mitchell	do	461,200
Do	do	Water	300,000
Murphy	Cherokee	Sewer	425,000
Marshall	Madison	do	160,000
Norlina	Warren	do	211,000
Hendersonville	Henderson	do	1,150,696
Tabor City	Columbus	Streets	87,600
Do	Macon	Courthouse	369,000
Do	Columbus	Sewer	71,250
Bryson City	Swain	do	76,225
Do	do	do	101,825
Roxboro	Person	do	128,950
Do	do	Water	86,950
Durham	Durham	do	507,950
Roper	Washington	do	54,670
Elm City	Wilson	Sewer	14,980

OHIO

Ripley	Brown	Sewer	$467,572
Aberdeen	do	Water	280,000
Lorain	Lorain	Bridge	5,144,900
Do	do	Sewer	5,271,200
Zanesville	Muskingum	Water	656,600
North Bend	Hamilton	do	43,800
Do	do	Sewer	86,300
Greenfield	Highland	do	187,100

OKLAHOMA

Wilburton	Latimer	Water	$690,000
Ada	Pontotoc	Sewer	307,658
Do	do	Highways	42,793
Do	do	Sewer	1,035,000
Do	do	do	150,000
Do	do	Highways	26,875
Do	do	do	20,090
Broken Bow	McCurtain	Sewer	149,698
Chocotah	McIntosh	do	135,727
Nowata	Nowata	Highways	36,995
Valliant	McCurtain	Sewer	87,008

OREGON

City	County	Type of project	Estimated total cost
Newport	Lincoln	Water	$241,000
Nelscott	do	Sewer	144,000
Yamhill	Yamhill	do	125,000
Eastside	Coos	do	398,000
Cave Junction	Josephine	do	136,526
Newport	Lincoln	do	575,000
Willamina	Yamhill	do	209,000
Coos Bay	Coos	Waterfront improvements.	1,100,000

PENNSYLVANIA

	Allegheny	Bridge	$7,301,795
	do	Viaduct	6,822,500
	do	Bridge	17,681,000
Athens, Sayre	Bradford	Sewer	3,331,213
Belle Vernon	Fayette	do	945,000
Dravosburg	Allegheny	Sewer	526,440
Erie	Erie	Auditorium	3,650,000
Do	do	Harbor facilities	842,000
Do	do	do	8,584,000
Do	do	Road	1,996,200
Fayette City	Fayette	Sewer	240,000
Glassport	Allegheny	do	959,500
Glenwillard	do	do	845,000
Harborcreek Township	Erie	Water	2,199,386
Latrobe	Westmoreland	Sewer	2,989,630
McKeesport	Allegheny	Railroad crossings	11,352,550
McVeytown	Mifflin	Water	545,000
Monessen	Westmoreland	Streets	914,404
Moon Township	Allegheny	Sewer	2,662,150
Do	do	Water	750,000
Nanty Glo	Cambria	Sewer	748,000
New Castle	Lawrence	do	9,300,000
Newton-Hamilton	Mifflin	Water	57,750
Patton	Cambria	Sewer	627,000
Pleasant Township	Warren	do	315,000
Tunkhannock	Wyoming	do	340,000
West Franklin	Greene	do	155,000
Rostraver Township	Westmoreland	do	2,241,000
Waterford	Erie	do	571,555
Whitehall	Allegheny	do	3,800,000
Alexandria	Huntingdon	do	138,000
Old Lycoming Township.	Lycoming	do	764,000
Liverpool	Perry	do	545,000
Do	do	do	545,000
Youngsville	Warren	do	85,000
Bradford Township	McKean	do	807,000
	Allegheny	Incinerator	6,300,000
Pittsburgh	do	Water	7,600,000
Synder Township	Blair	Sewer	330,000
Lower Yoder Township.	Cambria	do	490,000
Woodland	Clearfield	Water	312,000
Conneaut Lake	Crawford	Sewer	2,480,000
Millcreek	Erie	do	3,000,000
Scranton	Lackawanna	Bridge	304,000
Hempfield Township	Mercer	Sewer	609,000
Pine Grove	Schuylkill	do	900,000
Tamaqua	do	do	1,600,000
Orwigsburg	do	do	719,000
Port Carbon	do	do	303,000
Beaver	Beaver	do	480,000
Pittsburgh	Allegheny	Administration building.	225,000
Do	do	Roads	87,000
Do	do	Sewer	265,600
Hollidaysburg	Blair	Courthouse	531,280
Mount Union	Huntingdon	Sewer	252,370
Williamsport	Lycoming	Courthouse	2,372,000
South Williamsport	do	Sewer	207,000
Williamsburg	Blair	do	230,335
Blakely Borough	Lackawanna	do	14,300
Do	do	Roads and streets	43,002
Huntingdon	Huntingdon	Sewer	732,548
Blakely	Lackawanna	do	450,295
Wilkes-Barre	Luzerne	do	3,181,817
Hyndman	Bedford	do	163,638
Hughestown	do	do	184,485
Nanticoke	do	do	1,146,000
Pittston Township	do	do	471,204
Duryea	do	do	548,617
Jenkins Township	do	do	865,742
Exeter	do	do	832,048
Plains Township	Luzerne	do	1,572,439
Dupont	do	do	900,085
Pittston	do	do	1,169,157
Punxsutawney	Jefferson	do	287,084
Sheffield Township	Warren	do	189,000
West Newton	Westmoreland	do	180,000
Latrobe	do	do	597,544
Athens	Bradford	do	668,176
Coudersport	Potter	do	402,909
Mansfield	Tioga	do	108,480
Donora	Washington	do	704,000

PROGRAM OF ADVANCES FOR PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING—Continued

Projects planned or being planned in areas eligible for aid under H.R. 10113, June 30, 1962—Continued

PENNSYLVANIA—Continued

City	County	Type of project	Estimated total cost
Orbisonia	Huntingdon	Sewer	$152,552
Canton	Bradford	do	359,740
West Wyoming	Luzerne	do	875,915
New Eagle	Washington	do	288,044
Monongahela	do	do	565,248
Nescopeck	Luzerne	do	101,666
Meyersdale	Somerset	do	80,635
Tunkhannock	Wyoming	do	353,771
Sayre	Bradford	do	272,216
Scranton	Lackawanna	do	7,560,417
Saegerstown	Crawford	do	83,399
Cornplanter Township	Venango	do	278,579
California	Washington	do	318,074
Hazelton	Luzerne	do	1,663,985
Belle Vernon	Westmoreland and Fayette.	do	500,000
Plymouth	Luzerne	do	614,848
Monesson	Westmoreland	do	1,470,000
Charleroi	Washington	do	796,430
Brownsville	Fayette	do	967,422
Wyalusing	Bradford	do	30,085
Do	do	do	118,410
Masontown	Fayette	do	404,500
Harrisville	Butler	do	103,050
Taylor	Lackawanna	do	545,504
Wyoming	Luzerne	do	377,071
Matamores	Pike	do	649,650
Cressona	Schuylkill	do	344,489
Borough of Ashland	do	do	442,400
Township of Lackawanna.	Lackawanna	do	353,973
West Pittston	Luzerne	do	194,245
Saxton	Bedford	do	246,395
Freeland City	Luzerne	do	550,000
Dawson	Fayette	do	79,661
Olyphant	Lackawanna	do	425,880
Dickson City	do	do	476,750
Vanderbilt	Fayette	do	207,846
Duquesne	Allegheny	do	1,582,000
St. Clair	Schuylkill	do	306,000
Township of Monroe	Snyder	do	477,921

RHODE ISLAND

East Greenwich	Kent	Water	$1,157.000
Cranston	Providence	Sewer	2,500.000
Narragansett	Washington	do	601.000
Do	do	Town hall	298.000
Westerly	do	Incinerator	161.400
Smithfield	Providence	Sewer	345.000
Do	do	do	191,000

SOUTH CAROLINA

Aiken	Aiken	Sewer	$1,500,000
Do	do	Storm drains	1,000,000
Fairfax	Allendale	Sewer	81,000
Summarville	Dorchester	Municipal building	27,800
St. Stephen	Berkeley	Water	11,420
Do	do	Sewer	80,000
Chester	Chester	Public buildings	60,986
Orangeburg	Orangeburg	Sewer	46,500
North	do	do	13,500
Port Royal	Beaufort	do	110,000
Springfield	Orangeburg	do	88,000
Orangeburg	do	do	83,500
Branchville	do	do	111,008
	McCormick	Health center	100,394
Dorchester	Dorchester	Courthouse	111,562
Kershaw	Kershaw	Sewer	86,500
Do	do	Water	45,500
Beaufort	Beaufort	Sewer	185,000
Do	do	do	273,000

TENNESSEE

City	County	Type of project	Estimated total cost
La Follette	Campbell	Sewer	$859,650
Brin	Houston	do	215,000
Monterey	Putnam	do	610,000
Pikeville	Bledsoe	do	281,059
Sneedville	Hancock	do	200,000
Jellico	Campbell	Roads	79,000
Jasper	Marion	Sewer	86,440
Do	do	Water	95,387
Big Sandy	Benton	Sewer	156,500
Livingston	Overton	Water	75,842
Sparta	White	Sewer	60,704

TEXAS

Port Arthur	Jefferson	Bridge	$400,000
Do	do	Water	500,000
Do	do	Sewer	500,000
Do	do	Storm drains	2,500,000
Beckville	Panola	Water	50,000
Do	do	Sewer	85,000
Avery	Red River	Water	72,000
Blossom Prairie	Lamar	Sewer	50,832

UTAH

Beaver	Beaver	Hospital	$260,000
Orem	Utah	Water	1,500,000
Coalville	Summit	Sewer	115,000

WASHINGTON

	Kittitas	Hospital	$1,367,130
Ronald	do	Sewer	4,914,500
East Wenatchee	Douglas	Sewer and water	2,320,000
Toledo	Lewis	Sewer	125,500
Spokane	Spokane	Streets	4,440,000
Tacoma	Pierce	Park	496,265
Do	do	Bridge	3,000,000
Newport	Pend Oreille	do	890,000
Anacortes	Skagit	Sewer	310,000
Yakima	Yakima	do	585,000
Concrete	Skagit	do	138,760

WEST VIRGINIA

Montgomery	Fayette and Kanawha	Sewer	$660,000
Clarksburg	Harrison	Water	52,000
Huntington	Kanawha	Sewer	194,000
Cameron	Marshall	do	297,000
Wheeling	Ohio	Water	5,313,000
Harrisville	Ritchie	Sewer	200,000
Craigsville	Nicholas	Water	532,000
Bethlehem	Ohio	Sewer	575,000
Blacksville	Monongalia	Water	40,000
Charleston	Kanawha	Sewer	1,460,000
	Mercer	Water	646,738
Rivesville	Marion	Sewer	300,000
Oceana	Wyoming	do	376,473
Welch	McDowell	do	358,973
Do	do	do	489,698
War	do	do	400,000
Marmet	Kanawha	do	243,847
Stonewood	Harrison	do	350,389
Ansted	Fayette	do	287,828
Wheeling	Ohio	do	2,150,000
Morgantown	Monongalia	Parks	186,000
Do	do	Airport	351,000

WISCONSIN

Coleman	Marinette	Sewer	$44,000

Mr. Nixon Can't Win—Not by a Dam Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are familiar with the witty, amusing articles by Art Hoppe, whose timely observations are published in the San Francisco Chronicle.

I am certain that those who follow Mr. Hoppe's articles with avid interest will find his column which appeared in the Chronicle on Monday, August 20, as appealing as those previously inserted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 20, 1962]

MR. NIXON CAN'T WIN—NOT BY A DAM SITE

(By Art Hoppe)

Mr. Kennedy looked great. He was wearing a dark blue suit with dark blue coattails, sturdily woven into the fabric.

The reason I mention his attire is that I went to see Mr. Kennedy blow up 10 pounds of TNT. It was a blast. But everybody agreed he did not come all this way for that. He really came to help reelect Governor Brown and a lot of Democrats. Because just shaking the hand of a popular President, or even standing next to him, is tremendously valuable in getting elected.

Everybody knows that. But, surprisingly, very little work has been done on precisely how much each aspect of associating with a President is worth. Candidates fight tooth and nail to associate with one. But the values are vague.

So I'm proud to report that after following Mr. Kennedy around California for a day and a half, I have compiled a contribution to American political science—the coattail clutching point system. Which will be of lasting worth to all political candidates.

Take Friday. Waiting to greet Mr. Kennedy at Castle Air Force Base are Governor Brown and Senator KUCHEL, who is a Republican but who voted for medicare. Each got a handshake or shaker (three points) and a smile or smiler (one point).

Mr. Brown then led Mr. Kennedy over to the photographers for a poser (seven points, but only if it makes the papers). In turn, Mr. Kennedy invited Mr. Brown to ride in his convertible for a short rider (five points). Mr. Kennedy stood up in the back seat to wave to the crowd and actually leaned a little on Mr. Brown. This, as you may have guessed, is a leaner and is worth six times what it is in horseshoes.

But the talk of the town was Mr. KUCHEL's four points. Because his Democratic opponent, Mr. Richard Richards, was not present at the welcome and was therefore scoreless at halftime. Oh, there was gloom in the Richards dressing room.

The next morning, Mr. Kennedy arrived in a helicopter to blow up the San Luis Dam site with Mr. Brown, but he promptly vanished into a swarm of local politicians and I lost track of the points.

But who emerges triumphant from the melee but Mr. Richards, leading Mr. Kennedy. That's a leader (10 points). And Mr. Richards got to sit right in back of Mr. Kennedy on the platform, leaning forward as though confiding in his ear. Oh, with all these leaders, sitters, leaners and confiders, joy reigned supreme in the Richards camp.

Well, as you may have read, Mr. Kennedy in his speech saluted Mr. Brown's "water leadership" for a plugger (priceless beyond pearls). And did just about everything but throw his arms around Mr. Brown for a ringer (50 points).

Indeed, I conservatively totted up all Mr. Brown's shakers, smilers, leaners, posers and riders at 873½ points. Or enough to defeat Mr. Nixon by 7 million votes.

Of course, should Mr. Kennedy's own popularity dip much further, it will play hob with the system. But I have already figured that out. We simply make all laboriously accumulated points minus.

Calm Appraisal of the Two "Vostoks"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much editorial comment appearing in the American press concerning the recent Russian achievement in space. From all of the comments, we seem to sense the exercise of a new sort of discipline by our editors, and even by those in the executive branch associated with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for that matter in the comments made by some of the Members of Congress. This is a very different situation from the hysterical reaction following the launching of sputnik in 1957 and different even from the fear-filled reaction to the first successful Russian orbital flight.

We thought the editorial appearing in the Kansas City Star, following the Soviet Union's double space flight was worthy to be reprinted in the RECORD because the principal thought of this editorial is that our response to that achievement should be a calm appraisal of our own goals in space, and a determination to move ahead with confidence in our Nation's scientific ability.

The editorial is as follows:

TWO "VOSTOKS," A WALL AND THE MOON

The Soviet Union's amazing double space flight comes at a time when many in this country are seriously questioning the wisdom of the $20 or $80 billion program to place an American on the moon. It comes, too, when the world is noting the first anniversary of the infamous Berlin wall. Indeed, you might conclude that the timing was a deliberate attempt to distract world attention from that symbol of Communist failure.

To say this is not to detract from the magnificent achievement. It stands as the greatest chapter in manned space flight to date. It is proof that the Russians possess rockets of great power and reliability. These facts you can't deny or wish away. Nor can we deny or wish away the Berlin wall and its meaning. In this mid-August of 1962, the world witnesses the double drama of communism's failure as a system, and of its success in the world of science.

The success of democracy as a system is a proved fact for those who will open their minds to the evidence. But science in a democracy, concerning itself with many things, lacks the single-track concentration of science in a totalitarian state. So we must recognize, that in this one category of the space race—flight to the moon—the Soviet Union is well ahead of its democratic competitor. In other categories—weather research, for example, or communications—the United States is the unchallenged leader. There have been no Telstar or Tiros satellites sent into orbit from Soviet launching pads. Nor has Soviet space science contributed nearly as much information about the universe as has U.S. science.

Yet the world is captivated by the spectacular and the double space shot was surely the most spectacular effort to date. For the United States it may be a significant point for discussion in the debate over our own space program. Perhaps we have been lulled by the fact that the Communists have had no manned space flights for more than a year. Our sense of urgency may have been dissipated during this period. Moreover, the state of the economy has prompted a look at the whole pattern of Federal expenditures. Now, perhaps, we can weigh the question of the space program a little more realistically.

For we have been told in unmistakable terms that the Soviet program has not been cut back, as some have suggested. It is moving forward in an orderly scientific fashion, although, from science's point of view, with a one-track mind. It lacks the diversification of the U.S. effort. But it has the potential of putting a man on the moon—a Communist man—perhaps sooner than anyone had expected.

Certainly the race has not been won by the Russians. The pilot of *Vostok IV* referred to his spaceship as "the swallow." To paraphrase Aristotle, "One swallow does not place a man on the moon." Nevertheless, this weekend has given the United States a second sputnik-type warning. We hope the American reaction will not be one similar to the near hysteria of late 1957. A healthier response would be a calm appraisal of our own goals in space and a determination to move ahead with confidence in the Nation's scientific ability.

Soviet Space Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is natural that considerable attention be given to the latest Soviet space flights in comparing them with our own progress, as well as all the other scientific, technological, and military aspects.

I have been especially impressed by the calm, practical, thoughtful manner in which the press has discussed the subject, and I submit for the RECORD two editorials which I think are especially reflective of grassroots public opinion, as seen through the eyes of the local newspapers in my district.

The editorials are "Room for Learning" which appeared in the Des Plaines Valley News of Argo, Ill., on August 16, and "Cosmonauts' Freedom From Fear" from the Palos Regional, Palos Heights, Ill., August 16 edition.

[From the Argo (Ill.) Des Plaines Valley News, Aug. 16, 1962]

ROOM FOR LEARNING

Two Russians whirling about in a space orbit made it painfully clear that the United States does not have the premium on ability and brainpower that its technical achievements and prosperity had led peoples of the world to admire.

While U.S. technology is far ahead of other foreign lands in many fields, it is possible that our Nation was so smug and content with leading the industrial effort in the world that superiority in a small portion of the total would be overlooked.

However, what most of us have forgotten is that no one nation or political system possesses the edge on brains.

In a nation with less technical equipment than ours, the inventor and scientist must improvise. Where U.S. scientists seek the best equipment and tools that money can buy for experimentation, it must be remembered that less advanced nations or individuals must substitute techniques, machinery, and other things to fabricate the idea pattern.

One may recall that Edison, Ford, and many early inventors achieved their initial designs with meager equipment, which in today's engineering terms could be described as substandard.

Our policy has long been to throw a few billion dollars into the project, and thus solve the problem, forgetting that some problems cannot be solved by money alone.

Let not those in the lead forget that the first in the race needs the competition of those who follow close behind. Our mistake was in being content to remain ahead so often that we failed to notice the runner close behind.

Remember that in some respects the most ignorant savage can be brighter than the scientist. It would be foolish to admit that we cannot learn more.

Perhaps man is not tied down to this earth planet. Perhaps more intelligent creatures reside in another planet, for it is rather egotistic to expect that the planet earth alone had the environment and conditions necessary for intellectual development.

[From the Palos Heights (Ill.) Palos Regional, Aug. 16, 1962]

COSMONAUTS' FREEDOM FROM FEAR

One of the ironies of the Soviets' dual space flight this week was the quiet announcement that the United States had agreed to a Russian request to halt atmospheric nuclear tests while the two cosmonauts orbited the earth.

It is not surprising that the Soviet Union asked for a temporary test ban, nor it is surprising that the United States quickly agreed: neither country wanted to endanger the cosmonauts as they took a major stride toward the conquest of space.

But important as the mission of the cosmonauts may be, it involves only two lives. The disarmament talks, which have dragged on endlessly and unsuccessfully at Geneva, involve the lives of millions, possibly the entire population of the world. Yet, the two great powers of the world, which readily agreed it would be unthinkable to endanger two lives, have not been able to reach agreement on a matter which threatens millions.

The problem of disarmament, admittedly, is more complicated than a 2-day test ban, and that, of course, is why the odds are considerably longer on a permanent ban. But while the odds are longer, the stakes are the same.

The Soviet space achievement this week—as well as the recent accomplishments of both Russian and American space programs—should emphasize that the need for a solution to the arms race is critical.

The immense destructive power of both the West and the Communist countries is multiplied with every advance in the race to space. The space flights are a sort of barometer of rocket capabilities, and the rockets could carry nuclear warheads as easily as they carry space capsules.

The two Russian cosmonauts have no reason to fear the possible effects of a nuclear test while they are orbiting the earth. We wish that freedom from fear could be shared permanently by everyone.

J. Edgar Hoover: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the United States is blessed with many able and dedicated public servants, but few have served their country with the high distinction, uncompromising loyalty and all-out devotion of J. Edgar Hoover. It is a privilege to pay tribute to this great American.

For 38 years, as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. Hoover has been serving the cause of freedom and justice in the United States. He came to this post in 1924, a young lawyer 29 years of age. Today, at 67, he is one of our most revered public servants. He has literally devoted his entire life to the cause of keeping America free from her two worst enemies—crime and communism.

In building up the FBI over the years into what is today the finest crime detection agency in the free world, Mr. Hoover has, from the beginning, been meticulous in maintaining that justice must be above politics. When he accepted the directorship 38 years ago, he did so on condition that appointments to the FBI would be made solely on merit and promotions based on proven ability. Only men of spotless character are eligible for appointment as special agents, and nothing short of a college education, supplemented by training in the law, will suffice as prerequisites for these positions of public trust.

As a dedicated leader in the field of law enforcement, Mr. Hoover has been a prime mover in creating a professional stature for the American policeman. In so doing, he has increased the understanding of the responsibilities of law enforcement officers throughout the world.

He has been ever alert to the need to bring principles of science to bear on crime detection as well as law enforcement. The FBI Identification Division and the FBI Technical Laboratory are famous throughout the world. Today, the FBI has the world's largest collection of fingerprints—more than 150 million sets are on file. Every month, some 1,300 fugitives are identified through fingerprints.

In his 38 years as FBI Director, Mr. Hoover has created an agency which is the model of efficiency and effectiveness. Last year, the fines, savings, and recoveries made by the FBI totaled approximately $150 million—an amount exceeding the funds spent to operate the FBI for the entire year.

Mr. Hoover is proud, and all Americans can be proud, that conviction in FBI cases brought to trial average over 95 percent. It is in the category of the phenomenal that during World War II no successful act of enemy-directed sabotage occurred in the United States.

It is a singular commentary on Mr. Hoover's stewardship of the FBI that he has diligently and scrupulously avoided all roads that would lead to the FBI's becoming a national police force—a hated Gestapo or a GPU. Mr. Hoover could have used his power to ask Congress to make the FBI an independent agency. He is the first to point out the dangers of a dictatorial national police agency to a free society. Today, the Federal Bureau of Investigation remains a department under the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. Hoover's great love of freedom and his keen awareness of the subtle erosions of freedom which can take place through overcentralization has resulted in one of the finest examples of Federal-State-local cooperation in our history. Both the famous FBI Identification Division and the experts and facilities of the FBI Technical Laboratory—the largest of its kind in the world—are available to all law-enforcement agencies throughout the Nation. The FBI National Academy in Washington offers the same type of training given its own special agents to local, municipal, county, and State law-enforcement officers. Local agencies in every State in the Union have sent their men to the Academy—police organizations in many foreign countries have requested that the benefits of an FBI training be extended to their personnel. The FBI not only provides these and other cost-free cooperative services, but also, upon request, provides expert testimony in local courts in connection with evidence they have examined. Thus, the FBI is in partnership with every community across the Nation.

Not only has Mr. Hoover dedicated his life to combating organized crime; he has been a stalwart and articulate leader in our struggle against communism. Time and time again, he has availed himself of every opportunity to make Americans more fully aware of the dangers of communism and to exhort us to fight this menace not only by being against it, but by being for the American ideal and by working for the cause of liberty and justice.

Notwithstanding all this and the fact that Mr. Hoover is known as "Mr. Integrity" of the law enforcement world, occasionally we hear rumor that there are some in high political places who would like to have him replaced by someone more responsive to control and for exploitation of the 6,000 special agents in the FBI and their antiracketeering and antisubversion activities.

Public opinion, of course, as long as Mr. Hoover is in charge would rebel at any such political maneuver. Thus any smear attack on him should be examined to try and discover the motive behind it.

Mr. Speaker, one such recent attack on Mr. Hoover should be thus scrutinized. I refer to the remarks of Wilbur H. Ferry, vice president of the Fund for the Republic made on August 6, 1962, in Seattle as luncheon speaker at the Western States Democratic Conference.

In this speech the Director of the FBI was accused of having built a false legend of Communist strength.

The vicious distortions of facts in the "Ferrytale" should not be dignified were it not that the speech in question was to a formal and important political party conference. As such, it smacks of undermining a great American by a means of influence through the Democratic administration's policy.

On this account I point out that Mr. Ferry referred to J. Edgar Hoover's warning against Soviet espionage in the United States.

> This is an old whine of the FBI chief—

Commented Mr. Ferry, adding—

> and its success year after year is a tribute to the trance into which his sermons throw Americans, not excepting Congressmen.

Using the old technique of ridicule he described Mr. Hoover as "a spy swatter" and his work against communism as mischiefmaking.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud, let me say, to acknowledge having contributed through my vote in this House to the remarkable record of the past 10 years where we have appropriated every cent recommended by Mr. Hoover for operation of the FBI.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as additional tribute to Mr. Hoover, because I believe him to be one of the great Americans of the 20th century and because I believe him to be as close to irreplaceable as any mortal man can be, I introduced legislation on August 14, 1962, H.R. 12898, which relates to the appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the FBI, when the present incumbent, J. Edgar Hoover, ceases to serve by reason of retirement or for reasons beyond the control of mortal man. This legislation, if enacted, would require that the new Director and any subsequent Director thereafter be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 15 years, the same provisions applying also to the Associate Director.

Mr. Speaker, I realize it is too late to expect action on H.R. 12898 in this Congress, but I hope and plan if I am a Member of the 88th Congress, to reintroduce this legislation and push for its early consideration.

Respect for the service and achievement of one of America's greatest living patriots is not a partisan matter. Nor is contempt for those who ridicule patriotism.

Opportunity and freedom survive, thank God, in spite of those who belittle and besmudge the ideals and systems that America holds dear.

This is because of the high morals and dedication of men like J. Edgar Hoover to whom I pay this sincere tribute today.

All Americans owe a debt of gratitude to J. Edgar Hoover, a great American, and a great leader of the free world.

Fly a Banner: Welcome HOG's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in these aptly described "trying times" an injection of humor seems not only appropriate but necessary to keep a level balance during perpetual discussions of arms racing, racing to the moon, and so forth.

I know of no better source than the artful writings of Art Hoppe, columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, who is a clever conniver in semantics.

One of his recent columns follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 19, 1962]

FLY A BANNER: WELCOME HOG'S

(By Art Hoppe)

The world is indebted this morning to my friend, Mr. Jack Wyman, for his contribution to a lasting peace. Mr. Wyman's suggestion is to form the International Association of Heads of Government. So it can hold a convention. Which is the prime reason such organizations are formed.

It's a great idea. I have even worked up a tentative program.

Monday, 9 a.m.: Registration in lobby. Delegates will receive lapel name cards saying, "My name's Nik" or "Just call me Your Excellency, General De Gaulle, for short."

9:30 a.m.: Panel discussion, Green Room. "How To Deal With Businessmen," J. Kennedy, U.S.A. "How To Really Deal With Businessmen," F. Castro, Cuba. "The Future of the Businessman," N. Khrushchev, U.S.S.R. (illustrated).

11 a.m.: Workshop, Rose Room. "A Simple Solution To Facing Mounting National Debts," Consultant Edward M. Gilbert, now of Brazil.

12 noon to ?: Refreshments, Billie Sol Estes Hospitality Suite.

(NOTE.—The Ladies Auxiliary will gather in the lobby at 10 a.m. for a tour of the waterfront conducted by Mrs. J. Kennedy. Please bring cameras, binoculars, and water skis.)

Tuesday, 10 a.m.: Panel discussion on crises, Green Room. "Crises I Have Known and Loved," R. Nixon, U.S.A. "Fame and Power Through the Vice Presidency," L. B. Whatshisname, U.S.A. "How To Succeed in Business Without Really Trying," George M. Humphrey, U.S.A.

11 a.m.: Panel discussion on world affairs, Rose Room. "Will the Dreadnought Prove the Ultimate Weapon?" B. Goldwater, U.S.A. "My China," M. Tse-tung, China. "My China," C. Kai-shek, China. "There Is No China," State Department team, U.S.A.

12 noon to ?: Refreshments, B. Goldfine Hospitality Suite.

(NOTE.—The Ladies Auxiliary will meet for tea at 2 p.m. to hear brief talks on "How To Make a Splash in Society," by Mrs. Ethel Kennedy and "Haute Couture—So Who Needs It?" by Mrs. N. Khrushchev. The next 5 days will be free for shopping.)

The convention will be a smash. The speeches are nonsense. But no delegate ever listens to speeches. And each will have all afternoon for the main purpose of any convention: refreshments. They relieve his frustrations and renew his wellsprings.

Indeed, as a keen student of world affairs, I have long felt the only course for our heads of Government to pursue is to get fried. And if they got fried together—well, I ask you: Could Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev ever declare war on each other? After they've jointly tossed a grand piano out a 10th-floor window? I can think of no better path to mutual understanding than getting fried. Not with the way things are going, I can't.

Latin American Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD three short articles dealing with Latin American affairs. These articles are written by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, well-known international lawyer and authority on Latin American problems.

The first of these articles, "Peru," deals with the situation in relation to that country. It should be noted that the author wrote it on the day the United States suspended relations with Peru, which was an erroneous step and was subsequently corrected. The other two articles, "Let's Look at Ecuador" and "Latin America," are perhaps a bit too critical, but they point up the true situation in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues and to all those interested in improving United States-Latin American relations:

PERU

(By Fred A. Orleans)

It is difficult for the ordinary citizen to understand why our State Department has promptly suspended diplomatic relations with Peru and cut off Alliance for Progress programs in that country, because a military group has toppled the Government.

It has not been indicated that this group is unfriendly to the United States and it has been acknowledged that they came to power to prevent a leftist from becoming the next President of Peru.

It is believed in Washington that even though he is a leftist, he is anti-Communist.

This is a firm demonstration by the U.S. State Department that they will not tolerate military dictatorships in Latin America. No objections appear to be offered to dictatorships headed by other than military men, but military dictatorships, which tend to usually lean to the right, are unacceptable.

How can we reconcile this with the strong desire in Washington to continue to give aid to known Communist dictatorships as Poland and Yugoslavia.

How can we reconcile this with the burning desire in Washington to feed the starving Chinese who are governed by a Communist dictatorship. No consideration is apparently being given to the fact that the people of Peru might also need food.

A fundamental error of American foreign policy in Latin America has been the popular assumption, a basic American belief, that we can export our democracy to any country and any people.

In pursuit of this will-o'-the-wisp, we have not once, but many times, deliberately set out to destroy or unseat a dictatorial regime, however friendly to us that regime might have been, in the delusion that what might finally emerge would be a democratic regime modeled in our own image.

We can no longer continue to pressure friendly, anti-Communist governments out of power because they do not conform to our standards of democracy.

Democracy cannot be imposed from without; democracy is a spirit from within each person and is a slow process for people who have rarely known real freedom which can only be achieved by education and knowledge of what freedom means.

Our foreign policy should be arrived at by fostering those elements in any given country, which in the fullness of time, will permit the slow growth of democracy.

The United States must adopt realistic policies to meet the needs of the times.

LET'S LOOK AT ECUADOR

(By Fred A. Orleans)

Recently the President of Ecuador, Carlos Julio Arosemena, visited Washington and it was indicated in the press that he would undoubtedly discuss with the President of the United States the troublesome situation in Peru.

Apparently, our Government has not yet been informed that last October the armed forces in Ecuador overthrew the constitutionally elected President of that country, Velasco Ibarra, because of his attempt to implement tax reforms required for his country to participate in the "Alliance for Progress." The United States has insisted on these types of reforms as the indispensable first step by the countries of Latin America seeking U.S. aid, but has not taken into consideration the fact that as, in the case of Ecuador, Latin American governments that attempt to implement the required reforms are very apt to meet internal resistance which can result in their being ousted.

The revolution in Ecuador, which resulted in the ouster of President Velasco Ibarra, and the installation of his successor, was hailed by Fidel Castro as "an impressive victory over Yankee imperialism." The revolution in Ecuador was supported by one of the strongest and best financed Communist Parties in all of Latin America.

The present President of Ecuador assumed his position as a direct result of the aforementioned revolution and was not elected by the people of his country. Apparently, this qualified him to advise Washington how to handle Peru.

LATIN AMERICA

(By Fred A. Orleans)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is a partial reprint of an article by Mr. Orleans published 1 year ago which would seem to indicate that we have made little progress in the past year.)

Our Government appears unable to establish effective contact with Latin America despite propaganda at home to the contrary and despite the many tours by top U.S. officials who, upon their return home, only reconfirm the severity of the problems the United States faces in the countries of the Americas.

In general, many leaders in Latin America look upon inter-American relations at this time with resentment, bitterness and disillusion. It is felt that relations between the United States and the other nations of the Americas have never been worse. There are frequent complaints of neglect and a feeling that the United States only gives attention to Latin America in times of need. There is frequent reference to the great interest the United States shows in the countries of southeast Asia halfway around the globe, compared to the relatively little interest shown in the countries of the Americas which are in our own backyard.

Our mounting problems in Latin America are a direct result of the policy we have pursued toward Cuba which has consisted of drift, go easy, and wait without giving any thought to the fact that Castro is not drifting, has no intention of going easy with us and he won't wait. Our inability to provide the countries of the Western Hemisphere with the firm leadership they need has left them drifting without direction in an ocean of communism. The United States has not been able to demonstrate that it can provide the vigorous leadership the times call for.

The people of the Americas do not understand why the United States should be continuously on the defensive, waiting for the Communists to act and then attempting to counteract them. They have looked to the United States and have expected from the United States leadership of our hemisphere. Many in Latin America feel that the United States is slowly but surely fading out as the dominant force in hemisphere relations.

Leaders of Latin American countries feel that those who are shaping the U.S.-Latin American policies are inexperienced, impractical theorists and that the United States is using amateurs to conduct its relations with Latin America when the best professionals available are clearly called for.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Stock Market Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 24, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is not often that events march rapidly enough to belie an accusation in a few short months. However, this has happened in the case of the charges made earlier this year that the "Black Monday" downward plunge of the stock market was the result of a lack of confidence among businessmen in the Kennedy administration.

The falseness of this omit-business charge was proved yesterday when the stock market completed its climb back to its level of May 27, the date before the big drop. This recovery story, carried yesterday in the Washington Post, when combined with the recent Gallup poll showing that only about one out of eight people ever believed that the Kennedy administration is antibusiness, should emphatically lay to rest this unfortunate political canard. I ask unanimous consent that the AP story appearing in the Washington Post story be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTORS LEAD VIGOROUS MARKET RECOVERY—GM FORECAST IS FACTOR

NEW YORK, August 22.—In a vigorous rally today, the stock market crossed an important milestone, wiping out all its losses since the "black Monday" of May 28.

Much ground still remained to be recaptured before the record heights of last December would be seen again, but in the eyes of Wall Street chartists an important psychological victory had been won for those who want higher prices.

In the midst of the session, the Dow industrials topped their May 31 recovery peak of 613.36, drawing in a host of new buyers. The average was up 6.90 to 615.54 at the close. This left it roughly midway between the 1962 closing low of 535.76 reached June 26 and the historic peak of 734.91 attained December 13, 1961.

The Associated Press 60-stock average rose 2.4 to 226.1 with industrials up 3.8, rails up 1.3, and utilities up .9, making its biggest gain since July 2 when it rose 3.7.

Motors paced the rally. Brokers credited a glowing 1963 forecast by General Motors for inspiring the advance. GM, on its way to record profits this year, forecast that 1963 would be just as good a year as 1962 for the auto industry, even though other companies have predicted a sales decrease. The GM production came as it staged a preview of its new car models.

Stock prices had an uncertain start but strengthened as the GM news came through. The list was at its highest level at the end when tickers ran late under a final wave of buying.

IBM was one of the volume leaders, rebounding above the important 400 level which has proved an upside barrier. It rose 16¼ to 409 as it generated enthusiasm on the way up.

Rayonier was the volume leader, thanks to a late block of 100,000 shares, in a sale of the stock arranged by a broker for a group of buyers. The stock was up 1¼ to 19½ on 176,100 shares.

Second most active was Studebaker, up ⅜ at 9¼ on 118,100 shares. Third was American Motors, touching a new high for the year of 17½ before closing with a net gain of ⅜ at 17⅜ on 71,800 shares.

Prices also advanced on the American Stock Exchange as volume swelled to 1.41 million shares from 1.05 million yesterday.

The Franklin Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 20, 1962, Mr. J. G. Richard Heckscher, executive vice president of the Franklin Institute, of Philadelphia, testified before the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the House Committee on Government Operations. Much of his testimony was devoted to the accomplishments of the various laboratories of the institute in the areas of science and technology. The Franklin Institute has long been one of Philadelphia's finest educational and scientific organizations and has added much to the cultural activities and life of the city. I have included part of Mr. Heckscher's testimony for the information of the Members:

The Franklin Institute has a long and distinguished history. It was founded in 1824 for the purpose of the "promotion of the mechanic arts," to use the language of our charter. We interpret this charge today as encompassing the physical and engineering sciences.

The Franklin Institute is incorporated in accordance with a charter granted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on March 30, 1824, and later revised through an act of the legislature approved on April 18, 1864. The institute is a membership society of over 8,000 members which functions as a scientific and educational organization for public service. It is a private organization, independent of any other. No part of the net earnings of the institute inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

In a moment I will outline very briefly the institute's tradition of scientific investigation, but first permit me to list the activities that we are currently pursuing to accomplish the objectives of our charter.

Today, our activities encompass—

A teaching museum of the physical sciences and technology, including a planetarium and a national memorial to Benjamin Franklin, with an annual attendance of about a half million persons.

A unique scientific and technical library, available to the public.

Programs of scientific lectures, seminars and demonstrations.

Dissemination of scientific information, through the 136-year-old Journal of the Franklin Institute, through papers prepared by our staff and published in other technical journals, and a variety of other means.

Regular programs of class instruction for students and adults.

Medal awards for notable achievements in science and technology.

Basic and applied research, and development.

During the years between 1829 and 1924 the institute undertook a great number of scientific investigations. These investigations, initiated either by the institute itself, or at the request of local, State or Federal Government, are in themselves a very clear reflection of the Nation's growing scientific and industrial maturity. It may be of interest to note that the expense they entailed were met by friends of the institute who wished to further the progress of industry and the public good.

I shall make no attempt to enumerate these studies. I cannot refrain, however, from mentioning what we believe to be the first Government-supported research in the United States, an institute study to uncover the causes of steam boiler explosions which were occurring with alarming frequency. The study, begun in 1830, soon attracted the interest of the Federal Government. As a result, the Congress appropriated $1,500 which served to defray the cost of experiments.

For nearly a century, the institute's activity in research and development was characterized by this committee-of-volunteers approach. As the First World War was drawing to a close, the institute realized its long deferred hope to have a permanent staff of research workers. In 1918, Henry W. Bartol, a prominent local industrialist, bequeathed a sum approximating $1 million for the establishment of a laboratory "for the conduct of research in the physical sciences and for the investigation of problems of a scientific nature arising in the industries."

Before the outbreak of World War II the Bartol Research Foundation devoted its energies to basic research on matters pertaining to atomic structure and cosmic radiation.

With the outbreak of hostilities, the work of the foundation underwent some modification, but the staff is today devoting its main efforts to studies of nuclear physics, studies of cosmic radiation, studies of solid state and physical electronics.

Headquarters of the Bartol Research Foundation are at Swarthmore, Pa. It also maintains research installations in the arctic and antarctic regions, and aboard ship. Its staff numbers 59, 45 of whom are scientists or technicians.

The foundation's research programs are supported from its endowed income, augmented by contracts and grants from the Federal Government. The foundation performs no work for industry or other profit-making organizations.

Because many of the foundation's Government contracts afford only nominal overhead costs, the cost of these research programs is of necessity shared by the foundation.

In addition to its research programs the foundation maintains an active program of scientific colloquia and seminars, active collaboration with physicists of other nations, a program of postdoctoral fellowships, and an undergraduate research participation program.

After the establishment of the Bartol Research Foundation the institute's research activities were extended when it assumed trusteeship in 1935 of The Biochemical Research Foundation at Newark, Del. This foundation consists of a group of investigators who are actively engaged upon problems in the field of cancer research, enzymology, microbiology and immunology. It receives financial support from a philanthropist who desires to encourage research in this vital field.

An unprecedented development of the institute's research activities was evoked by the outbreak of the Second Warld War. Certain members of the museum technical staff were promptly engaged in the conduct of mechanical, optical, and electrical research for the purpose of improving weapons and instruments for the military.

The Army Ordnance Corps and the Office of Scientific Research and Development allotted to them tasks, and the small original staff was progressively increased as the work expanded in volume, diversity and complexity. These tasks related to the problems concerning airborne fire control and artillery design.

In 1945 the urgency of our research programs for both OSRD and OCO began to abate, and the institute undertook to organize a permanant laboratory facility which would enable the institute to play a larger role in science and engineering both for the Government and for industry.

The result was the establishment, in 1946, of the Franklin Institute Laboratories for Research and Development. With the staff that had earlier carried out our wartime military projects serving as a core, the laboratories began to develop its resources to meet the rapidly growing research and development requirements of Government agencies and industry.

At the outset, the laboratories' chief capabilities were those it brought to and developed during its first wartime projects: chemistry, physics, electrical engineering and mechanical engineering. In the early fifties, through judicious acceptance of research and development programs and careful acquisition of scientific personnel a strong and solid state physics and metallurgy research capability had grown up. Through the fifties, there was developed a competence in the study and analysis of complex operations (air traffic control is an example); in the study of man-machine systems, better known today as human factors engineering; in the practice of nuclear and areospace engineering, an outgrowh of our mechanical engineering experience.

Today, the laboratories is assisting in techncial problems and research programs in chemistry, solid state physics, metallurgy, applied physics; in electrical, mechanical, and nuclear engineering; in operations analysis and research, aerospace sciences and in engineering psychology.

The Franklin Institute Laboratories does not engage in or seek what are known as hardware contracts. We have no production facilities, outside of the institute's modest shop facilities which are suited only to fabricating prototypes.

The laboratories also avoids conventional testing work, for the reason that this type of work adds little to our scientific competence.

It is not difficult to specify the type of work which the laboratories prefers, and consequently seeks. By far the most important qualification is the degree to which the project challenges the capability of our staff.

A very practical qualification is that it should be work for which we will receive adequate recompense, although we often have called upon our own resources to help carry out contracts and grants that do not carry full overhead, but that will measurably increase our competence in an important discipline.

Another important consideration is whether the project might enable us to publish to the scientific community any advance in knowledge. We encourage and help our staff to publish their findings in the technical literature, and to present papers at meetings of scientific societies.

During the period 1946 through 1961, the growth rate of the laboratories staff and facilities was modest. Funds were slight for self-sponsored research, or for purchasing expensive research apparatus. From a staff of 170 in its first year of operation, the laboratories had grown by mid-1962 to a total of 330, of whom 280 were scientific and technical people. The entire employee body of the institute numbered 642.

Prior to 1946, the institute's research equipment was furnished by the Government, specifically for the projects carried out under contract. Thereafter, as the staff and its range of interests and need for new equipment grew, the institute began to acquire with its own funds the sort of research apparatus that serves the basic and continuing interests and disciplines of the laboratories.

The office, laboratory, and service areas required by the laboratories have been provided by the institute both in the main building which houses our executive offices and public museum areas, and in buildings in the immediate neighborhood, acquiring these by lease as the need for new space became apparent. Two years ago, plans were set afoot that will result in 1964 in a new building, to be leased under a long-term arrangement by the institute, with about 120,000 square feet of space.

The Franklin Institute laboratories has been by many standards a small organization, and yet it has gained substantial recognition in many different fields. This is the consequence of our having highly qualified people representing many disciplines, and willing and able to combine their skills to an unusual degree. Obviously, not all of our projects need this multidisciplinary capability, but many do, and their number increases each year.

Very early in the career of the laboratories, we foresaw that the nature and variety of contract research services required a clear-cut policy that would help our staff avoid conflict-of-interest situations. We thus established safeguards against such situations, by requiring close management scrutiny of any consulting assignment offered to our staff.

Consultants to our staff are required to reveal any possible conflict of interest.

Last month, at the Navy's request the Franklin Institute Laboratories assumed responsibility for the management, technical direction, and support of certain of the Navy's operations research activities.

Under a contract with the Office of Naval Research, the institute on July 1, 1962, subsumed several of the Navy's longstanding operations research groups, principally the Operations Evaluation Group, formerly under contract with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the Institute for Naval Studies, formerly a division of the Institute for Defense Analyses.

The result is a new entity, the Center of Naval Analyses, with a total staff of about 250, operating as a division of the Franklin Institute Laboratories. The center will not affect the operation or staff of the existing laboratories' divisions but—and this is most important—the CNA staff will have access to the laboratories' competence in basic and interdisciplinary studies.

Under Franklin leadership, the center performs analyses of immediate and long-range naval warfare problems, operational and logistical. It serves the fleet through operations research and by interpreting advances in science and technology in terms of naval hardware, weapons systems, long-range logistics, and long-range strategic planning.

The growth of laboratories' business activity can be inferred from what I have said earlier about staff and facilities growth. In the laboratories' first year of operation, 1946, the value of contracts received was less than $1 million. The value of contracts received in 1961 was slightly over $4 million.

Basic Ideas of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 24, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it was my good fortune to have been a guest Wednesday, August 22, in Chicago at a dinner given by the Order of Ahepa, at which our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] was the principal speaker. His remarks were so fundamentally American, and his address so replete with basic ideas of government, that, in my opinion, it should be made available for all to read.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Goldwater's address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Basic Ideas of Government

(Text of a speech by U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, or Arizona, before the Order of AHEPA banquet, Wednesday, August 22, 1962, Chicago, Ill.)

It is a great honor and a great privilege to be here today—to have the opportunity to address you Americans of Greek ancestry. There is no other group in all this country which stands in a closer or more vital relationship with the basic traditions of Western civilization. For it was the ancient Greeks who described for the first time the conditions necessary for political freedom. It was your ancestors—you—sitting here in this room today—who created the idea of a mixed constitution, the concept of checks and balances which lies at the very heart of our American system of government.

A conservative is a man who believes we have something worth conserving. A conservative knows that we were not born yesterday. A conservative knows that the wisdom of the ages is not something to throw overboard because some young college gradnate has just had another bright idea.

You, here in this room, are true conservatives. You whose ancestors developed a level of civilization which even now many of us are scarcely able to understand and appreciate. You know the meaning of the word conservative, because the great part of our civilization, and the best of it, exists today only because you and others have conserved the magnificent cultural heritage of Greece. As one who is primarily interested in the political life of our Nation, I feel very strongly the debt we owe you, especially for the basic poltical ideas that come to us from the Greek tradition.

Very properly we pay homage to the Americans who have been called the Founding Fathers of our country. But they could not have thought as they did, they could not have drawn this blueprint for American Government had it not been for your great ancestor Plato, or even more for another incomparable thinker of ancient Greece—Aristotle.

These men—Plato and Aristotle—are truly Founding Fathers of America, in a very real sense. Theirs were the ideas, handed down from ancient Greece, which lie at the heart of the American concept of freedom.

It was your forefathers who pioneered the idea of freedom. It was your forefathers who, 2,500 years ago, built the new frontier against barbarism, and against despotism.

It was your forefathers who literally created the very idea of freedom today as we know it. And the creation of this idea was a kind of miracle.

We have to remember that the ancient Greeks lived in a world which never had known, in all its history, a concept of freedom like the idea they brought into the world. It was an entirely new idea, a new way of life. There was no tradition of freedom for them to look back to. They had to create the idea, as it were, out of nothing.

And they created there a new frontier—a frontier between free men, on one side, and, on the other side, men who live in constant fear of their government, whose whole lives are subject to the whim of despots. In all history since then there has continued to be only one real frontier, the frontier of freedom beyond which lies man, helpless before the overwhelming power of government.

How did those astonishing ancestors of yours create this great liberating concept of man? Not only was there no tradition of freedom to teach them this way of life, this concept of man, but they stood near rich and immensely powerful nations whose whole outlook was hostile to the idea of freedom. Egypt at that time had several thousands of years of history as a rich and powerful nation, and the tyranny of the Pharaohs was cruel and absolute. Even the terrible slave labor camps of Soviet Russia are hardly worse than were the enormous gangs of slaves—tens of thousands in number—who were driven to death building the enormous pyramids to satisfy the whims of the Egyptian Pharaohs. These were the neighbors of the Greeks, a hundred times as wealthy and a hundred times more powerful than the Greeks.

And there were the Persians of that day—a powerful and rich empire ruled by cruel and arbitrary despots. As you know so well, the Persian kings sent a huge army to conquer the Greeks. Most of the army was composed of well-equipped slaves, who were sometimes driven into battle by whips in the hands of the Persian officers.

All this array of slave power failed. Poor as they were, few in number as they were, the Greeks had one precious weapon the Persians lacked. They were freemen with a fierce sense of independence, a characteristic which Greeks have never lost. This is the greatest gift of Greece to Western civilization: The concept of a man as a free citizen.

The whole idea of politics as a subject which could be studied is a Greek invention. No one ever heard of political science before Plato and Aristotle, and no man since has spoken more profoundly on the problems of politics.

It is to the concept of the free citizen that we owe the possibility of all the other achievements of the Greeks. Now politics I know something about. Now I am not a scholar in the field of Greek ideas, yet who is there who does not have some grasp of the breadth and significance of our debt to Greece?

Every schoolboy knows something of this debt. Yet, sometimes reformers with ideas they believe are new, or scientists in love with some new scientific development are tempted to forget the source of almost all the ideas.

We are often tempted to think of our civilization as having hit peaks of development unheard of in the past. The atom seems like something new. How many remember that the very word "atom" is a Greek word and that the idea of the world as being constructed basically of atoms was originated by a Greek—Democritus, by name—several thousand years ago.

It was this concept of the atom combined with modern mathematics which created this new atomic age we live in. But the very word "mathematics" is also a Greek word, and most of the basic mathematics we now have was originated and thought through 2,000 years ago by Greeks.

"Geometry" is another Greek word. Who can think of basic mathematics without following in the footsteps of Euclid?

In a word, the really hard basic thinking which created the possibility of the modern world of atomic physics was done by the Greeks long ago. We moderns have only taken a few steps beyond the giant strides of those men. Our whole world of technology is unthinkable, is clearly impossible without the astonishing creative thinking of the Greeks. These powerful rockets that soar into space, all the complicated machinery of modern living are only rather ingenious developments flowing from the astounding intellectual creations of Greece. Without Greece, they would not exist.

What about philosophy—except for religion, the only serious and profound attempt to penetrate and explain the meaning of human existence? Again, the word "philosophy" is a Greek word. As you know, the word means love of wisdom. Sometime ago I was reading on an airplane—that's where I get most of my reading done—and I was reading some comments by Professor Whitehead, whom many have called the most distinguished modern philosopher. Whitehead's comment that stayed in my mind was this: "All modern philosophy is only a series of footnotes to Plato."

Now some of our modern thinkers would have us believe their ideas are very original, very novel. These people are, to put it very simply, ignorant of history. They don't know that many of their notions are nothing more than pale and distorted reflections of past ideas, many of which were discussed as trivial or unsound by the giants of the past.

The very writing of history itself—as we know it today—was an invention of the Greeks. Herodotus and Thucydides were as you all know so well the first great historians. Even today Thucydides stands as a giant among modern writers of history.

Now what are we to say about a nation like the Greeks who create a great cultural innovation like the writing of history, and who, almost simultaneous with the first efforts in the field, produce histories of such astounding excellence that we are still stumbling behind them 2,000 years later. What histories are being written today that we dare compare with Thucydides for sheer dramatic power, such a devotion to truth, such a determined objectivity. Thucydides wrote history on a broad canvas with a generosity of spirit and a grandeur of vision which is almost inconceivable in our own age.

Anyone suffering from the illusion that ours is a great age and that our modern ideas constitute the last step in progress could regain some objectivity and a proper sense of humility by studying Thucydides, one of the great Greeks.

It would be possible to go on far more time than I have today, reviewing the magnitude, the astonishing creations of the Greeks. Who is not acquainted with the greatness of Greek architecture, of Greek art? Has ever a more distinguished, a more beautiful or a more appropriate building been conceived than the Parthenon?

Almost all the important buildings in Washington are built in the Greek style. What beauty there is in the Capitol building in Washington, and the White House—the dignity and serenity, the essential seriousness, the sense of order—these characteristics are Greek, and Greek alone. They represent the great tradition of Western civilization, the heart and core of the ideals that motivate us, the atmosphere of rationality which remains even in the midst of temporary disorder. These ideals, this tradition, this rationality remain so powerful that they can survive even the constant barrage of reforms, the small revolutions proposed by small minds, the disorder promoted by modern day reformers who keep proposing as "bold" new concepts many of the same notions which were long ago consigned to the trash barrel of history.

When I stand and gaze at the great Parthenon up there against the sky, on the escarpment overlooking Athens I know what the word "bold" means. To understand what has happened to us, you need to do no more than study the use of the term "bold" in the hands of mediocre modern reformers. No notion is now so trivial that a modern reformer will not describe it as a "bold new idea" or a "bold new plan." Among pygmies even the smallest things look big. Among those who think history began yesterday, everything is new.

To get a perspective on the prevailing style of today nothing is more salutary than to study the art of the Greeks. It is only necessary to place a great sculpture from the high period of Greek achievement against almost any modern sculpture. The humanity of the Greek is almost inevitably in sharp contrast with the inhuman modern concept. The Greek serenity, the Greek balance and repose, the Greek rationality, the inherent sense of human dignity stands sharply against the confusion and distortion, the tangled emotions, the cult of the ugly and commonplace which is so often characteristic of modern art.

And the theater. We could never leave a discussion of the Greek tradition without a view of the grandeur and magnificence of the Greek theater. Here, again, we are in the presence of a great invention of the Greek imagination.

In the Greek theater the whole community gathered to view a spectacle of the highest significance. In the great tragedies, the Greeks beheld a spectacle in which the most profound human emotions were plumbed and all against a cosmic background that strangely did not dwarf the actors but caused them instead to rise to heroic levels which would be inconceivable on the modern stage. There was an air of greatness about the Greek theater which not only represented in truth the Greek view of man and the universe but reflected back upon the audience and taught them that greatness was possible even in the face of inevitable evil, even in the face of a monstrous and absolutely terrifying fate. The Greek theater was made by men who drew the breath of greatness; the Greek theater was created by men who knew greatness and who taught men how it was to be great. Even their comedies shared in this sense of greatness. In the midst of even the wildest and most whimsical comedy there remained that breath of greatness and of freedom.

It is no surprise that the greatest writer of Greek comedy—Aristophanes—was also profoundly conservative.

I wonder what he would have said about the humorless and self-righteous professional reformers of today? I wonder what he would have said about their cult of the common or mediocre man?

Unless there is a belief in the potential greatness of man, there can no longer be tragedy; there can be only melodrama. When man becomes trivial, tragedy becomes ludicrous. What is more, comedy also becomes a trifling thing—at best witty and clever, never carrying with it hints of the grandeur and depth of the tragic vision which must serve as the necessary vital contrast for truly great comedy.

I do not believe, in our present social state, dominated as it is by a trivial conception of man—dominated as it is by superficial reformers who expect to save and to protect and to remake man through government action—I do not believe that either great tragedy or great comedy is possible in such an environment.

Your ancestors once showed us what man could be. Your ancestors in their concept of the theater gave us a model of greatness against which to measure the theater, for all time.

And what of the modern theater?

Have you looked at your TV set lately?

What wallowing in self-pity. What vast and contorted expressions of emotion over trifling problems. What meaningless violence and meaningless sex.

Comedy has become "wisecracks." Very clever, sometimes even very witty. But the background of greatness is not there, so the savor, the depth of contrast, is gone. The surprise, the fast switch, the shock have taken its place.

Your ancestors would look upon us with pity. To them, we would be truly barbarians.

We who call ourselves conservatives have only the most profound respect for this great Greek tradition, whether it be in the art of government, or in science or mathematics, whether in architecture or sculpture, or in philosophy, or in history, or in the art of the theater. I have no time to talk of the magnificence of Greek poetry, or the handicrafts, or of the creation of the great sciences of botany and zoology. All these you know so well.

We conservatives do not believe that history began yesterday. We do not believe that anything over 20 years old is necessarily "horse and buggy," and ought therefore to be discarded. We conservatives do not believe that something is good just because some think it is new, or that it is obsolete just because some say it is old.

We believe that what wisdom we may have is the product of the thought and work of many, many generations. If we stand high at all, we gain this height, we believe, because we stand on the shoulders of past generations.

We ask only that the wisdom of the past be brought to bear also on today's problems. We ask only that reformers read some history, and that they have a decent respect for our forefathers and our great traditions.

We conservatives ask for an end to the cynical, cocksure attitudes of reformers who describe any ideas inherited from the past as "horse and buggy."

In a word, we conservatives believe there is something great and something valuable to be conserved from the past. We do not believe we were born yesterday.

We conservatives believe that Americans of Greek ancestry have a special character. They are bearers of a special trust.

All of us who live in the Western World owe a profound, immeasurable debt to your forefathers. But you, the direct descendants of the men who created so much of the basis of our whole civilization—you have in your very blood, in the very fiber of your brains and nervous systems, the germ of that greatness.

The heroic stand of modern Greeks against the Nazis and then against the Communists showed the world that the spirit of ancient Greece still lives today in the Greeks of modern times.

You are conservatives. You have conserved from your ancestors that tradition of fierce independence—that concept of the greatness of man—which we conservatives of the modern world treasure as a priceless possession.

I am a conservative, and I feel at home here.

It has been a great honor for me to be here with you, the sons and daughters of the magnificent Greek tradition: The tradition which is now an essential and central element in the America which is also yours and mine.

New York Prayer Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 24, 1962

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from my constituent, Mrs. Floyd Gibson, of Covington, Va., to Mr. Justice Black of the U.S. Supreme Court, concerning the opinion he wrote in the New York prayer case of Engle against Vitale.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COVINGTON, VA.,
June 26, 1962.

JUSTICE BLACK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been a schoolteacher in rural Virginia for many years. I have seen all kinds of "isms" come and go. I never could have lived through the hectic days successfully if the children and I had not met together with our Father at the beginning of each workday to thank Him for His care and to ask Him to bless the day and help us make it a good one.

As a result of such beginnings, the days went more smoothly and the children seemed happy, too. Over and over it happened that if we had a rough day it would be found that for some reason we would have had to omit the morning prayer.

There is no greater beauty to be found in the English language than is to be found in the majestic words of the Bible. First Corinthians, chapter 13 is a masterpiece that has never been matched by any writer since St. Paul was inspired to record those words for us. Repeatedly I have seen the great words of John 14 bring a changed expression to a troubled little face. Small shoulders might be drooping when those words were repeated just before heads went down on desks for a moment of silent prayer which was to be closed by all the class praying the prayer that was given to us by our Lord. When the quiet moments were ended, and faces were lifted, hope and cheerfulness were written where the troubled expression had rested.

I tell you, sir, I have had the very words "get out your Testaments" bring quietness into a whispering, moving class during the first moments after the bell, while I was checking the roll, taking up the milk money, the cafeteria money, the ice cream money, and any other money that always takes time of the elementary teacher on every weekday morning in our schools. Just holding a well-worn Testament in his hands, or loafing through its pages, seemed to bring serenity and stillness to the child. A schoolchild today needs such moments to himself ahead of the busy hours that lie ahead.

I have never felt resentful because of the ruling on segregation. I know that the public school teacher will have to bear the brunt of the burden of adjustment when it comes to all of us. I have felt that it is just another challenge to us to do our best, always keeping in mind that it is the children, only, who matter.

Immortal souls are more important than all the politics of administrations and governments. Schools have to clothe many children. Schools have to give vitamin pills and do anything else for the children that the parents fail to do. At least that is the way it seems to me. Then, on the side, the schools even see to it that an education is given to meet each childs' individual differences insofar as is possible in this day of heavy loads and many problems, while an ever-increasing number of parents spend textbook money on whisky. Isn't soul salvation more important than these other service?

What of the child who never sees the inside of a church? Would the Jews and Unitarians and the others like them have said anything if they had known of the children of their faiths who were being deprived of the right to offer a simple prayer acknowledging the greatest of God who created our beautiful world, and then sets us in it to live and enjoy the life that He gave to us? It seems to me to be a simple matter of good manners, if nothing else, to send up a sincere "Thank you" as we hurry through our day.

I believe that God can, and will, work out a solution for us so that we can safely emerge from this muddle of world problems and politics into which we, small, unassuming people, have been shoved. The Supreme Court that we trusted to keep us and our ideals safe, has today added to the muddle and the noise and confusion about us. You men charged with this great responsibility, have done what you could to make it easier for our youth of the last half of this 20th century to grow into godless adults by tying the hands of the public school teacher who wanted to do something about this condition of our times. You, and we, may have to live under a government run by these children. Do you think you will like that living?

Most sincerely,

MRS. FLOYD GIBSON.

Guardsmen Settling Back Into Useful Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 24, 1962

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last October during the crisis in Berlin the President called up some 150,000 members of the National Guard and Reserves. Our citizen-soldiers responded quickly and convincingly to that call. The Congress supported the call. The American people supported it, with vigor and determination.

It was that solid response by the American people that was heard all the way to the Kremlin, and it was that strong position by the American people which kept Khrushchev in hand when the Berlin situation was at a dangerous moment in history.

Now, most of those men who put on the uniform have returned to their civilian jobs, to their homes and loved ones, to their businesses and professions.

We congratulate them for a job well done, and we welcome them home again.

I commend to the Senate an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, August 12, 1962, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, Aug. 12, 1962]

GUARDSMEN SETTLING BACK INTO USEFUL WORK IN OUR COMMUNITY

All over Mississippi, National Guardsmen and Army reservist troops, our citizen-soldiers, are taking off the uniform and settling back into useful lines of work in their communities.

A series of "welcome home" parties have been held in many sections of the State, letting the young men know that their sacrifices while in extended service of the Nation, are recognized and appreciated.

Wtihout exception, the units which went out from Mississippi received training that advanced their readiness in case of any emergency. They return home amid hopes that though the cold war continues, emergencies will have a tendency to dimish.

At the Jackson party for the 114th Military Police Company and the 134th Surgical Company, speakers made mention of these hopes that the cold war can be expected to continue, but with reduced threat at least for the time being. This is said even though the Russians are completely unpredictable.

Several reasons project themselves as basis of hope. One is that agricultural production and industrial achievements in Russia are still so far short of what a nation would need to fight a major war outside its borders, that the Soviets will be circumspect in dealings that carry real danger of major conflict. They are certain to continue to provoke incidents in scattered places, but the chances of their initiating a real global conflict are seen as less than likely.

A second reason for Russian reluctance to create a catrastrophic event is seen in the development of the European Community, where progress has been so marked in recent years. If the Common Market advances as expected and as it is trending today, a unified political community could well spring up that would act as a real check on Red expansion toward the West.

Here in Jackson, we are glad to have the officers and men back home. Dr. David Wilson commanding the 134th Surgical Hospital, will resume his place at the head of the university medical center hospital. Many of his officers and men will likewise go right back to their duties just as before they left 10 months ago for Fort Polk, Va.

Incidentally, this unit is distinguished by having the first women in its table of organization in a Mississippi National Guard unit. Miss Annie Tucker of Jackson went into the hospital unit in 1957 as a captain in the Army Nurses Corps. Now Major Tucker, she was the first woman inducted into active Federal services as a member of the Mississippi Guard.

The 114th Military Police Company, a sharp and well-drilled outfit, commanded by Capt. James Robert Ellington, brought back from Fort Gordon, Ga., a crew of vigorous, able young men whose presence will again be welcome in the community. Captain Ellington himself resumes his duties as a civilian aid to the U.S. property and disbursing officer in Jackson.

The men of these units have been commended for the job they did in answering the call in a national emergency. They have been welcomed home, both officially and unofficially. They now are called to community service in the solving om many homefront problems. We are certain their response will be prompt and effective.

Remarks by William G. Simpson at Swearing-in Ceremony as SBA Deputy Administrator for Management and Research Assistance, 10 a.m., Tuesday, August 14, 1962, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, having previously extended my remarks on August 20, page A6313 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, relative to this subject—I am honored to call to the attention of the House that after his induction as Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration for Management and Research Assistance on Tuesday, August 14, 1962, Mr. William G. Simpson in response to the encomiums paid to him as to his spectacular career of accomplishments and abilities and assumed duties in this field by Administrator John E. Horne, responded as follows:

Honorable Senators, Congressmen, Administrator John Horne, fellow SBA members, relatives and friends.

Greetings, and a sincere expression of my gratitude to each of you for attending this ceremony today. Some of you have traveled a thousand miles or more to be here, and I appreciate this demonstration of your friendship.

The reception being given me today differs markedly from the first one I received in Washington. This prior reception occurred in 1946 immediately after I had been graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. I was assigned to the Pentagon. You can readily imagine the reception that was accorded by the Pentagon to a new second lieutenant at that time.

It is with great pleasure and honor that I assume the position of Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration for Management and Research Assistance. I have devoted all of my adult business life to the serving of small business. Those of you who have known me or my family well in Illinois can confirm the observation that all of my relatives for over three generations have been active either in the professions or in small businesses. So, it is with this deep-rooted family background in small business coupled with a sympathetic understanding of the small businessman and his problems, born of my own direct experience, that I now take up the responsibilities of the office to which I have been sworn today.

For over a century and a half, small business has been for many Americans a way of life, consistent with the best traditions of freedom, independence, and individual initiative. I believe it is true that as long as individuals can aspire to entrepreneurship, as long as they can order their economic lives according to their own ambitions and abilities, and as long as people in this country can acquire equities in businesses built up through their own efforts, then, as long as these conditions obtain, personal freedom in all of its broad aspects will be well supported.

I maintain that if you give a man economic freedom and choice, then you have also progressed significantly in guaranteeing to him the other moral and social freedoms that all of us as Americans cherish. Each year approximately 450,000 individual Americans take advantage of this basic economic freedom of choice. I say that this particular freedom is well worth preserving.

We can cite many favorable aspects of small business, while at the same time recognizing that, in our modern mass industrial society, the small business is no longer the dominant force in our economic life that it was 75 years ago.

Yet there are approximately 4,500,000 small businesses in our country and they are a significant and vibrant force. They employ large numbers of our people; they account for countless new products and innovations; and in certain industries they have inherent advantages over larger businesses with greater assets and manpower.

As small business concentrates on the phases of activity in which it can serve and compete best, it will continue to grow and prosper. It is in this role of its own enlightened self-interest, keeping in tune with the times, that small business as an American institution deserves to survive and prosper. For these reasons, it merits our loyal assistance.

Because of the complexities of our industrialized economic society, I believe that government has the right and duty to create the economic and social environment which encourages the formation of new businesses, spurs their growth and assists in their prosperity. Small business needs Government encouragement. It also needs proper amounts of Government's direct and indirect support in order to survive and grow. But in providing such encouragement and support, Government does not seek to control or dominate. Such a role would impede progress rather than accelerate it. A person in good faith may judge that a particular Government action tends to veer too strongly toward control or regimentation. But this is a question of judgment, and the objective of Government's participation remains the same—to help or to regulate but not to dominate.

The major programs now being conducted by the Small Business Administration, exemplify, in my opinion, the proper role of Government encouragement and support of business. These include the provision of financial loan assistance, management counseling, promotion of business education and research and helping to foster a favorable overall business climate.

I would like at this time to pay tribute to the farsighted legislators who constituted the SBA as an independent agency of the executive department. I also wish to acknowledge the general debt and gratitude which we owe to the men and women of the SBA who are devoting their careers to furthering the legitimate interests of small business in this country.

In closing, may I say that it is with these basic beliefs in the enlightened role of small business in our country and in Government's proper relation to it, that I now enter upon my new assignment.

It is also upon these same beliefs that I solicit your moral support and help in the months and years to come.

We can only but observe from William G. Simpson's brief but choice remarks, that the Small Business Administration has inducted into its ranks a man who understands its problems and is dedicated to the purposes of its existence in Government. He has our confidence and support.

Philadelphia Association for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in 1932 the Crime Prevention Association of Philadelphia was founded to assist in the control of antisocial behavior through programs of an educational, social and recreational nature, in cooperation with other appropriate agencies. Over the years the association developed a number of programs and expanded its activities, while concentrating its efforts in area-youth-work.

In 1960 gang youth violence flamed from south to north to west Philadelphia, resulting in deaths, severe injuries and increasingly dangerous interracial tensions. The Crime Prevention Association decided that it was necessary to attempt a new approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency. The subtitle "Philadelphia Association for Youth" was adopted and the new organization appealed to trusts, foundations and the Philadelphia City Council for funds to meet this situation. Late in 1960, through the efforts of Hon. Paul D'Ortona, now president of Philadelphia City Council, an appropriation of $40,000 was secured to aid the association's area-youth-work program in 1961. Additional funds were obtained from a foundation grant, private contributions and the United Fund. The newly formed Philadelphia Association for Youth was now financially prepared to approach the problem of juvenile delinquency control.

A pilot project was initiated under the direction of Stephan H. Kneisel, executive director of the Crime Prevention Association. The 17th police district, an area with a history of street fighting among youth groups and frequent interracial hostilities, was chosen as the site for the project. Prior to 1961, the 17th district held top position for recorded tension and youth conflict situations. The district embraces about 6½ square miles and about 2,500 boys between the ages of 14 and 17 and over 13,000 school-age youngsters.

It was decided that, except for a minimum clerical staff, the new funds were to be used to put as many workers on the street as possible in areas of greatest need. By January 1961 two full-time and four part-time workers had been employed. The staff was gradually enlarged until it comprised 25 full- or part-time workers, 20 of whom were employed working directly with the youth of the area. Extensive cooperation was obtained from the board of education, which made three strategically located school gyms available for recreational programs; the Philadelphia Department of Recreation assigned a youth worker of its own to one of the recreational facilities in the area; the juvenile aid division of the police department provided day-to-day communication between the association's area workers and the police officers assigned to the 17th district; and the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations supplied additional personnel and coordination functions. The support of the residents and businessmen of the area was also enlisted. Several businessmen donated vacant apartments or store basements to be used as clubhouses and residents aided in the formation of Boy and Girl Scout troops as well as supplying much-needed adult leadership and supervision.

It is difficult to evaluate the intangible improvements brought about by the Philadelphia Youth Association's activities in the 17th police district. The overall improvement of the living conditions, property values, and social climate of the area cannot be taken lightly. However, there is more tangible evidence of improvement after only 12 months of operation. Homicides due to youth group violence numbered 3 in 1960, while there were none in 1961 in the 17th district; major group conflicts were reduced from 34 to 12 and major intergroup incidents from 38 to 21. Both the youth and racial conflicts in 1961, as opposed to those in 1960, were sporadic and seemingly unrelated. The overall operations of the Philadelphia Association for Youth in 1961 reached 19,937 boys and girls, including 3,325 registered members.

What of the future? The youth association has already begun expanded operations for 1962, including an increased grant from the city council. H. Hunter Holt, Jr., president of the Crime Prevention Association, stated in the 1961 annual report: "This has been a glorious, hectic, exhausting year of progress, not for the association but for Philadelphia. If it has the vision and will, Philadelphia can become the first major city in the world to have redirected the energies and potentialities of its most troublesome youth groups into constructive channels."

I congratulate the Philadelphia Association for Youth for its efforts in 1961 and for the progress it has made toward solution of Philadelphia's juvenile problem.

Senator Thomas J. Dodd Delivers Inspiring Address at Congressional Breakfast Meeting of Religious Heritage of America, Inc., Pilgrimage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 24, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 12th annual Washington pilgrimage sponsored by Religious Heritage of America, Inc., is being held in this city from August 22 to 25, 1962.

Religious Heritage of America is a nationwide, nonsectarian association of citizens who believe that faith in God is the foundation on which this Nation was built, and that our future depends on maintaining our position as a "nation under God."

Each year this organization holds a pilgrimage to Washington, D.C., encouraging personal meetings between members and governmental leaders. Through such close contact, Religious Heritage of America, Inc., promotes the practice of religious principles in Government.

It was my privilege this morning to attend the congressional breakfast portion of the pilgrimage. Presiding at this gathering of legislators, churchmen, and interested citizens was Senator JACK MILLER, of Iowa. The invocation was offered by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, and "the Lord's Prayer" was sung by Miss Lee Meredith soprano soloist at the Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D.C.

Dan Fenn, staff assistant to President John F. Kennedy, conveyed the greetings of the Chief Executive and then presented awards of appreciation to T. Sutton Jett, Regional Director of the National Capital Parks, and to Ronald F. Lee, Director, Fifth District, National Park Service.

In directing the program, Senator MILLER made reference that these meetings had in the past been chaired by the late Senator Francis Case of South Dakota, and that prior to his death Senator Case had hoped to introduce a joint resolution setting aside one day during the year to be known as Religious Heritage Day. Senator MILLER stated that the Sunday immediately before Thanksgiving has been proposed, and that the matter was now being studied by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin.

Principal speakers at the congressional breakfast were Representative FRED SCHWENGEL of Iowa, whose subject was "U.S. Capitol, Symbol of This Nation Under God"; and Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut.

Senator DODD commented meaningfully on "The Spiritual Basis of our American Democracy", and stressed the need to remain cognizant of our traditions of freedom, equality, and democracy, all evolved through deep adherence to spiritual ideals.

Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that Ella F. Harllee has been selected as Churchwoman of the Year by Religious Heritage of America, Inc. Miss Harllee, president and director of the Educational and Religious Radio and Television Association, has been responsible for more than 12,000 religious radio and television broadcasts in the Washington area during the past 10 years, and has contributed much to the spiritual betterment of our Nation's Capital.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator DODD's remarks, and the Washington Post and Times Herald article concerning the selection of Ella F. Harllee as Churchwoman of the Year be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Thomas J. Dodd, at the Religious Heritage of America Congressional Breakfast, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., Friday, August 24, 1962

It is a pleasure and an honor for me to participate in this congressional breakfast sponsored by the Religious Heritage of America.

The subject assigned to me this morning is "The Spiritual Basis of Our American Democracy." This is a very large order for me, and one which I doubt I can properly fill.

In trying to prepare for it, I thought back to the origins of our democracy and to that remarkable group of men who brought into being upon this continent a free society.

On the beautiful grounds of Monticello, near Charlottesville, Va., is the tomb of one of those men, Thomas Jefferson. On that tomb is an inscription which Jefferson himself prepared, according to a custom of the time.

As he reflected, during his last years, on the achievements of his life and tried to summarize in a single sentence the things for which he wished to be remembered, many thoughts must have come into his mind.

He had played an important part in the decision of the Thirteen Colonies to fight for their independence. He was our first American Secretary of State, our second Vice President and our third President.

At a single stroke, and without a drop of blood, he achieved through the Louisiana Purchase a doubling of the size of our country. He was the founder of one of our political parties and the father of policies which have shaped American history down through the decades.

And, yet, he cited none of these things for the remembrance of his countrymen. The inscription that he wrote was this:

"Author of the Declaration of Independence; of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom; and the father of the University of Virginia."

In that simple inscription, I think, can be found the elements which form the spiritual basis of our democracy: that in the eyes of the law, all men should be equal and should enjoy the inalienable rights with which they have been endowed by their Creator; that men should be free and that their freedom to accept or reject should extend even to the most sacred and fundamental of man's beliefs; and that the purpose of society is not only to guarantee these freedoms and to protect these rights but also to educate, to elevate each citizen to the fullest realization of his capacities and talents in order that he might make the wisest use of freedom, for himself and for society.

These were the basic fundamentals of the ideal society to which Jefferson devoted his life. But these ideals did not appear full blown in the 18th century in the writings of the founders of our country and their contemporaries around the world.

Whence comes the dignity of man, a phrase so glibly used these days by writers and speakers?

Why ought man to be free, to be educated, to be loved, to be treated justly?

Our spiritual heritage gives the answer: Because he is a child of God, with a noble destiny. And as such he has inalienable rights, he has infinite possibilities. The ideal society is that society best formed to enable individual men to achieve those infinite possibilities. And the only form of government which, in the long run, has proved itself to be in harmony with these goals is that which we loosely call democracy.

We cannot appreciate the extent to which these ideas have transformed the Western World unless we look back for a moment at the kind of society that existed, at the philosophy that prevailed, in the mighty civilizations of antiquity.

Historians tell us that in the predominate thought of archaic times, human life was a melancholy and futile thing, without meaning and without purpose. The earth itself was considered hostile to man, and life upon it, whether it be the life of vegetables, animals, human beings or civilizations, consisted merely of endless cycles of birth, growth, decay, and death.

In the despair-ridden thought of that day, everything eventually returned to its original state and its journey signified nothing.

The gods were merely manifestations of various aspects of nature. Man was thought to be in complete bondage to an unchangeable fate. Every aspect of his life was predetermined by fate and beyond his power to change.

We know that society and its institutions reflect our ideas about God and man, and the governments of that time were therefore reflections of these ancient concepts.

Since man had no significance, since his life consisted only of a preordained role, his part in life was only to conform. His only conceivable duty was to fill his little slot in the social order, to perform his inevitable tasks, and to suffer his inexorable fate.

There was in this order of things no room for freedom, no room for individual choice, no room for individual responsibility, no room even for the quest for individual goodness.

Therefore, political order in the ancient world was an order of ruthless despotism, of rigid and permanent class structure, of complete domination by the state of every aspects of human life, of the unspeakable cruelty and contempt for human life that characterize all government, ancient or modern, which is not elevated by moral law.

And worst of all, this cruel, purposeless world would never change.

The Roman Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, one of the most enlightened of pagan rulers, illustrated this changeless fatalism when he said that every man of normal intelligence who had attained the age of 40 had seen everything that had ever happened in the world and everything that would ever happen.

It is in this contrast between the philosophy of the ancient world and the philisophy of our free world that we can find the spiritual basis of democracy.

Democracy could not gain a foothold under the prevailing thought of antiquity.

Democracy cannot exist without recognition of individual worth; without a concept of personal responsibility; without respect for the rights of others; without hope for the future; without the confidence that man by his own deeds can alter the course of events and reshape the world around him.

Before democracy could have meaning, there had to be a complete transformation in man's concept of his own nature and of his purpose and role in life. It was the evolution of Judaic-Christian thought which brought about this transformation.

To the Jews and Christians there were no nature gods that were mere reflections of the phenomena of nature, such as the seas and the sun, the stars, and the moon.

Ther was one God, the Creator and sustainer of the entire universe. The earth was inherently good because it was created by that God, and man was significant because he was created for a divine purpose. Life on earth therefore had meaning.

The god of the Jews and Christians was a personal God, profoundly concerned with the individual fate of men. Man was His coworker in building a new order on earth. The spark of divinity was in him. He had a vocation as a son of God. As such, he had an inherent dignity.

There was a moral law governing the operations of men. They were not helpless victims of fate. They were free agents. They were free either to accept the divine law and build a good and humane society or to reject it and build an evil and inhumane society.

The new philosophy flatly rejected the archaic thinking that the essence of life was blind and meaningless repetition. History had significance. Purposeful progress in carrying out the divine plan was the law of life. And so, in place of the ancient belief that the earth was changeless and static, the great Hebrew and Christian prophets and scholars offered visions of an order of justice and righteousness which have made a profound impact on the thinking of mankind ever since.

We need not be surprised that political democracy came very late in the development of our Judaic-Christian civilization, for democracy is but a political means to achieving an end, and first the end had to be established and accepted.

Slowly, under the impact of Judaic-Christian teachings, man's ideas about himself changed.

Slowly, the new concepts of the nature of man gained victory over the old.

Slowly, as the centuries passed, the individual human being, his personal destiny, his intrinsic worth, his infinite possibilities moved toward the center of the stage. And as this concept of intrinsic individual worth grew, there grew with it inevitably the concept of individual freedom.

Men began to ask—if God endowed man with a free will, why should the princes of this world deny him free choice?

If all men are equal in the sight of God, why should they not be held equal before the law?

If all men are to be judged upon their personal merit in the next world, why should they not be judged upon their personal merit in this world?

We regret that the answers to these questions were so late in coming. We regret that religious leaders themselves so often failed to understand the social and political implications of the revolution which their basic doctrines had set off. We regret that temporal leaders all too often misused these doctrines as pretexts for establishing a ruthless authoritarianism. We regret that princes and prelates alike so misunderstood the implications of free will that they repeatedly launched unspeakable persecutions and wars against one another.

But we may glory in the fact that it was our own Founding Fathers who saw individual freedom and political democracy as the logical outgrowth of our spiritual heritage.

We rejoice that the founders of American democracy saw in Christianity not a justification for authoritarianism, or religious wars, or persecutions, or enslavements, but rather they saw in it a foundation for the rights of man, a justification for freedom of thought and religious tolerance, and a mandate to educate and to elevate and to liberate the individual.

We are indebted to the men who founded this Nation for many gifts, but none more priceless than this: Three great revolutions have swept across the world in the modern age; the American, the French, and the Communist revolutions. The French Revolution and the Communist Revolution were antireligious in character and the evil which they let loose far outweighed any reforms they achieved. The American Revolution was rooted in a deeply religious foundation and the good that has flowed from that revolution has transformed the world.

For almost two centuries we in America have pursued the goal of broadening and extending our kind of democracy.

Perhaps the greatest danger facing our Nation is that as we pursue this goal, and as the tide and turmoil of recurring crises loom up on all sides, we will forget the spiritual origins of the freedom, the equality, the democracy, which we espouse.

This meeting today and the many that have been held and will be held are efforts to remind ourselves of these values and to ask ourselves what, in the light of these values, our country should stand for and, if need be, fight for.

I am pleased and honored to have been permitted to take part in so significant an occasion.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1962]

Ella F. Harllee, Cited; She's the Church Woman of the Year

(By Marie Smith)

Ella F. Harllee, president and director of the new Educational and Religious Radio and Television Association which opened offices here August 1, will have a citation of honor to hang on her office wall after tonight.

She has been named Church Woman of the Year by the Religious Heritage of America and will receive the award at a banquet tonight at the Washington Hotel.

Miss Harllee, a native Washingtonian who still lives in the house in which she was born on Lamont Street has carved out a career for herself in religious education and broadcasting.

She has been responsible for more than 12,000 religious radio and television broadcasts in the Washington area in the past 10 years and more recently her horizon has broadened to include the world.

The Religious Radio and Television Association, founded on a grant from the Lilly Foundation, will distribute to an international audience the televison Bible courses that Miss Harllee and her associates have directed to local audiences in the past.

"The urgency is so great we've got to cut corners to educate large masses," Miss Harllee said in telling about the enlarged program.

For the past 2 years she has been director of the religious film and television project jointly administered by the American University and the National Capital Area Council of Churches.

She developed and completed the video recording of two college credit television courses, "The Life and Teachings of Jesus" and "An Introduction to the New Testament" which have been viewed by more than a million people and are to be distributed by the association throughout the English speaking world.

Next month, her third course in the trilogy, "An Introduction to the Old Testament" will be introduced locally on WMAL–TV with the Reverend Edward W. Bauman, teacher of the two earlier courses, as the instructor.

Mr. Bauman will be assisted by Rabbi Balfour Brickner, director of Interfaith Activities of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in New York and formerly at Temple Sinai here.

Miss Harllee said the courses are "interfaith" and those enrolled, both on campus and at home, have included Jews, Protestants, and Catholics.

Of the foreign distribution courses, Miss Harllee said: "The only answer to mass education is mass media. We haven't got time to teach the illiterate to read to educate them. They can learn through pictorial images."

She added that the religious telecourses will supplement the work of missionaries and help them tell their stories.

Students who take the course for credit go to American University to classes, take field trips and examinations. Those who study at home take only the field trip. This year's field trip for the Washington area home students was a visit to the National Gallery to view religious art. "We had 750 people turn out for that trip," Miss Harllee said.

Miss Harllee, who began her religious work at Central Presbyterian Church, where she is a member, is the daughter of the late Brig. Gen. William Curry Harllee, of the Marine Corps, and Mrs. Harllee, who is a past historian general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Her brother is Rear Adm. John Harllee, Vice Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

She comes by her interest in religion naturally. She is a direct descendant of the Reverend Richard Buck, second rector of the Jamestown (Va.) Church, and chaplain of the general assembly which convened in the church at Jamestown on July 30, 1619. Miss Harllee, who has traveled 30,000 miles in the past year in behalf of the Bible courses and has visited 30 art galleries in Europe in a search for religious art to illustrate them, said more than 6,000 persons have enrolled already for this season's courses currently scheduled in 6 cities.

"This is more than a national network college course got over the entire United States last year," she said.

The Bible course is sponsored in each city by a local college or civic group and is offered on a credit and noncredit basis.

"We've found more nonchurch people than regular churchgoers are enrolled," Miss Harllee said, "and the response ranges from people who haven't even finished high school to people with Ph. D. degrees."

"The largest segment is people between 30 and 40 years of age," she added.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Wisconsin Kickapoo Valley—Tourist Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 25, 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recently had the opportunity to visit with Mr. Glen Hagar, who is the editor of the Crawford County Independent, a weekly newspaper located at Gays Mills, Wis., in the heart of the beautiful Kickapoo Valley region.

The inhabitants of that area are hopeful that the Kickapoo Valley may be given the status of a State or national park. Because the delights of this beautiful valley in the extreme southwest corner of Wisconsin constitute a potential source of enjoyment for the citizens of adjacent States, I would like to bring them to the attention of my colleagues.

This largely unpublicized area contains many of nature's gifts in the form of scenic vistas, fruits, flowers, fish, and animals. It is also of great historic interest. Perhaps a brief description will explain why this area would well repay a tourist visit.

The Kickapoo Valley region is a geographical oddity, unique in the world, the only spot surrounded by glaciers during the Ice Age, yet not ever covered by ice.

It was the great central population seat of the Mound Builders and abounds with Indian artifacts.

The bullets which were used at the Battle of Tippecanoe were manufactured at the forks of the Kickapoo. The Indians had a forge at Haney Village and manufactured them with lead brought from Galena, Ill.

The brooks flowing into the Kickapoo are full of northern pike, catfish, and speckled and rainbow trout—the woods are filled with squirrels, rabbits, quail, and grouse.

The first products of the Kickapoo Valley were the timber and lumber cut from the wealth of oak, maple, hickory, black walnut, linwood, elm, birch, poplar, ironwood, butternut, boxelder, pine, sumac, and hazel trees growing in profusion along the Kickapoo and Wisconsin Rivers.

Amidst the soft carpeting of its beautiful June grass, said to be the famous Kentucky blue grass, grow masses of wild flowers—ferns, anemones, violets, trilliums, buttercups, wild roses, ladyslippers, columbine, honeysuckles, harebells, wood orchids, oxalis, fleur-de-lis, Dutchman's breeches, jack-in-the-pulpit, goldenrod, asters, oxeye daisies, aromatic mint, moss, and Virginia-creeper.

The valley is a treasure house of red and black raspberries, blackberries, gooseberries, elderberries, wild strawberries, plums, black haws, chokecherries, black cherries, hazel nuts, butternuts, walnuts, hickory nuts, hop vines, grapevines.

But the great crop today is the apples. The Kickapoo Valley Apple Festival held in September celebrates the harvesting of the great orchards loaded with Wealthys, McIntosh, Delicious, Cortland, Greenings, Jonathans, and the mellow Old-fasioned Duchess apples which rival those of any apple-producing region in the Nation.

For 17 miles the Kickapoo River winds through 4,000 to 6,000 acres of forest primeval, a virtually unexplored wilderness, rich in wildlife, with innumerable camping and picnic spots.

In 1896 a young minister of the Congregational Church in the little village of Retreat, Wis., the Reverend William Haughton, sat on a bluff overlooking the river and composed this charming tribute in verse to the wonders of the beautiful valley below.

I ask unanimous consent to have the tribute printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KICKAPOO

(By Rev. William Haughton)

When heaven's creative hand was laid
Upon these gorgeous hills
In emerald sheen and gold arrayed,
And cleft by flashing rills,
I traced in beauty mead and dale
With charms forever new,
But left its blessings on that vale
Where flows the Kickapoo.

O favored land! — No foot has trod
Through fairer paths than thine
Where hills uplift their heads to God
And speak His power divine,
Where valleys breathe of peace and rest,
Fresh as the morning dew,
And Vernon on her own warm breast
Impearls the Kickapoo.

Above me bend the clustering boughs;
The cliffs around me stand
And heavenward rear their giant brows
In beauty calm and grand,—
I linger lovingly and long
Beside these waters blue
And yearn to give thy name to song
O peaceful Kickapoo!

But men will come in after days
Thy wondrous charms to see,
And many an abler pen will praise
Thy matchless scenery—
God shield thee by His mighty arm
And every wrong subdue;
God keep thy dwellings safe from harm
O tranquil Kickapoo!

Waste in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 25, 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Waste in Space," which was published in the Beloit News, discussing a presentation which I made to the Appropriations Committee on the space budget.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASTE IN SPACE

Senator PROXMIRE is concerned about where our space program is taking us—financially.

Wisconsin's junior Senator appeared Tuesday before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee which is holding hearings on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget.

"Fiscal caution has been thrown to the winds in the administration of our Nation's space program," he asserted.

Senator PROXMIRE cited as one example the manned space flight center in Houston, Tex. The projected cost of this project has zoomed like a rocket from the initial estimated cost of $60 million to the current budget request of plus $90 million. And, says Senator PROXMIRE, the most recent reports indicate the actual cost will be $123 million, more than double the original cost estimate with construction barely started.

In conjunction with the space center, he cited the acquisition of land and what happned to prices. Originally, he explained, the site of the center was to be a tract of land donated by Rice University. The acreage was deemed inadequate, so an additional 600 acres of land had to be bought. Land prices in the meantime had leaped skyward. He testified it is his understanding that the space agency actually paid $1.4 million for the additional land, about double the price before a premature announcement sent prices upward.

"Both these matters—the vastly increased cost of the center itself and the unnecessarily high cost of land acquisition—raise serious questions about the prudence with which the space program is administered," Senator PROXMIRE declared.

It is this kind of financial irresponsibility that prompts the demands of many U.S. taxpayers that the Government accompany proposed tax reductions with fiscal belt tightening.

property damage were prevalent. Property records were sometimes inadequate, mislaid, or lost.

Three years after the passage of the 1948 act, the Department of Justice in 1951 recommended that Congress authorize the Attorney General to compromise and settle all claims up to three quarters of the amount of the compensable items, or $2,500, whichever was less. Congress agreed to this change and it was approved by the President on August 17, 1951. As a condition precedent to the award, the applicant had to agree to an automatic 25 percent deduction of his allowable items. In addition, there was no appeal procedure.

Thus the claimant was faced with a choice of getting a little bit now and nothing later or, through other procedures including an action in the Court of Claims, waiting several additional years in the hopes of securing a greater amount, but quite possibly securing nothing. The "bird in the hand rather than two in the bush" philosophy is not new to human affairs. Many accepted these awards in full and complete settlement of their claims against the Government. Rising inflation, increasing age, the desire to get reestablished, and the fact that no interest was provided on any award made in the future were certainly material factors in making a determination to accept a smaller and probably inadequate amount.

Regardless of procedure, thousands of these claims have been settled, surveyed by the Internal Revenue Service, and closed. On many of these settlements the statute of limitations has already run.

A few of these claims, however, remain. The Internal Revenue Service apparently has announced that the awards made under the 1948 act, as amended, will now be subject to taxation.

I respectfully disagree with this decision. I do not believe that it can reasonably be construed as the intent of Congress. Such action by the Internal Revenue Service would compound a wrong already long and valiantly borne by American citizens of Japanese ancestry. That the original awards were inadequate, paltry, and late in terms of the damages actually inflicted is clear. At no time in the letters, records, and official hearings pertaining to this vexatious problem have officials of the Federal Government raised the question of subjecting these awards to taxation. The fact that the great majority of the claims are now closed and not subject to taxation would mean that discriminatory treatment is being applied to the remaining few for whom the statute of limitations has not yet run.

I am unable to find any testimony in the action of Congress regarding possible taxation of these awards. The nature of the awards themselves would, it seems to me, negate any such intention by the Congress. I urge you to resolve this matter administratively by overruling the prior position your Service has taken.

May I hear from you.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 2, 1962]

INSULT ADDED TO INJURY

In the hysteria that followed Pearl Harbor, 80,000 U.S. citizens were deprived of their freedom and property. There was no proof of sabotage or disloyalty, but they were of Japanese ancestry.

An Executive order issued February 19, 1942, by President Roosevelt authorized the exclusion from Pacific coastal areas of all German and Italian aliens and all Japanese aliens and citizens. A total of 135,000 persons of Japanese origin were thus forced to "relocation centers."

For 20 years non-Japanese Americans have been trying to forget this incident. In 1957 the Congress tried to make amends by passing the National Japanese Evacuation Claims Act.

Unfortunately the $400 million in claims for property lost by the Nisei were settled for less than 10 cents on the dollar—$36.9 million. Many Nisei, including members of the much-decorated 442d Combat Team, must at times have thought that they would have been better off to have stayed in Japan and been rehabilitated as ex-enemies, for Congress was much more generous with Japan.

But none of us can now ignore the plight of these Nisei. Internal Revenue Service officials have discovered that Congress left a loophole in the compensation act so that the money paid out in claims is taxable.

This, as Senator KUCHEL said, "is adding insult to injury."

Senator KUCHEL this week introduced a bill to right the wrong. His measure would make all compensation under the 1957 act nontaxable. The bill should have high priority in the Congress.

We cannot undo the injury. But we can prevent the added insult.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner, July 24, 1962]

PILING AN INJUSTICE UPON INJUSTICE

The income tax bite now being put upon Japanese-American wartime evacuees from the west coast for compensation awards carries injustice to an extreme few can countenance. The Internal Revenue Service probably has no other recourse under existing law. But if the compensation law is that bad, remedial law is needed and should be promptly written.

The IRS ruling is that compensation awarded for property losses incurred in consequence of evacuation is in part taxable income. Comparison is made with lands seized for freeways. Conscience rejects that interpretation, if law doesn't. And if law doesn't, the statutes should be made to reflect conscience.

The evacuees were never compensated adequately for property losses. There was no indemnification at all for the months and years taken out of their lives, the hardships endured and the humiliation suffered.

The merits of evacuation are not being argued. The facts are. And the facts are that thousands of people with full rights of American citizenship were compelled to leave their homes and businesses and accept imprisonment. We called it relocation, but it was plain and simple incarceration.

Few Americans have easy minds about that now. Congress acknowledged injustice in enactment of the Evacuation Claims Act. But indemnification seldom covered actual physical loss. Now, because Congress failed to exempt the compensation awards from income tax, IRS feels under compulsion to take back a good part of what was so niggardly given.

Instead of the original wrong being righted, new wrongs are being pyramided upon it. Congress should start all over again in setting the record straight. The first thing needed is to put an end to the absurdity that Government can admit a wrong, offer indemnification for it, and then take it back in taxes. Bad as the original injustice was, this rivals it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I make these comments and place in the RECORD these insertions tonight so that they will be available to our colleagues next week. I do hope most sincerely that the Senate overwhelmingly and, indeed, I permit myself the hope, by unanimity, will approve the legislation which I have offered, not alone for myself but also on behalf of a number of my colleagues in the Senate—legislation which will prevent insult from being added to injury.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, August 27, 1962, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 25, 1962:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

E. Avery Crary, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California.

Jesse W. Curtis, Jr., of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California.

Appendix

Thomas F. Stafford Offers Forthright Comment on Agricultural Growth and Continuing Need for Improved Farming Methods in West Virginia and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as the days of summer pass and the season of harvest approaches we are more understanding of the vast accomplishments that have been made in agriculture. Research and scientific experiment have enabled this Nation to become the most successful agricultural power in the earth's history.

This knowledge is particularly heartening at a time when the food-producing success—or lack of it—of the Communist nations has become the object of much high-level discussion. Immediately coming to mind are the cases of Cuba and Communist China, where the commune method of agricultural control has failed to produce even the bare minimums required for proper health and adequate nutrition. By reaching too greedily for advancement in industrial fields these lands have neglected the farmer, and have suffered not only an internal disaster, but international disgrace.

In contemplating the agricultural state of the nations today we are reminded of the words of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

> Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind; as that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times.

This Nation has dedicated itself to fulfilling these words of wisdom, and the result is a land where abundance blesses the industrious, and proper nourishment is available to all.

However, we cannot allow ourselves to become complacent. Jefferson's ideas will continue to be true hundreds of years from now. We must therefore, continue to place emphasis upon the growth and development of our agricultural resources, not only for the good of our own citizens, but also in order that we may discharge our responsibilities with respect to the emerging nations.

In connection with growth and development, I wish to express my commendation of Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, who handled the agriculture appropriations bill in floor consideration last week. He successfully advocated more research expenditures for agriculture. This able Senator correctly gaged the thinking of his colleagues when he exercised this effort in wise manner, yet felt we could properly cut the amounts in certain other phases of the program.

Mr. President, in an article in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette of August 22, 1962, Thomas F. Stafford, an experienced and widely read columnist, discusses the agricultural abundance which America today enjoys. Commenting on the outstanding examples of livestock and farming achievement to be found in West Virginia and other parts of this country, Mr. Stafford emphasizes that the need for wise utilization of land, conservation, and continuing research is as prevalent today as in times past. He likewise acknowledges our dependence on that hardworking and conscientious man who provides so much of this Nation's strength—the farmer.

I ask that the article by Thomas F. Stafford in the August 22 issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFFAIRS OF STATE: STATE MUST TRY MODERN FARMING

(By Thomas F. Stafford)

LEWISBURG.—Summer begins to die a little for us as we enter the State fairgrounds at nearby Fairlea. Officially the end for this delightful season is a month away, yet everywhere—in the display sheds and on the faces of the farm folk—there are gentle reminders that nature's pulse is slowing down.

Our feelings are mixed at this moment. We are depressed by the thought of autumn's coming, but we feel a sense of borrowed pride as we look upon the evidence of accomplishment that is piled high on every side.

There are firm, ripe tomatoes, smooth and polished potatoes, full beans in the pod, fattened cattle, sleek horses, and inviting creations from the kitchen. From late winter to last week thousands of people toiled to make these displays possible, and they have brought forth a generous hint of one of America's finest weapons.

Food is the rich fabric of America's strength. The outside world first became aware of this fact when our troops went overseas in World War I. And again in 1941 it was driven home, when the second war came and troops were dispatched to every global front.

Twice in less than a generation this Nation's young men helped bring peace to the world, and twice the farmers of America kept them healthy and strong. Together they worked for peace, and together now the farmers and Government are helping to keep the peace by pouring a portion of our bounty into underdeveloped parts of the world.

Food makes for energy, and energy makes for doing. Prime food grown on good land enables men to think better, work more energetically, and produce the machines or processes that take the burden off their backs. It is a weapon more powerful than the nuclear bomb. It cuts to the core of reason more quickly than the most articulate diplomat.

Indeed, the fair visitor has cause to count his blessings as he tromps through the dust from the cow barn to the small-crop display center, from the carnival midway to the grandstand. Food such as one finds here is part of America's genius.

But there also is cause for alarm. In driving here, as we have almost every year since the late 1930's, we observed the costly effects of bad agriculture.

There were erosion's scars in the pastures, dry creekbeds in the mountains, forest lands turned into corn patches, scrubby garden plots, fruit trees with little fruit on them, broken fences and abandoned farmhouses. In such tragic sequences from the total picture there is a warning.

Is West Virginia abandoning its share of the challenge of global leadership? Is it giving up its part of the task of feeding the exploding population?

Hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent every year in this State to spread the gospel of conservation and better land use. Our land-grant university, the State department of agriculture, and the Federal Government seek with everything from subsidies to fair prizes to encourage farmers to adopt modern techniques. And what is the result?

The migration from farm to city grows larger every year. Land values keep dropping. Courthouses in the rural counties grow gradually more seedy. And recently the desperate but wise suggestion was made by school authorities that rural counties join in the building of consolidated schools as a means of providing the rudiments of schooling for their children.

When one takes all of this into account and looks at the same naked hillsides year after year, one begins to wonder if it isn't time to pause and reflect upon the agricultural course West Virginia has been following. Perhaps the old policies should be cast aside and new ones adopted.

This State, which was primarily agricultural as recently as the First World War, is no longer an important producer of food. Yet it is rural, with all of the liabilities and few of the assets of rural life.

It may be that the people who display their prime foods and animals here have the key to the future. They may have found a formula the experts haven't discovered yet. But we rather suspect theirs is the same as that of every successful hill farmer from Maine to California—love of the land and hard work.

At least, that was the thought we had as we browsed through the food and livestock exhibits Tuesday and were reminded anew that without this enterprising breed in America the rest of us would soon perish.

The Clerks Are Minding the Store

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I commend Fortune magazine, a business publication, for its generally excellent article about the Retail Clerks International Association headed by James A. Suffridge, a labor statesman.

Too frequently important American publications such as Fortune present biased, unflattering portraits of labor unions, if they bother to mention them at all.

Only once, in the very beginning of the Fortune piece, is there a rather sweeping generalization which seems unfair. It is true that there is corruption, strife, and opportunism in some segments of American unionism but the same can be said of our business community. However, the hard core of both American business and American unionism is directed and made up of decent citizens trying hard to do the right thing.

The Retail Clerks International Association is certainly a model of 20th century progressive unionism, the type of organization the Bob LaFollettes would have approved. The Fortune story portrays its success admirably. Congratulations to both the magazine and the Clerks Union.

The article follows:

THE CLERKS ARE MINDING THE STORE

Much of unionism today has the look of a stagnant, strife-ridden movement, led either by tired war-horses who loll at Miami Beach and wear silk shirts, or by bare-knuckled opportunists who defy the world and don't mind taking a buck on the side.

So far as the Retail Clerks International Association is concerned, the image is wrong on all counts. The fastest-growing union in the United States, it is led by a quiet-spoken, church-going Republican, who cracks down with dizzying swiftness on corruption and makes a genuine effort to speak kind words about employers as he doggedly pushes forward in the hard-to-organize fringes of the white-collar world.

Since James A. Suffridge, 53, took over the presidency in 1944, the Retail Clerks have moved from 25th place in the old AFL to 8th place in the merged labor federation, with 400,000 members. And as they rack up organizing successes in the fast-growing discount field, the union's leaders foresee the day when they will have 2½ million on the rolls, more than any union today. "We see beyond the present evolution in retailing to a revolution," says Suffridge, "and we plan to be on top of it."

For Suffridge personally, the top may be even higher up. He is a solid if not often mentioned contender for the presidency of the AFL–CIO, if and when George Meany decides to step down.

The Retail Clerks International Association was born out of the Early Closing Societies of the 1880's, which developed in an effort to get the 14-to-16-hour day in stores reduced to 10. But in the 1920's, when modern department stores came of age, the climate was not favorable to labor-union growth. Then during the lush early days of the Wagner Act, when other unions were organizing anything that moved, the Retail Clerks were asleep. When Suffridge took over, membership was only 60,000.

Suffridge was born in Knoxville, in the heart of a Tennessee area that has traditionally been Republican. He looks like a successful local merchant, which is not surprising since he grew up clerking in a series of food stores his father bought, built up, and sold at a profit. Suffridge himself got a job during the depression as a clerk in a grocery store in Oakland, Calif. In 1936 he was elected secretary of RCIA's local 870 in Oakland, when it had fewer than 100 members, and no contract with any store. Eight years later, when Suffridge left to become president of the international, local 870 had a contract with every food store in its jurisdiction, and the contracts provided the highest wage scales for food clerks anywhere in the world.

In the union's top post, Suffridge applied on a national scale the approach that had brought success in local 870: first concentrate hard on supermarkets, then fan out into other areas of retailing. In 1957, when he got wind of corruption in the New York locals, he moved instantly to install trusteeships and clean out the tainted leaders. By that time RCIA membership had moved from 60,000 to 300,000. It passed the 400,000 mark in 1961.

A retail store is harder to organize than a factory. As Suffridge is fond of pointing out, "You can't just take a megaphone and shout over the plant fence at the workers." Moreover, since store clerks don't think of themselves as "labor" in the blue-collar sense, they have to be approached carefully.

The Suffridge organizing strategy reflects his merchandising background. The product is carefully designed to fit the market. While other unions persistently try to widen their jurisdiction, the RCIA sticks to clerks and clerks alone, and it hires only organizers who have themselves worked as retail clerks. If Jimmy Hoffa's Teamsters tries to move in on a retail store, the RCIA's organizers point out, charitably, that the Teamsters is a good union for truck drivers. The implication is clear that a union run by and for clerks is the best union for clerks.

AS USEFUL AS AN OLD ASHCAN

Having designed a product suited to his market, Suffridge merchandises it aggressively and persistently. The RCIA spends about $2 million a year on organizing, probably more per capita than any other union. Seven regional organizing directors run the campaign across the Nation, and Suffridge and his chief lieutenants move around constantly, listening, advising, trouble-shooting, and exhorting.

The RCIA is not much interested in organizers who are fire-breathing liberals, following the class-warfare line. In attempting to organize a clothing store in Beverly Hills, for example, such organizers would be "about as useful as an old ash can," in the words of RCIA's chief organizer, First Vice President Sam Meyers. "The benefits we offer are liberalism enough," he says.

The first thing an organizer looks for in a nonunion store is leadership. "Our growth is found," says Suffridge, "where the leadership is found." Sometimes the right leadership walks in through the door. If the clerks in a nonunion store are unhappy with conditions they may get in touch with the RCIA. Some of these leads can turn out to be duds, however. A $15,000-a-year salesman may get upset because his commission base has been changed and contact the union. But the rank and file in the store in unlikely to sympathize deeply with his problem. Moreover, when the boss hears about the union activity he is likely to call the malcontent in, explain that it was all a horrible misunderstanding, correct the difficulty, and hint discreetly at the possibility of future promotion. Then suddenly, says Sam Meyers, the prospect "turns cold." When, on the other hand, it is the boys in the stockroom who are dissatisfied and contact the union, the organizing effort is likely to be off and running. "Their loyalty sticks," says Meyers. "We have grown as a union because of the initiative of members in the rank and file."

But the RCIA does not sit around waiting for such initative to develop. If a store looks promising, an organizer begins to browse around, quietly engaging clerks in conversation, noting down their names and home addresses for future contact. Most nonunion stores have no-solicitation rules, but Suffridge admits that "we don't cooperate very much."

No matter how smoothly and silently the organizer operates, sooner or later the boss finds out about it. Then the real contest begins. At a minimum the employer will express his displeasure at the idea of a union, and, as Suffridge says, "Clerks are so vulnerable any word from the boss is coercive." At worst an employer will use what union organizers call the Shefferman technique, after Nathan Shefferman, the labor consultant whose operations on behalf of Sears, Roebuck stores were publicized in McClellan committee hearings in 1957. According to testimony, Sheffermanism includes undercover agents, discharges, bribes, and employee brainwashing to block an organizing effort.

When an employer actively opposes an organizing campaign the RCIA attempts to counter by developing group spirit among the employees, in order to give them a sense of support and common cause. It also warns them in advance what methods the antiunion employer may use. The organizer interviews employees individually and sends literature to their homes, then calls a meeting. One by one, according to Sam Meyers, the interested employees timidly straggle in. When they recognize fellow employees, they begin to feel at home. Then if one employee will get up and begin to talk, says Meyers, "you've gone a long way in driving the fear out."

Although RCIA literature does not paint the boss as a saint, an earnest effort is made to avoid embittering the relationship. "We don't go in for vilifying the boss," says Suffridge. "If we do, we find that after the union is elected the members demand so much we can never satisfy them."

To get the employer actually to recognize and bargain with the union, the RCIA has two alternative strategies. If the employer is financially in a shaky position, and the employees can be persuaded to authorize strong action, the union demands immediate recognition and bargaining, under threat of a potentially ruinous strike. If, on the other hand, he is financially strong and militantly antiunion, a boycott is used instead of a strike. A boycott puts a minimum strain on the union treasury since the only cost is publicity. It puts a maximum strain on the employer, since he must still meet his payroll, even though sales may be reduced. The greatest economic impact comes from picketing the store, combined with publicity material sent directly to the homes of shoppers. "We find," Suffridge says, "if we can stop a housewife before she sets out, the boycott is more effective."

The RCIA has enjoyed its greatest organizing success to date in grocery stores. It has broken into all the major supermarket chains except the Winn-Dixie Stores in the South, and its membership in the grocery field totals about 100,000. But even this represents only about one-sixth of all eligible employees, so the growth potential is still great.

In other fields the potential is even greater. The RCIA has so far organized only about 25,000 of the 175,000 eligible employees in drugstores, 20,000 out of 200,000 in variety stores, and another 20,000 out of 300,000 in furniture stores. In department stores only 40,000 employees out of a potential 400,000 are organized. Resistance to unions in this field remains strong, especially in the big stores. Says one store executive, "Our pay scale and fringe benefits far exceed anything that the union has got anywhere else. There simply is no need for a union here."

Right now the RCIA is concentrating on the discount houses, where it hopes to repeat the success it achieved while supermarkets were evolving. "The organizer with discounters to organize is lucky," reads the union's guide for organizers, "for of all fields needing organization in retailing, the discount store, by the very nature of the business, is most likely to be organized * * *. Most 6perators in the discount field have their total working capital tied up in the inventory which must be sold at a rapid rate of turnover * * *. They will meet our demand for recognition almost without fail if convinced we have their people behind us."

Although discounters' sales last year were less than a third those of department stores, the RCIA already had almost as many members in discount houses as in the old-line stores. And union organizers see no signs of a slackening trend. For as the discounters continue to take volume from the department stores, they will hire more employees who are easy to organize. Meanwhile the union expects department stores, as their volume declines, to become economically more vulnerable to union pressure.

Must God Get Out of Our Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate a radio broadcast by Dean Clarence Manion entitled "Must God Get Out of Our Government?" This address was broadcast by Dean Manion over the "Manion Forum" which is used weekly over approximately 250 radio stations across this country.

I ask unanimous consent that Dean Manion's eloquent comments on the recent Supreme Court decision on the school prayer case be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST GOD GET OUT OF OUR GOVERNMENT?

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

When the Supreme Court decided to take God out of the Government last June 25, I was tempted to have my say then and there—along with those thousands of other people, great and small, who expressed themselves at once. Now I am glad I waited until all or nearly all of the votes have been counted for and against the Court's startling conclusion.

Immediately after the decision was announced, the President of the United States told us to respect it and be glad that we can still pray in our homes. None of the newspaper reporters who were present made the obvious retort, namely, that Khrushchev could have said the same thing to the Russians, to the Poles or to the Hungarians.

After all, cannot Cardinal Mindszenty still pray in the cubicle of the American Embassy in Budapest, where he has been confined for 6 years in protection against the Communist government?

The popular reaction to this unfortunate Supreme Court decision was like that of children who have just been told by the sad and wise old family doctor that their mother has cancer: "I am so very sorry, my dears, but it is so; all of the scientific tests prove it." The Supreme Court was like that in its decision and the American people were like sad and simple children in their reaction to it. What can the American people know about their Constitution? Theirs is not to reason why; theirs is but to listen to the bad news from the experts—the Supreme Court.

And so, school superintendents all over the country sorrowfully but nevertheless seriously, announced plans to reconsider time-honored customs such as invocations at high school football banquets, salutes to the flag (and, therefore, to God) at their morning convocations, and nondenominational sermons to their graduating classes on baccalaureate Sunday.

Recently someone published a book called "A Nation of Sheep." I have read only the title, but I know now that the author is referring to the people of the United States.

Our reaction to this Supreme Court decision indicates that his conclusion is correct. We have permitted the Federal Government to shear us to the skin and we are ready to respond, like sheep, when a Judas goat—in this case the Supreme Court—leads us up for the slaughter of our spiritual and constitutional heritage.

The decision brought a deluge of editorial criticism, of course, but for the most part the editorials ended up like this one: "Those of us who believe the ruling of the Court to be in error will, nevertheless, obey this decision since ours is a government of laws." When we all slavishly obey a Court decision that we know to be in error, we destroy our government of liberty-protecting laws and substitute a government by arbitrary decree.

A Court decision is not the law of the land; it is merely the law of the particular case in which the decision was rendered and, of course, the parties to that lawsuit will be forced to observe it unless and until they can get the decision reversed.

But when the decision obviously is in error, and particularly on a subject that is as vital to our civilization as the relationship of Almighty God to the Government of the United States, then all Americans who respect the great Author of Liberty are under a moral and patriotic obligation to blast the decision for the error that it is, and for what one Justice of the Supreme Court itself declared it to be, namely, "a misapplication of a great constitutional principle" and an attempt to divorce our constitutional government from its official historic "reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

The decision of the Court, as read by Justice Black, is unsupported by any judicial precedents except those that Justice Black himself has made out of legal whole cloth during his long tenure on the Supreme Bench.

I saw this error coming up 14 years ago and addressed myself to it then in a carefully documented criticism of one of Justice Black's 1948 opinions which now turns out to be a part of his foundation for this climactic sophistry. ("The Church, the State, and Mrs. McCollum," Notre Dame Lawyer, vol. 23, p. 456.)

The entire case made by Justice Black and his concurring colleagues against the New York Board of Education in the June 25 decision is based upon the gratuitous assumption that the first amendment to the Constitution which says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" must now be taken to read: "No State or any subdivision or agency of a State (such as a local school board) shall make any law or rule respecting an establishment of religion."

How does it happen that a plain constitutional prohibition against congressional action now turns out to be a prohibition against State action through the regulation of a local school board? By whose authority is the unmistakable language of the first amendment thus turned around and transformed?

The answer is that the language has been changed by the repetitious insistence of Justice Black that the first amendment which was added to the Constitution in 1791, was made operative against the States by the adoption of the 14th amendment which was added to the Constitution 77 years later, namely, in 1868.

Remember, please, that for 69 years before Justice Black became a member of it, the Supreme Court in a great number of cases had construed the 1st amendment and the 14th amendment respectively, as entirely separate and unrelated provisions of the Constitution. These repetitious constructions were in complete harmony with historical facts.

When the 14th amendment was ratified its authors and proponents had no idea that it would ever be construed to bring the provisions of the 1st amendment into operation against State governments.

On the contrary, in 1876, 8 years after the 14th amendment had been adopted, a new constitutional amendment was proposed in Congress which read, in part, as follows: "No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This proposed amendment was voted upon in the U.S. Senate on August 14, 1876, and the proposal failed because it did not receive the necessary two-thirds majority.

If the 14th amendment embraced the 1st amendment when it was adopted in 1868, as Justice Black says it did, why did Congress feel it necessary in 1876 to attempt to adopt another amendment specifically restricting the States in the terms that had been used to restrict Congress in the 1st amendment?

Since this specific prohibition against State-established religions was expressly rejected by Congress in 1876, by what authority does Justice Black now assume to add such a prohibition to the Constitution in 1962? Justice Black does not cite any authority for this revolutionary transformation of the English language and of American history except his own judicial opinions.

The "wall of separation between church and state," to which Jefferson referred in a private letter written in 1802, has become an obsession with Justice Black, but he conveniently ignores what Jefferson said publicly 3 years later in his second inaugural address, namely: "In matters of religion I have considered that its free exercise is placed by the Constitution independent of the powers of the General (Federal) Government."

Jefferson realized that large areas of American life were expressly made independent of the powers of the Federal Government by the language of the 10th amendment and that religion was merely one of these areas deliberately reserved for the exclusive operation of States rights.

Justice Black and most of the Justices associated with him on the Supreme Bench during the past 25 years have been so preoccupied with the 1st amendment, the 5th amendment, and the 14th amendment, that they have never been able to consider the equally valid import of the 9th and 10th amendments, which protect the immunities of the States and of the people in the States against the intrusion of unlawful Federal action.

Pursuant to the rulings of Justice Black and his associates, Federal judges are now taking over the constitutional duties of State legislatures in the field of reapportionment of Representatives. (*Baker* v. *Carr*, 82 S.C.)

The Constitution of Maryland provides that Maryland officeholders shall declare their belief in the existence of God, but that constitutional provision was swept aside last year by Justice Black's Supreme Court opinion that the 1st and the 14th amendments will no longer permit the State to protect itself in this respect. (*Torcaso* v. *Watkins*, 81 S.C.)

It so happens that the constitution of the State of Maryland like that of New York begins with an expression of thanks for God's blessings, followed by an invocation of His continued protection; but all this will soon be changed by the Supreme Court under Justice Black's influence, and Justice Douglas, in his separate concurring opinion in the New York school case, confidently predicts that the change is coming.

If this Court has its way, God must get out of government—State and Federal. As a byproduct of this Courtmade law, the States will have to disappear as self-governing units of our constitutionally established Federal system and become mere administrative agencies of the tightly-centralized, absolute authority in Washington.

A constitutional amendment is now being considered to remedy the situation created by the Court's decision in the New York school case, but constitutional amendments cannot be proposed and ratified fast enough to protect the Constitution from the kind of a Supreme Court that we have now.

Its decisions have destroyed more established legal precedents in the last 20 years than were accomplished in the previous 133 years of Supreme Court history. What this Court will do next is anybody's guess.

The appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is determined by Congress. Article III, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States empowers Congress to regulate and limit the questions of law and fact that may be appealed to the Supreme Court from State and inferior Federal courts. Using this authority, Congress should withdraw all appellate jurisdiction from this Supreme Court now and thus leave final determination of constitutional questions with State courts and Federal circuit courts of appeal.

Unless this is done, and done quickly, the Supreme Court as presently constituted will make a shambles of our Republican form of government. If this Nation under God is to have a new birth of freedom, then it is up to Congress to get the present Supreme Court out of the delivery room.

Montana's Newest Treasure Is Worth Its Weight in Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at this time to draw the House's attention to the construction of a new Permanente Cement Co. plant in my district of Montana. This efficient new facility is being designed and built by Kaiser Engineers, a division of Kaiser Industries. It is located in East Helena, Mont., and operations at the plant will begin early in 1963.

The cooperation in building this $10 million modern plant by two private enterprise organizations, and the projected use of the plant's facilities in the construction of Yellowtail Dam, illustrate the effective cooperation possible between private and Government enterprise projects. This sort of cooperation always results in expansion for all parts of our national economy.

Though at the present time two of my district's counties, Silverbow and Flathead, qualify as distressed areas, I am happy and encouraged to note this instance of industrial expansion and initiative in Montana. Let us hope that more and varied projects will soon be constructed in the State to provide challenging work opportunities for Montana citizens qualified and eager to do their part in our expanding economy, and thus allow Montana to play the vital role she is capable of in our Nation's industrial progress.

I might add that I am proud to note that the Olsen clan is centrally involved in this project, though through a member unrelated to me, in the person of Mr. Ken Olsen, chief project engineer for Kaiser.

Following is a feature article from the Kaiser Builder, a company news journal, for August 1962, outlining the plans and progress of the plant in detail:

Kaiser Engineers is now designing and constructing its seventh complete cement plant, bringing the total contract value in cement plant projects to over $110 million in the past 25 years. This figure includes integrated expansions totaling more than $50 million for existing cement plants, and numerous feasibility studies, geological reports and market analyses.

The new $10 million wet process cement plant is being built by Kaiser Engineers for Permanente Cement Co. at Montana City, site of an abandoned gold mine 6 miles from East Helena, Mont. When completed, it will have an annual production capacity of 1,400,000 barrels of cement.

Design of the plant has several notable features, achieved through the experience and knowledge gained by Kaiser Engineers in working on the many previous cement producing and handling facilities, and coupled with studies by Permanente personnel.

The major improvement with the new plant is its compact arrangement around a centralized control room, laboratory, and electrical motor control and transformer room—three levels, one below the other. From the control room, located beneath two silos, operators will be able to see directly into both the mill room and the firing end of the kiln. Other areas can be monitored by closed circuit television screens. The laboratory will be adjacent to the automatic weigh feeders for both raw and finish mills.

Besides simplifying and attaining better overall control through centralization, a number of other advantages and benefits are obtained by the core design: (1) Capital and future operational costs are reduced; (2) conduit, piping, slurry and gas lines, and conveyors are greatly shortened, hence cutting down construction time and the amount of equipment, materials, and basic horsepower required; (3) a greater degree of automated operation is achieved; and (4) plant appearance is enhanced.

Economy of operation will be further aided because deposits of limestone and shale are located on the 470-acre site. Dug from the quarry by a diesel shovel, these basic materials will be transported by trucks and dumped into the primary crusher for the first stage of processing.

After being reduced to pieces about minus 6 inches, the limestone and shale will then be conveyed to a surge bin before they are fed to the secondary crusher, which crushes it to minus three-quarters inch. In both primary and secondary crushing, the feed rate will be automatically regulated. In addition, secondary crusher output will be automatically sampled for physical and chemical control.

From the secondary crusher, a bucket elevator wil lift the crushed limestone and shale into two silos and star bin of the plant's seven raw material silos. A separate bucket elevator and belt conveyor handles silica tailings, iron ore or slag, and gypsum for the balance of the raw materials silos.

Automatic weigh feeders at the bottom of these silos will weigh the material at preselected ratios before discharging it to the raw mill feed conveyor, after which it goes to the open circuit mill where it will be mixed with water to produce kiln feed slurry. The slurry is stored in either of two tanks adjacent to the kiln.

When it is needed, the slurry will be fed automatically to the kiln at a constant rate by means of a magnetic flow meter, density gage, and pinch valve. The kiln is a 450-foot-long rotating tube, one end of which is 14 feet 6 inches and the other 13 feet in diameter. It will convert the slurry at about 2,700° F. to clinker. Considerable new instrumentation, based on studies conducted at Permanente's home plant, will be provided for the kiln and clinker cooler. The aim is toward complete computer control. As with the crushed limestone and later the slurry, the clinker also is stored in silos until it is required.

A feed system similar to that for the raw mill will be provided for the finish mill. In both mills, the feed rate will be controlled by an automatic sound device, which determines loading according to the sonic volume. After crushing, the finish mill product will be separated into coarse and fines; the former is returned to the mill for reprocessing, while the fines or finished cement will be conveyed pneumatically to any of nine storage silos or five star bins. From these silos, the cement will be bagged or shipped in bulk by bottom-dump railroad cars or trucks.

As construction and installation of the facilities goes ahead, Kaiser Engineer has been making innovations to complement the design improvements. Models have been built to study overall feasibility and to check clearances for piping, equipment, structural members, accessibility, etc. Each phase of the construction has been scheduled within narrow limits for completion and start-up early next year.

One example of the planning was the around-the-clock placing of concrete for the storage bin and silo complex. This work was accomplished in June in only 10 days by using the slip-form method to construct, as a unit, all 16 of the 105-foot-high silos. Nearly 7,000 cubic yards of concrete were used for the silo walls. Short forms (about 4 feet high) were raised an average of 8 inches per hour by 285 jacks as concrete and reinforcing steel were placed within them.

Hal S. Meyer is general superintendent of construction at the job site, while Ian Watson is working out of Kaiser Engineer's Oakland headquarters as project engineer.

With the new Montana City plant, Permanente Cement Co. will extend its sales into that State, and large parts of Wyoming, Idaho, and North Dakota. When the plant begins operation a large part of the production will be used in the construction of Yellowtail Dam and powerhouse, a joint venture in which Kaiser Engineer is participating.

PROFESSIONAL PROFILE: KEN OLSEN

"The centralized control facilities for the new Montana cement plant will be a big step forward in our attempts to cut down construction and operational costs while raising efficiency."

This comment by Ken Olsen, chief project engineer, reflects Kaiser Engineers continuing achievement in the design of better cement plants.

In the trend toward improving centralized control, Ken also noted that the 1,400,000 barrels per year wet process cement plant designed and built by Kaiser Engineers for

Arkansas Cement Corp., in 1958 had one of the earliest centrally-controlled milling departments. Ken was project engineer for that plant.

Although only the past 6 of Ken's 20 years' experience in civil engineering have been almost exclusively in cement plant projects, a great many of the preceding projects required extensive materials handling facilities, which are among the basic elements in cement plant design.

After he was graduated from Polytechnic College of Engineering in Oakland, Ken began his engineering career in 1942 preparing drawings and structural designs for Columbia Steel Co., at Pittsburg, Calif. He is a registered civil engineer in California, Washington, and Hawaii.

In the same year he joined the Kaiser organization preparing designs for conveyor support structures, raw materials handling facilities, car dumpers and other parts of the Fontana, Calif., steel plant.

For the next 2 years Ken was engaged in checking final designs and structural analyses for a gypsum plant, several office and warehouse buildings, and a water distribution system. He was appointed assistant engineer in 1947 and from then until 1950 was in charge of structural and mechanical design for a material handling system and second blast furnace at the Fontana steel works.

In 1950 he was appointed senior engineer and placed in charge of a 30-man structural design section to begin his first cement plant design work. This was for a $14 million expansion program at Permanente, Calif., now the second largest cement plant in the world. A year later he became principal engineer and began a 4-year stint of design responsibility for a wallboard plant and plaster mill, iron mine expansion, gypsum products plant—all requiring conveyors and considerable other materials handling equipment.

"Having then done quite a lot of structural design work on gypsum and cement projects," said Ken, "I became particularly interested in those plants. So I was very happy when an opportunity came in 1956 to go into project engineering work in those fields."

In the past 6 years, he has had over-all responsibility for the design and construction of four cement plants—Foreman, Ark.; Waianae, Hawaii; and now the new Montana City plant and doubling the capacity of the Cushenbury, Calif., plant.

With the current two cement plants, a $2 million bulk loading facility for ships at Long Beach, Calif., and several feasibility studies under way for other plants, Ken's project engineering group keeps a busy schedule. It's been that way so long, however, that Ken sees nothing out of the ordinary about it.

Legislative Questionnaire, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, early in July I mailed out nearly 55,000 questionnaires to residents of the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey in order to get a sampling of opinion on the major issues facing Congress this year. More than 10,000 people, nearly 20 percent of those who received my questionnaire, filled it in and returned it, and I am informed by experts in the field that this is an extraordinarily high response.

This high rate of return and the fact that a great many of those who responded took the time to write personal comments on the issues represented, as well as on other leading issues, is strong indication that the voters of the Fourth District are well abreast of current events. I was sincerely impressed with the thoughtfulness of the comments and the seriousness with which people approached the task of expressing their opinions to their Representative in Congress.

While the tabulated answers speak for themselves, a few comments are in order. More people expressed an opinion on health insurance for the aged than on any other question, confirming President Kennedy's belief that this will be a major issue in the 1962 election. The question that fewest people expressed an opinion on had to do with appropriations for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In my view this is a reflection of the fact that the agency is a new one and its activities have not received a great deal of publicity. In a future newsletter I will discuss the purpose and operations of the agency.

On several questions the responses were quite decisive. An overwhelming majority of people favored continuation of the Peace Corps, favored the Federal Communications Commission taking steps to raise the quality of commercial TV programs, approved of President Kennedy's decision to resume nuclear tests, and opposed admission of Red China to the United Nations. On the question of Federal aid to education, a strong majority favored financial assistance to the States for school construction, but by almost the same percentages a majority opposed aid for teachers' salaries.

The questions that I presented to the Fourth District residents were phrased in the terms of the specific legislation before the Congress, and every effort was made to present the issues in as objective a manner as possible. I wish to express my thanks to all those who helped in this project by letting me know their opinions, and I hope the results will be of interest to all.

The final tabulation follows:

LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE, 1962

1. Do you favor or oppose the plan for the United States to buy up $100 million of United Nations bonds to help pay for United Nations special operations in the Congo, for the Middle East, and elsewhere? Favor, 47 percent; oppose, 43 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

2. Do you favor or oppose a program of health insurance for the aged paid by a 25-cents-per-week increase in social security deductions? Favor, 55 percent; oppose 41 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

3. Did you approve or disapprove of the actions taken by President Kennedy when several large steel companies recently announced an increase in prices? Approve, 54 percent; disapprove, 41 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

4. Do you favor or oppose—

A. Federal financial aid to the States for public school construction? Favor, 58 percent; oppose, 37 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

B. Federal financial aid to the States for teachers' salaries? Favor, 38 percent; oppose, 54 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

5. Do you favor or oppose a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing being added to the President's Cabinet? Favor, 37 percent; oppose, 46 percent; no opinion, 17 percent.

6. Did you approve or disapprove of President Kennedy's decision to resume nuclear tests in the atmosphere? Approve, 76 percent; disapprove, 18 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

7. Do you favor or oppose increasing appropriations for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency? Favor, 45 percent; oppose, 30 percent; no opinion, 25 percent.

8. Do you favor or oppose continuation of the Peace Corps? Favor, 71 percent; oppose 17 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

9. Should Congress create a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to make recommendations to the President and Congress? Yes, 49 percent; no, 27 percent; no opinion, 24 percent.

10. Do you favor or oppose the Federal Communications Commission taking steps to raise the quality of commercial television programs? Favor 73 percent; oppose 20 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

11. Would you approve or disapprove of the Federal Government helping to pay for the construction of fallout shelters? Approve, 27 percent; disapprove, 62 percent; no opinion 11 percent.

12. Do you favor or oppose the admission of Communist China to the United Nations? Favor, 18 percent; oppose, 74 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

13. Do you favor or oppose giving the President broader authority to negotiate the reduction of tariffs between the United States and the European Common Market? Favor, 58 percent; oppose, 33 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

14. Would you approve or disapprove of Federal aid to industries which suffer from increased competition from imports as a result of tariff agreements with the European Common Market? Approve, 35 percent; disapprove, 51 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.

15. Do you favor or oppose the continuation of our foreign aid program? Favor, 56 percent; oppose, 35 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

16. Do you favor or oppose giving the President discretionary authority to combat a recession by lowering taxes and increasing public workers programs? Favor, 63 percent; oppose, 32 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

17. In general, do you believe that Congress should give greater support to President Kennedy's legislative program? Favor, 49 percent; oppose, 33 percent; no opinion, 18 percent.

18. Do you consider yourself a: Democrat, 32 percent; Republican, 33 percent; Independent, 35 percent.

Replies to a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I sent a questionnaire to citizens in central Iowa last winter, and I am gratified and thankful for the great response of thousands who made their opinions and views available.

While those who returned questionnaires would not necessarily be a perfect cross section of the voters of that area, I believe the occupations and addresses listed on the returned questionnaires, when considered as a whole, do indicate that those responding were fairly representative of all the people of that area. While I could almost immediately determine the general opinion on various questions, there were so many thousands of returns that I have only recently been able to tabulate the precise percentages. For the information of those who may be interested, the full question and the tabulation is set forth below:

	Those with an opinion		Percent of total with no opinion
	Percent for	Percent against	
1. Agreements for lower tariffs	85	15	16
2. Continued support of United Nations	85	15	29
3. Continued foreign aid	68	32	19
4. Aid to grade and high schools	54	46	15
5. Aid to increase college classrooms	57	43	19
6. Loans for college students	72	28	27
7. Pensions for World War I veterans	53	47	23
8. Increase disabled veterans' compensation	61	39	26
9. Extend feed grains program:			
Farmers voting	88	12	5
Nonfarmers voting	40	60	39
10. Administration's new farm proposal:			
Farmers voting	50	50	5
Nonfarmers voting	41	59	39
11. Health care for the aged under social security	57	43	10
12. Further civil rights laws	66	34	33
13. Establish Urban Affairs Department	62	38	36
14. Prohibit Federal officials hiring relatives	68	32	17
15. Increase social security benefits	57	43	14
16. Expand recreation areas	72	28	22
17. Continue $700,000,000 medical research program	87	13	18
18. Tax credits for new industrial machinery	59	41	

Millions Recouped, Thanks to Mr. Findley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a recent amendment to the statute under which our food-for-peace programs operate has evoked a favorable response from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. This amendment, which will allow the funds generated by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to be sold to Americans planning to visit the countries who participate in the food-for-peace program and who allow this sale procedure, offers this country the chance to recoup some of the value of the surplus food which we have sent abroad.

This amendment was sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] and is a sound money-saving idea. I wish to join the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in commending the gentleman for his work in behalf of saving millions of dollars for the American taxpayer.

The Globe editorial, "Mr. Findley's Amendment," which appeared in the August 20 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, follows:

MR. FINDLEY'S AMENDMENT

Thanks to Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois Republican, some of the millions of dollars now wasted under our food-for-peace program will be recouped. Surplus American food is sold at a fraction of its cost to foreign governments who pay for it in their own currencies.

This money can't be taken out of the country. It must be spent there—and in a very limited number of ways.

It can be used to pay the expenses of visiting American officials like Congressmen, to operate our embassy, or to finance programs or projects which help the country itself.

Often, these rupees or dinars or zlotys simply pile up in foreign banks.

Congressman FINDLEY sponsored an amendment which permits the money in these blocked foreign accounts to be sold by Washington to American tourists for dollars. This is subject to the approval of the foreign government.

So far, the Department of Agriculture has been able to persuade 11 countries to agree to this provision. These agreements mean Washington can now sell up to $88,152,302 in foreign currency to tourists who plan to visit countries where the money is legal tender.

Thus, Washington will be able to get back something for the surplus foods which it now ships abroad virtually as a gift.

In addition, this will help stop the drain on our gold. It results when foreign nations acquire American dollars from tourists, for example, and cash them in at Fort Knox for bullion.

Mr. FINDLEY's amendment became law last year. But it was not until this July that the White House took advantage of it. "It is regrettable that there has been nearly a year's delay in putting into operation the tourist-dollar program," the Illinois Republican said.

"But I am glad President Kennedy is now giving it top priority."

Thirteen nations, including the Congo, India, Indonesia, Poland, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia refused to permit the blocked funds to be sold to tourists.

Mr. FINDLEY believes Washington should insist that all nations which get our surplus food on this cutrate deal should agree to the sale of their currency to American tourists.

So does the Globe-Democrat.

Our Veterans Adjust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to what I believe to be some very significant facts which were released by the Veterans' Administration a few days ago. These figures were quoted in an editorial printed in the Wichita Falls Record News, of Wichita Falls, Tex., on August 14, 1962, titled "Our Veterans Adjust."

This information, sets forth the stability of our veterans of World War II, and the success with which they have adjusted to civilian life. I believe this to be particularly significant to those of us who come from areas where National Guard and Reserve troops are just returning from their tour of active duty in connection with the Berlin crisis.

The editorial follows:

OUR VETERANS ADJUST

Wichita Falls recently had the experience of welcoming home a group of servicemen who had been called for emergency service.

The events reminded this city of the experience it had 17 years ago today at the end of World War II. This anniversary provides an excellent time for checking up on how those more than 15 million men and women, who had lost the prime time of their lives, could readjust and settle back into our normal living scheme.

The Veterans Administration released figures this week which measure the way in which these Americans have met the challenge of readjustment. Many of us were worried they would have great difficulty. Other nations had some sad experiences with the restless veterans who had returned home.

Today the average veteran of World War II is 44 years old. He is married and has three children. His average annual income is $6,000 and he purchased a home that has the average value of $14,500.

More than 87 percent of the veterans are living with their original wives and 97 percent are employed, another indication of normal readjustment.

Most of them are engaged in manufacturing with trade, transport and construction following. Seven percent live on farms.

Sociologists find no distinct difference between the average veteran and the average citizen. In trying to account for the normalcy which has made them such fine citizens, the political experts try to find the answer in the law passed by Congress.

Congress aided the veterans in education, housing, medical care and hospitalization and other categories ranging from specially equipped automobiles to small business.

Other nations had tragic experiences with restless returning veterans, but America can point with pride at its veterans as good citizens.

It is a valuable bit of information on this the 17th anniversary of the end of the war.

Retreat From the Wrong Battleline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial, "Retreat From the Wrong Battleline," which appeared in the Denver Post on Friday, August 24, 1962, which I believe will be of great interest to all Members of Congress.

The editorial is as follows:

RETREAT FROM THE WRONG BATTLELINE

The official publication "Battle Line," of the Republican National Committee, came bristling out of Washington last month with a startling charge against the Kennedy administration.

This is what Battle Line said:

"With 4 million Americans jobless, steel mills operating less than half capacity, Kennedy administration gives Japan $2 billion order for vehicles, although J.F.K. professes alarm at dangerously low gold level, this one order obligates 12 percent of $16 billion gold United States has on hand."

It was, indeed, an accusation to stir the blood.

How could the administration be so economically callous as to even consider pumping $2 billion worth of orders into Japan when it was expressing concern for our own economy and for our own gold balance?

And $2 billion for vehicles. Battle Line didn't say what kind of vehicles, but taking a round estimate of $2,000 per vehicle, that could mean an order for something like 1 million Japanese vehicles. What in heaven's name were we going to do with that many Japanese vehicles?

This newspaper pursued these intriguing questions in Washington. Apparently, so did other people. And this week, the pursuit caught up with the charge.

In some confusion, the GOP National Committee retreated from this particular battleline. There had been, it was explained at headquarters, a little mistake in the handling of the information.

The national committee had gotten the information from a public relations man who had gotten a copy of a newsletter from a Michigan Congressman who had apparently gotten the information—about a Defense Department purchase—from the news wire services.

Only these other sources didn't talk about $2 billion, they referred to $200 million. In reinterpreting the information for Battle Line, somebody had misread the zeros. The error, a GOP official told our man in Washington, left the national committee feeling very shamefaced.

It should. And in case the committee is still interested, here are the rest of the facts:

The transaction in question was made by the Defense Department in the last fiscal year. The Department purchased 80,000 vehicles, mostly three-quarter-ton and 2½-ton trucks and some jeeps, reportedly types no longer being produced in the United States, at a cost of $223 million. These were all for use in the military assistance program for our Pacific allies.

Although this is a far cry from the charge contained in the July Battle Line, the possible effect on the balance of payments problem is still a matter of concern with the administration and apparently it is with this problem in mind that the Defense Department, we are told, is reviewing such expenditures in the current fiscal year.

So, back to the firing line, men for some more dependable ammunition next time, we hope.

Gobbledygook—Plus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, there are times when every student has difficulty translating a foreign language. That is to be expected and is a natural occurrence.

The condition more difficult to explain or understand is the need for an interpreter to determine what has been said in English. The situation is becoming so serious a man has been retained by the Department of Labor to determine why bureaucrats cannot say what they mean in plain, simple language all can understand.

The following editorial from the Harrisburg, Pa., Sunday Patriot-News, of August 26, points up rather facetiously the need for this:

WHAT DID THEY SAY? BRAVE MAN SEEKS ANSWER

One of the more interesting sidelights of the Billie Sol Estes case was the relevation that county committees handling Government farm programs frequently don't read directives sent out by the Department of Agriculture. The reason? They're so frequently unreadable.

Governmentalese, officialese, "gobbledygook"—call it what you will—is a communications disease of epidemic proportions. The waves of jargon break over the land, and no one has proposed a way of fighting it.

But one man is going to try. He is Lawrence Klein, editor of the Labor Department's Monthly Review. He has been given what's called a career service award by Secretary Arthur Goldberg so that he can spend a year trying to determine why Government bureaucrats can't write.

Mr. Klein is not going into this blindly. For the last 15 years he has been trying to cut through garbled official prose. And he knows the enemy wherever it appears. Witness this example he cited: "In the current stages of the ongoing postattack productivity study, the identification of the enervating effects of a decreased caloric diet upon physical productivity indicates the need to plan preattack for adequate caloric food stockpiles."

That means someone better have something for soldiers to eat after a fight.

Mr. Klein, of course, will have no end of material to work on. If he somehow gets done with the Pentagon in time, he can go see the highway official who referred to moving vehicles as "conglomerate units of a fluid nature." Or the conservationist who called pleasant living conditions "a group of physical environmental conditions which we will refer to as amenity resources." Or the industrial education specialist who had this to say: "It is recommended that coordinate effort be made to attack professional problems on a cluster research basis. This would involve the identification of problems and segmentation of them so that the cluster research bears on a particular problem. The cumulative effect of this procedure could reduce the time necessary to find solutions to pressing problems."

Uncluster that one if you will.

In wrestling with all this, Mr. Klein might wonder if the English language is partly at fault. A French king once recommended that Spanish be spoken to the gods, French to men, Italian to ladies, German to soldiers, Hungarian to horses, Czech to the devil and English to geese. Winston Churchill, on the other hand, cited "that noble thing, the English sentence."

The thought occurs that governmentalese is more a state of mind than a deficient language, as witness this way a planner dressed up his lack of anything to report: "We're doing the advance groundwork on a pre-preliminary phase."

Whatever the case, Mr. Klein deserves sympathy, or a salute for bravery, or something of the sort. He's in the position of a man tackling 100 acres of crabgrass with his bare hands.

The Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under unanimous consent, an editorial from the August 8, 1962, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat which I believe should be brought to the attention of my colleagues. It concerns the speech of President John C. Satterfield before the American Bar Association on August 7, 1962, in which some timely comments were made relative to the growing assumption of power of the U.S. Supreme Court and how the highest Court in the land has abandoned stare decisis and departed into the field of social legislation.

The editorial follows:

THE TOO SUPREME COURT

The blunt, thoughtful arraignment of the U.S. Supreme Court, made yesterday by President John C. Satterfield of the American Bar Association, may not represent the unanimous opinion of the Nation's bar. It does represent a rising, worried concern of thousands of lawyers and millions of other citizens.

The constitutional purpose of the Supreme Court is not under attack. But the growing assumption of power the High Bench has grappled to itself, its vacillation and departure into fields of social legislation is the focus of deep American anxiety.

Mr. Satterfield assailed the Court's record on two basic counts: The submergence of State powers in a trend toward centralized Federal control, and the giving of "inordinate weight" to individual rights at the expense of majority rights.

There is plenty of reason to be deeply stirred by these two charges, for the simple reason they are impressively and increasingly true.

Not in every decree or opinion handed down by the Justices, but in the gradual accumulation of decisions which weld bigger Federal power at the expense of democratic freedom.

Civil rights of each American citizen are basic to our way of life. They are imbedded firmly within the Bill of Rights. They must and should be protected.

But these rights apply to all, not only to minorities. This truism of law and the Constitution, Mr. Satterfield with much justification contends the Supreme Court has forgotten or ignored.

"The exaltation of liberties of individuals," declared the American Bar Association head, "at the expense of equally valid indivisible liberties of all citizens who collectively constitute our Nation * * * has developed into an apotheosis of personal rights—not only over property rights but more widely over law enforcement, national security, foreign relations, citizenship, prevailing custom, and a variety of other solemn claims of society and government."

He foresees a trend toward all crimes becoming Federal crimes, all police Federal police * * * "precisely the danger the Federal Constitution was designed to prevent."

Here is no pessimist's poltergeist. This appears a definite process, not only in the Court but in the aggrandizement of National Government and the steady relinquishment of State authority for Washington handouts—no matter what the cost.

The Supreme Court's conduct is not an isolated instrument of the march toward a nationalistic, social welfare Government with supreme power.

But the bench's contribution is significant, when this Court should be the very machinery to halt the encroachments of mushrooming federalism, with all its works of tax bounty and pomps of paternalism.

It is impossible for realistic appraisal to come to any other conclusion but that the Supreme Court increasingly uses its function, not always to interpret the Constitution and statutes on a legal basis.

It has in its actions often superseded the Congress, legislating by decree. The bench by its decrees too often abandons intent of the Constitution and construes the law to be what it wants, what it thinks it should be.

No intelligent person would dream of destroying the Supreme Court, as integral a part of Government as the Presidency and Congress. But it is utterly inane to consider the tribunal sacrosanct, or to ascribe criticism of its conduct to irresponsible marplots seeking to wreck justice and the machinery of law.

Congress and the President are subject to bitter blasts. Then, too, the Supreme Court can properly be criticised and much of Mr. Satterfield's denunciation is clearly justified.

The court of the land is entrusted with construing law and the Constitution—not according to its members' social nostrums, but according to facts and clear intent of basic precepts upon which this country was established. The Supreme Court has gone beyond this function too often and too dangerously.

Civil Service Bumper Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the farm bill in June, our colleague BOB GRIFFIN offered an amendment requiring that "the total number of employees in the Department of Agriculture shall at no time exceed the number of farmers in America." The amendment was greeted with laughter, accepted on a voice vote but rejected on a division.

It now appears that possibly more serious attention should have been given to Representative GRIFFIN's amendment. According to an editorial in the Detroit Free Press for August 25, 1962, nearly 12,000 employees have been added to the payroll in the Department of Agriculture during the past fiscal year. This editorial, entitled "Civil Service Bumper Crop," is significant, and under leave to extend my remarks I include it at this point:

CIVIL SERVICE BUMPER CROP

Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman made a speech to the American Farm Economic Association which was loaded with dire warning.

Among other things he said there is danger of Congress someday just giving up the subsidy struggle and leaving farmers to survive or sink according to how well they compete in the marketplace.

As one factor which might prod Congress into tearing up the subsidy pea patch. Secretary Freeman cited the declining power of rural forces. That is, the farming population keeps shrinking. Its political influence naturally shrinks along with its size.

Another factor which might influence Congress in the direction Mr. Freeman fears is his own addiction to the pleasures of empire.

In the past fiscal year his Department hired 11,975 new hands—seemingly on the popular governmental theory that the less there is to do the more payrollers you need not to do it.

Congress tends to regard the Federal payroller as more sacred than the flag, but presumably there are even limits on what Congress will stand still for.

An Agriculture Secretary who adds nearly 12,000 people to the load borne by taxpayers at a time when the population served by his department is decreasing so fast that he views the trend with alarm should nudge Congress on toward that limit.

Quesada Comments on Probable Cause in Aircraft Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last May Gen. E. R. Quesada, former Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, spoke to the 12th Annual Conference of the Guggenheim Aviation Safety Center suggesting improvements in the process for determining probable cause in the investigation of civil airline accidents. General Quesada did an excellent job in his years at the head of the FAA and his words in the field of aviation safety deserve the careful attention of all who would work to move America ahead in this important task.

The text of Quesada's remarks follows:

REMARKS BY E. R. QUESADA, 12TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, THE DANIEL AND FLORENCE GUGGENHEIM AVIATION SAFETY CENTER, MAY 16, 1962

By experience and conviction, I am certain that the present machinery of government responsible for making the official determinations of probable cause of civil aircraft accidents is not as effective as it should be and could be vastly improved. I refer particularly to the fact that existing law places this technical safety responsibility in the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is primarily—and I might say very heavily—absorbed in the burdensome and exacting task of economic regulation of the air transportation industry.

Its members are selected for their qualifications in the economic aspects of transportation, rather than in the technical or operational aspects of flying. A man well qualified in both of these highly specialized fields would be rare indeed. Assuming CAB members are highly qualified in air safety matters, as most of them would be quick to concede they are not, the staggering burden they bear in economic regulation of the airlines, offers them little opportunity to devote the necessary time and effort to the determination of probable cause after aviation accidents. The latter activity only tends to divert them and their staff from the mountainous backlog of crucially important work confronting them in the economic field, and leaves them unable to give either field the undivided attention it rightly deserves.

This condition is compounded by the Board's involvement with the economics of airline operation necessarily exposing it to strong pressures which should have no place in clinical efforts to determine the cause of an aircraft accident. The public is entitled to maximum freedom from such pressures in the search for the means to prevent tragedy.

My misgivings on grounds of principle have often been borne out in practice. In fact, the very nature of the proceedings employed to inquire into the cause of an air accident is such, as to make it inevitable that interested parties will engage in adversary efforts to shift blame, rather than give objective assistance in tracking down the cause and cure. Truth can be quickly lost in a heated public exchange of charges and countercharges. Information is given and statements made at the public hearing with one eye—or maybe both eyes—on ultimate legal liability in subsequent court litigation.

I am confident that much can be done to improve this sector of the Government's efforts in the air safety field. I strongly urge the Government to establish forthwith a group of highly qualified, objective individuals to look into this critical problem. They should be asked to produce a plan that would: (1) Free the Civil Aeronautics Board of its accident investigation responsibility; (2) establish new and effective procedures that eliminate the adversary practices now employed.

This recommendation is not meant to state or imply directly or indirectly that the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board are incapable of withstanding the pressures to which they are subjected or of making intelligent, objective, and informed conclusions. I do mean to state that the responsibility of determining probable cause should be placed elsewhere for organizational reasons and that the procedures should be improved. I do not mean to imply directly or indirectly that this responsibility should be placed on the Federal Aviation Agency.

If this function is soundly established, two birds can be killed with one stone. We can have the Board concentrating its efforts on what it knows how to do best. At the same time we can, in public interest, learn and apply, more quickly and effectively, the many lessons to be learned from an air tragedy when it strikes—seldom though it does.

Not Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Dr. T. E. Mattingly appeared in a recent edition of the Washington Post.

The letter brings to each one of us a very sad fact of modern life and modern philosophy, namely, that we have lost the power of righteous indignation and are willing to compromise with anything and anyone to keep ourselves safe and to be sure not to lose what we are pleased to call security. It may be just possible that we may be left with nothing but security, and with no soul:

NOT ALONE

Whither mankind's unashamed brutality? Once our conscience obeyed the unenforceable. There was a truce to succor the wounded. When captured, the prisoner was treated with dignity and mercy. There was neither genocide nor Iron Curtains of concrete, barbed wire, and ruthless ruffans as heartless slavemasters.

Yet with our eyes gazing at the Soviet triumph in the heavens, a German youth bleeds to death while his jungle slavemasters defy compassion to give a helping hand. And because we did not help, and because we slowly have accepted the code of the brute, we too have become less than the ideal for which we stand.

The unnamed German youth did not die alone. Something very precious and vital to mankind's hope and dreams died with him.

DR. T. E. MATTINGLY.

WASHINGTON.

Republic of Chad Second Independence Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to note the just concluded second anniversary on August 11 of the independence of a Republic of Chad. The progress of this important central African country during its 2 years of independent sovereignty is of great interest and satisfaction not only to me but to many Americans of all political persuasions, religions, and national origins.

Developing as we have from a colonial status and looking back on our own position as a newly developing nation, the United States has special pride in saluting the people of Chad on this significant occasion. At the time the United States established its own nationhood, we too faced many problems. We were young and inexperienced in the operation of our own Government. Our national resources although bountiful were undeveloped. We lacked the capital to make the improvements so badly needed.

Like Chad, however, we had in bountiful measure the desire and ability to build a nation in which all people would have the right of education, the right of employment, and the right to live in human dignity. Like the people of Chad, the people of the United States take pride in their country and in their Government. Nation building, as we all well know, is a process which is never ending. It is a process which calls for the continued support of every citizen of the country.

As an important nation in the free world, Chad has several advantages as it begins this third year of independence. Not the least of these is the fact that its independence was won by negotiation without bitter bloodshed. Good relations between Chad and the former colonial government of the French are an asset to Chad as it builds its future.

A second advantage is the fact that Chad over the years has acquired a good beginning in the development of roads and communications, and above all possesses a cadre of leadership, alert, intelligent, and capable of dealing with domestic and international affairs.

On this occasion of the second anniversary of the independence of Chad, I am pleased to express the genuine friendship of America for the people of Chad, and to express our best wishes for their continuing development in freedom and peace.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include my newsletter of August 25, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT: CONGRESSIONAL STAFF WORK

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, special report by Ralph Marlatt, administrative assistant to Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

This week the House is in recess to give the Members an opportunity, as stated by Speaker of the House JOHN MCCORMACK and Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, "to take advantage of this last chance to take a week off before the beginning of the new school term." Congressman ALGER, as did other Members with families, has used the week to spend a vacation with Jill, David, and Steve. In his absence, Congressman ALGER has asked me to report on the activities of the office in dealing with what is termed "case work."

These are the problems in which the people become involved with the Federal Government and turn to their Representative in Congress for assistance in unraveling the redtape and mysteries of dealing with the sprawling bureaucracy which now touches almost every aspect of our daily living. These are the human problems, some routine business matters, some tragic, all important and, under the inspiration of Congressman ALGER, each is dealt with sympathetically, earnestly and as thoroughly as possible. Of course, a Congressman is limited by law and the Constitution as to just how far he can go in handling a case, but in this office every legal and ethical effort is made to insure each constituent a fair and impartial hearing for any problem. All correspondence between the people and the Congressman is confidential, but I don't believe it is betraying any confidences to list just a few of the types of cases handled by Congressman ALGER and his staff in the past few months.

A constituent, traveling abroad, was suddenly taken ill and needed immediate blood transfusions. No blood of his type was available and had to be secured from the United States without delay. A member of his family was prepared to fly the lifesaving blood to him, but lacked a proper passport. We received the plea for help at 7 a.m., on a Sunday morning. All members of the staff immediately went to work and by noon all necessary clearances were made to permit departure. Another Dallas resident had difficulty in obtaining a permit to sail a boat he had just purchased out of a harbor in a Latin American country. He was using the boat in his work and could get no satisfaction either from American authorities or those of the country involved. We took the case up with the State Department and through a series of telephone calls and cablegrams were able to solve the problem. As a result of these efforts Congressman ALGER received a nice letter from the constituent which said, in part, "It was a relief, and gave me renewed confidence that some one in our Federal Government knows what to do and will take the time to do it for someone who is not an important official. Up until contacting you I have been most frustrated in getting anything done and equally discouraged."

Many cases involve young men and women in the service. A Dallas boy was seriously injured in the Far East and his parents were unable to get the details or clearance for one of them to go to him. We contacted the military, found the boy was hurt, but not as seriously as at first feared and made arrangements for his father to be flown to him. A young woman, unable to adjust to military life was upset because she felt she was not being given proper consideration for a discharge. Her parents were worried about her and sought the Congressman's help in expediting the paperwork. The service branch involved was most cooperative in giving every assurance that everything possible was being done for the girl, arrangements were made for the mother to see her in the hospital and within a few days she was discharged and is now happily at home taking up her college career where it was interrupted. A woman suffering a serious illness which left her totally disabled needed assistance in establishing her right to social security benefits. Recently she was awarded compensation with payments retroactive for 18 months which greatly helped her in meeting her hospital and medical expenses.

These are among the more dramatic cases, but there are hundreds involving income tax problems, VA and FHA loans, problems concerned with Government contracts, hardship discharges and transfer for military personnel, invasion of property rights by the Federal Government in areas where public and private lands adjoin, immigration and visa cases (many concerning refugees from Cuba and other Iron Curtain countries), and many other types, all in a nonpolitical category. They are not all solved to the satisfaction of the person who has the problem, but every citizen of Dallas County may be sure that any case presented to Congressman ALGER is given every possible attention. No other Member of Congress works harder for the people he represents, nor cares more deeply about their problems than does Congressman ALGER.

Milan's H. Steger Webb Honored as Typical Mayor of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Municipal League, which is the organization of towns and cities in our State, annually selects the Mayor of the Year.

We were honored in our congressional district this year by the selection of Hon. H. Steger Webb, of Milan, Tenn., for this award.

I quote from the official publication of the Tennessee Municipal League relative to the achievements of Mayor Webb:

MILAN'S H. STEGER WEBB HONORED AS TYPICAL MAYOR OF THE YEAR

Tennessee's Typical Mayor of the Year for 1962, Steger Webb, of Milan, was described to the annual Tennessee Municipal League convention as a hard worker who knows how to get people to work with him and with each other.

Dr. H. P. Clemmer, chairman of the Milan Chamber of Commerce Industrial Committee, cited the typical mayor's energy and enthusiasm as major reasons for his phenomenal success in helping to attract new industry to Milan.

The announcement of the annual award was made at the convention banquet, held at Ellington Agricultural Center. Mayor Webb may have had an inkling of something unusual if he noticed the large number of Milan and Gibson County people sprinkled through the crowd that evening. But the announcement—as usual—came as a surprise.

The certificate from the league, paying tribute to Mayor Webb as typical of hundreds of dedicated municipal officials throughout the State, was presented by James Tipton, Jr., executive secretary of the Tennessee County Services Association and a close personal friend during his many years' residence in Milan.

Dr. Clemmer listed these impressive statistics on Milan's progress since Mayor Webb took office in 1958:

An increase of 192 percent in employment in local plants, to a total of 1,095 workers.

An increase of 204 percent in employment at the Arsenal, to a total of 1,050.

An increase of 160 percent in the number of industrial plants, to 13.

A 14-percent increase in bank deposits.

A 600-percent increase in new housing starts.

"We have modernized and improved our city services, without increasing taxes," he said.

These municipal improvements include a water and sewer program which will cost $1,100,000. Milan will have 10- and 12-inch water lines in both industrial and residential areas, and it is hoped that the fire insurance rating will move from class 7 to class 6. The sewage disposal plant will be able to serve a population of 25,000.

During the past 5 years the city electric department has spent $250,000, the water department $148,000, and the sewer department $92,000 to keep pace with service needs.

Milan also boasts a new $100,000 city hall, housing a courtroom, the chamber of commerce offices, the health department, fire department, police department and the mayor's office.

"The story of Milan in recent years is a story of progress," Dr. Clemmer declared. "Much of this progress can be credited to Steger Webb."

After this award was given to Mayor Webb the Chamber of Commerce of Milan, Tenn., held a reception honoring him in the new city hall. Some 200 of the citizens of Milan attended this reception.

Mayor Webb in his capacity as mayor also serves as juvenile judge. His program of work has been very successful. He has never had a reformatory case. He attributes his success to patient counseling and guidance. He tries to find city jobs for delinquent, needy children, and has been known to loan them money out of his own pocket.

Mayor Webb, who is 44, says that his key to success "has been the complete cooperation of the town in doing a job. They have not been afraid to take a chance." Mayor Webb also added that he really believes that Milan has "the greatest future of any small town in Tennessee."

Mayor Webb is very active in civic clubs. He is a member of First Methodist Church, and a Mason. He has never been married. He said he likes to write some, but that his chief hobby "is operating the city of Milan."

Columbo's Boondoggle—A Fable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Columbo's Boondoggle," which appeared in the August 16, 1962, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The author of this article, Edgar Arnold, Jr., is a fine young newspaperman in my district and is known all over the State of Kentucky. This is not surprising, as he is following in the footsteps of an outstanding father, Edgar Arnold, Sr., the owner and publisher of the Messenger. The integrity and high principle which the father has established in connection with newspaper work has been instilled in the son. Their sense of fairness leaves the columns of the Messenger open to the other side—often leading to debate, but always working for a better community.

Edgar Arnold, Jr., like his father, is dedicated to the theory that a newspaper exists in order to dispense news with sincerity and truth and to serve as a forum for public debate and expression. In my opinion, he is an excellent newspaperman, a dedicated citizen, and an outstanding Kentuckian.

His article is as follows:

COLUMBO'S BOONDOGGLE—A FABLE

Almost 500 years ago, an Italian sea captain of note—namely one Cristoforo Columbo—became convinced that the world was round. He was granted an audience before the senate of Genoa, asking for funds with which to outfit a westward voyage to reach the rich spice islands of the Far East—or to discover what great lands, if any, might lie between. But his appeals were in vain, for a wise old doge held forth to the senate in this manner: "The world is flat and this fool would only sail off the edge. Were it even round, why the great hurry to get to the other side? We should proceed in an orderly, scientific way, building one accomplishment on another, rather than engaging in a mad effort to win a stunt race. Tilt at windmills if you must but waste not our riches on this million-lira boondoggle."

Sad but undaunted, this Captain Columbo traveled to the court of King Ferdinand V and Queen Isabella in Spain and spent 7 years appealing to this royal couple for support of his brave venture. At times he seemed almost touching success in his pleas, but each time a wise old don—once prime minister—prevailed upon Ferdinand and Isabella thusly: "Were the world even round (and we know it is flat), why the great hurry to get to the other side? We should proceed in an orderly, scientific way, building one accomplishment on another, rather than engaging in a mad effort to win a stunt race. Don't squander our riches sending this madman on a bootless errand, don't give another thought to this million-ducat boondoggle."

So Columbo finally gave up his venture, and died a broken man, taunted on the streets by young and old with shouts of "Columbo's boondoggle" and "the world is round, the world is round, hah-hah-hah."

At about the same time, in the 124th year of the Ming Dynasty of China—far to the east and still farther to the west—a sea captain of note, by name of Chou-lung, was granted an audience before the young Emperor and wove for his ruler a tale of lands far beyond the sea to the eastward and pleaded with the Emperor to give him three ships for a long voyage of discovery to the east. The Emperor was muchly impressed with this brave sea captain and bade him return in a fortnight for his answer. But the old Emperor, who had given up his throne to the younger ruler, shouted: "Confucius say bird in hand better than two in bush. This is million-yuan boondoggle; better we send this man to catch fish in the air. Even if world is round—and Buddha knows it's flat—why great hurry to get to other side? We should proceed in orderly, scientific manner, building one accomplishment on another, rather than engaging in mad effort to win stunt race." And there were other wise men who pleaded against the venture, saying: "Send ships without men aboard, maybe one of them will make the voyage and return and then we will know it is safe."

But the young Emperor would not be swayed and he granted to Chou-lung his three ships and they sailed away. Many moons later they returned, laden with gold and jewels and other riches and tales of a wonderful land stretching from the top of the earth to the bottom and sparsely inhabited by primitive red men not greatly unlike the Chinese. And the Emperor and his successors continued to promote these voyages of discovery, then colonization for the vast new lands, which they named in honor of their discoverer—North Chou-lung, Central Chou-lung, and South Chou-lung. And the Ming Dynasty prospered and grew and continues to this day.

And this is why the Chinese so dominate the earth with their modern culture and progress and prosperity, while the white men in Spain and Italy and the other little nations of Europe continue such a primitive existence. Now, we are told, the present young Emperor of this vast and modern land has given his blessing to a voyage to the moon. To his critics who denounce this venture as a "20-billion-yuan boondoggle," the Emperor has answered: "Our history books say this is same old story they tried to peddle when esteemed Chou-lung wanted to explore vast ocean. Confucius say: 'If a man take no thought about what is distant, he will find sorrow near at hand.' "

Today's quote: "Why the great hurry to get to the moon and the planets? * * * We should proceed in an orderly, scientific way, building one accomplishment on another, rather than engaging in a mad effort to win a stunt race."—DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Optimism in St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 the Optimists International opened a new international headquarters building in St. Louis. It was my very great pleasure to be able to join with this distinguished and forward-looking group in the dedication of the new headquarters. I commend the work of this organization and I am happy that the new international headquarters in St. Louis will have a part in moving its important work forward. The construction of this new headquarters is a significant milestone in the Optimists' efforts.

In addressing the dedication ceremony, I spoke on the point of employment and the fact that we have a great untapped resource in our unemployed. The Republican News of St. Louis County, reported on this speech in its July issue. I am placing this article, which does a good job of capturing the ideas which I offered in my speech, in the Record. A number of people have asked for copies of the entire speech and I intend to place it in the Record in the near future.

The article follows:

Curtis Says Unemployed Is Untapped Resource

"Our unemployed are actually one of our society's greatest untapped resources," U.S. Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, Missouri, Second District, declared in the principal address at ceremonies officially dedicating the new Optimists International headquarters building at 4494 Lindell Boulevard.

We have more jobs going unfilled than there are people to fill them, Curtis asserted, adding that America throughout its history has always had a labor shortage, not a labor surplus.

"That is one reason why immigrants flocked, and still flock, to our shores.

"I prefer to look at employment and the help wanted ads and wonder how can we get the men and women to fill these jobs—jobs which so urgently need to be filled that companies advertise week after week attempting to find qualified persons for these jobs," he said.

The pessimists say the jobs going begging call for skills, while the unemployed are centered largely among the unskilled, the semiskilled and possessors of obsolete skills, Curtis declared, adding that these same pessimists believe the high skills demanded to fill the unfilled jobs cannot be developed among the jobless group.

"I point out, however, that the dynamism of a society going somewhere, as ours is, consists of a constant upgrading of skills within the spectrum of skills," he continued.

"The possesor of the lowest skill is not the one trained for the newly emerging job demanding the higher skill. This job is filled by one with a highly skillful job upgrading his skill, thus leaving his old job to be filled by one below upgrading his skill, and so on down the line."

The greatest waste in our society, Curtis charged, is when someone capable of doing a job requiring a higher skill will not train himself to handle that skill but, instead, lazes along in a job which is too easy for him.

Such a person robs himself as well as the person who does not have the talent to fill the more demanding job but who could adequately handle the less demanding job, he said.

Memorial for a Constitutional Amendment Reserving Power of Apportionment to the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith, for printing in the Congressional Record, a memorial adopted at the recent special session of the Florida Legislature. House Memorial No. 18–X was introduced by Mr. Mathews, of Duval County, Fla., and is entitled:

A memorial to the Congress of the United States of America urging the Congress to submit a constitutional amendment reserving, granting, and confirming power and jurisdiction relating to the apportionment and reapportionment of the membership of State legislatures to the States without review of the Federal courts, and further urging the Congress to enact immediate interim legislation under article III, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution limiting appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

My State feels very strongly that the harassment of State governments and the constant erosion of States rights by the Federal courts must end. I share in that conviction, and I strongly support a constitutional amendment which clearly confirms the power of the States to deal solely with matters of apportionment and reapportionment of State legislatures.

The memorial follows:

"House Memorial No. 18–X

"(Introduced by Mr. Mathews of Duval County, Fla.)

"A memorial to the Congress of the United States of America urging the Congress to submit a constitutional amendment reserving, granting and confirming power and jurisdiction relating to the apportionment and reapportionment of the membership of State legislatures to the States without review of the Federal courts, and further urging the Congress to enact immediate interim legislation under article III, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution limiting appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

"Whereas the apportionment of the membership of State legislatures, both the House and Senate, is properly a State and not a Federal question; and

"Whereas there has been some effort recently by some of the lower Federal courts, not only to determine the validity of the apportionment or reapportionment of the membership of State legislatures, but also to make apportionment or reapportionment by judicial decree; and

"Whereas such judicial proceedings seriously interfere with States rights and the freedom of government by the people of the several States; and

"Whereas such judicial proceedings are a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past and are a deliberate, palpable and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to the Federal judiciary by the U.S. Constitution,

"Whereas it appears to be the view of the Federal judiciary that population numbers are a principal consideration in determining the validity of apportionment laws relating to the representation in both houses of a bicameral legislative body; and

"Whereas it has long been the custom, usage and law of the State of Florida and the several States that other factors in addition to population ought to be considered in arriving at fair and equitable representation in State legislative bodies; and

"Whereas it is necessary that the Congress enact suitable laws relating to both the original jurisdiction of the Federal district courts and appellate jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court, pursuant to power vested in the Congress by article III, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution and any other applicable laws until such time as the Federal judiciary's encroachment into the field of State legislative apportionment traditionally reserved unto the States is curbed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That the Florida Legislature hereby and herein petitions the Congress of the United States of America, and each House and Member thereof, to draft and submit a suitable amendment to the U.S. Constitution, specifically reserving, granting, and clearly confirming exclusive power and jurisdiction relating to the apportionment and reapportionment of the membership of State legislatures to the several States and to spell out that State action in this field is not subject to review by the Federal courts; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Florida Legislature hereby and herein petitions the Congress of the United States of America, and each House and Member thereof, to draft, submit, and enact a suitable law having the effect of excluding from the original jurisdiction of the Federal district courts cases relating to State legislative reapportionment and excluding from the appellate jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court cases relating to State legislative apportionment pursuant to powers conferred upon the Congress by article III, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, which provides in material part as follows: 'In all other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make'; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted forthwith by the chief clerk of the house and the secretary of the senate of the State of Florida to the President of the United States, and the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each of the congressional delegation from Florida in the U.S. Congress, and to each of the Governors, secretaries of state, and attorneys general of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal of both the Senate and house of representatives of the State of Florida, and sufficient copies thereof be furnished to the press."

I, Tom Adams, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Memorial No. 18–X adopted at the extraordinary session of the Florida Legislature, 1962, as shown by the records of this office.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 14th day of August A.D. 1962.

Tom Adams,
Secretary of State.

The Solution of Juvenile Delinquency Is in the Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss a matter which I believe I have a certain amount of knowledge, the subject of juvenile delinquency. As a State senator of New York, I was a member of the statewide commission on youth and juvenile delinquency. This commission consisted of nine members. It was headed by Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of the International Business Machines. Some members were George B. DeLuca, then the Lieutenant Governor; Jacob K. Javits, then the attorney general; Mrs. David M. Levy; Mr. Mark A. McCloskey; myself; and four other legislators.

We made a statewide study in the major cities and in the rural areas on this important subject. We heard thousands of witnesses, judges, probation officers, social workers, priests, rabbis, teachers, and citizens from every field of endeavor. As a result of the 6-month study, we made many recommendations to the New York State legislation, some of which have been enacted into law.

During hearings before the special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, under the chairmanship of Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, I testified and gave the subcommittee the benefit of the experiences which I had learned during my senatorial experience. As the membership of the House knows, the committee recommended an appropriation of $30 million covering a period of 3 years to coordinate the various activities in the various States to combat this problem of juvenile delinquency.

My testimony before the subcommittee follows:

There is probably no other area where statistics tell so little of the actual story than in the area of juvenile delinquency. Statistics tell us that 98 percent of our young people are good, law abiding citizens and only 2 percent can be labeled with the category of "juvenile delinquency," but statistics do not tell us what 2 percent means in terms of disruptions of family life, losses of education for all children in classes where education is continually disrupted and loss potential talent and manpower to our Nation. Finally, how can statistics measure the pain of the mother whose child is killed in a gang war or whose child does the killing?

Today, juvenile delinquency is a problem everywhere, in big cities and small rural towns, in slums and in suburbs. Three main reasons seem to be involved. The basic cause to my mind, is the breakdown of respect for authority, a breakdown that frequently manifests itself first in the home, later in the school, and finally in the courts. The second cause, is the breakdown in family life with today's increase in divorce, homes where both parents must work and there is insufficient supervision, and homes where there is lack of love and affection or indulgence and mother love.

The third reason is the negative role that youth is frequently asked to play in today's world. A hundred years ago, young people had important things to learn if they were to take their place in society—things they were taught by their families and communities as well as by the schools. Today's young people have no apprenticeship to serve, nothing seemingly to contribute so they become the rebels without a cause.

It is in the third category of causes that local communities today are playing an important part in the development of projects to integrate young people into the life and work of the community. In all areas, however, there is a great need for study, research and training on a national scale. Pilot projects are needed that will determine specific guides to the causes of juvenile delinquency and measures that can be taken to see that our current alarming increase in juvenile delinquency is halted and turned back. Pilot projects are needed that will show how our young juvenile offenders can first be rehabilitated and reclaimed for themselves, their families and society as a whole.

The Federal Government, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is actively engaged in many projects of this kind and millions of dollars have been spent in the search for these essentials, but more, much more is needed. A recent study revealed that in many areas, probation officers and others working with young people in trouble are not college graduates, and have received no special training. The preparation of materials and the provision of specialists to help give these people necessary training is a vast and essential area of endeavor.

Some Federal laws are aimed directly at the prevention of juvenile delinquency and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. The laws prohibiting interstate traffic in switchblade knives, enactments making it easier to arrest and prosecute pornographers and raising the age limit of youths covered by the Federal Youth Correction Act to 26 are explicit examples of such laws.

Much remains to be done. The creation of a new CCC Corps has often been recommended to give worthwhile work to the boy who would otherwise roam the streets. Laws which would protect the youthful offender against the loss of his civil rights so that he would have a better chance at rehabilitation should receive consideration. Today a boy who has a record generally is not eligible for any civil service position, no matter how menial, nor can he hold a job that require a license—he cannot, for example, be a barber or sell beer in a grocery store.

A boy whose way to a decent life seems blocked in all directions, who is told by his probation officer and officials that he has paid his debt to society, but he is not good enough to clean its streets, may certainly feel that crime is his only recourse.

The attack on juvenile delinquency, therefore, must come from all levels of society and government, with the role of the Federal Government a threefold one: Research and study; the provision of materials and trained personnel to help juvenile delinquency workers; and necessary legislation in areas where the problem comes under Federal domain.

Matt Cvetic: A Real Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mat Cvetic: A Real Hero," which appeared in the August 21, 1962, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. Mr. Cvetic's efforts to awaken the American people to the internal Communist threat are widely known. I was well acquainted with him and can attest to his utter loyalty to the United States and the freedoms for which she stands. I deem it most appropriate that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

MATT CVETIC: A REAL HERO

Some men become heroes on the battlefields of war, others on the battlefields of peace. Matt Cvetic, who died in Los Angeles recently from a heart atack, was one of the latter.

At the request of the FBI, Cvetic became a Communist to spy on the Reds and learn their secrets. In that he did a tremendous job and the Communists never learned they had been tricked until Cvetic went on the witness stand and told his story before a congressional committee.

But in the meantime, what suffering he went through in life. He could not reveal to anyone, including his closest relatives, why he had become a Communist.

His Austrian immigrant mother died in sorrow in 1949 believing her son to be a traitor to the United States. His father only learned the truth 3 months before he died.

When Cvetic's wife learned he was a Communist she took their twin sons and left him, eventually divorcing him.

Matt Cvetic, in our opinion, was a great hero. He made the supreme sacrifice in life. May kind memories of him and what he did for his country remain in our hearts forever.

Support for H.R. 11158: The Mass Transportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter I received from the American Transit Association with regard to my bill H.R. 11158:

AMERICAN TRANSIT ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., August 17, 1962.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: As you know, the urban mass transportation bills, S. 3615 and H.R. 11158, which provide matching assistance for capital facilities and equipment to improve rail and bus passenger transportation service in urban areas have been reported by the legislative committees of both Houses.

Recently, statements have been made that this assistance is to be limited to publicly owned transit systems and will be used to drive private enterprise out of business.

The organization for which I am authorized to speak by its board of directors is comprised of about 250 member local transit systems of which only 20 are publicly owned and operated. Last year they transported about 80 percent of all transit riders in the United States.

Because of our vital interest in the preservation of private enterprise, we respectfully submit that these statements are inaccurate.

We would not support the legislation if we believed it was in any way calculated to diminish the role of private enterprise in this field.

We believe that unless assistance for capital improvements are made available, State and local governments will be forced to take over more and more local private rail and bus carriers.

This legislation has been amended by the committees of both Houses to specifically require certification that the urban transportation program of any community requesting assistance provide for the participation of private mass transportation companies to the maximum extent feasible.

We are satisfied that the legislation gives adequate protection to private enterprise, and we therefore urge your support.

Sincerely yours,
Frederick J. Johnson,
President,
American Transit Association.

Mayor Wagner Salutes the Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, shortly after his return from a tour of Europe Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, was invited to address the annual State convention of the American Legion of the State of New York.

The mayor, who is a colonel in the Reserve Forces, had a distinguished military career during World War II and is keenly aware of the contributions and obligations of American veterans. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the text of the address given by the mayor during the State convention:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT THE AMERICAN LEGION ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION

I am just back from my first trip to Europe in 7 years. In those 7 years, Europe has changed but so has the entire world. Europe is much more prosperous than it was 7 years ago. The world and the world situation are much more complicated and difficult than was the case in 1955. But I am glad to be able to say to you, as a returning traveler and tourist, that America's position and prestige in the world are certainly much stronger and higher today than 7 years ago. This observation is based on the comments of hundreds of plain everyday people I met and talked to as well as of businessmen and government officials, including many European mayors whom I have known in the past.

But this is not the occasion to make a serious report on my trip abroad. I am here this morning to greet and welcome my fellow Legionnaires to this annual State convention here in New York City. But there is one comparison of Europe today with the Europe of the past that I am sure you as Legionnaires will appreciate * * * especially those of you who have been abroad lately.

The ninth national convention of the American Legion was held in Paris back in 1927. The other day somebody showed me a copy of the January 1927 edition of the old Legion newspaper, the Empire State Legionnaire. What caught my eye was the front page headline over an article about the forthcoming Paris convention of the Legion. The headline read: $300 is sufficient for Paris trip. The subheadline read: Will leave about $90 for incidentals.

That was 35 years ago. Europe has certainly changed. I can testify to that.

In the 3 days of your convention here in New York City, you will deliberate on many matters of grave import * * * not only for the Legion, for veterans in general, and for your country * * * but for the benefit of freemen everywhere.

The American Legion, with the New York department in the van, has always been dedicated to the preservation of our national independence and integrity. The Legion, through its continuing concern for the state of our national defense, has long supported the cause of American power in world affairs.

As for the department of New York, whether in fund raising for an educational television station, as in Buffalo, or in the preparation of a "School Guard Color Manual" by New York City's Schoolman's Post, or in the current Boy's State civic project at Colgate University, our department of the Legion can point to a record of many achievements.

During the past year, the New York department has spent more than $115,000 solely for the rehabilitation of our less fortunate comrades. Our child welfare program has earned, and deservedly so, the plaudits not only of the people of New York but of the entire Nation.

To my fellow Legionnaires I sincerely urge you to continue your efforts to build a finer and better America. Continue to be on the alert against the spread of communism and Communist imperialism. Above all, keep up your efforts to help each of our citizens to be proud of being an American, and to make America proud, especially proud, of each one of her citizens.

I regret that the resolution for a Korean bonus, sponsored by the American Legion, Department of New York, was killed in Albany on orders from the Governor's office. I was in favor of a bonus. I stated that fact publicly. I am still in favor of it. And in a year when our State and National economy could have stood a boost, a Korean bonus would have been doubly useful. But next year is another year.

Again on behalf of the people of New York City, I extent to all of you a warm and heartfelt welcome.

Let us continue to keep our Nation spiritually as well as militarily strong so that your children and mine may continue to enjoy the freedom which we and others before us have fought to preserve.

Good luck and God bless you all.

The Navy's Dental Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy Dental Corps celebrated its 50th anniversary on August 22.

As sponsor of a bill which helped mold the corps into the fine medical division it is today, I would like to warmly congratulate Rear Adm. C. W. Schantz and the officers and men of the corps for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, the mission of the corps is vital to the overall health and well-being of Navy and Marine Corps personnel. Since the days of its infancy, the Navy Dental Corps has established a record of devotion to duty, and high professional competence.

The News and Courier at Charleston, S.C., recently published a chronological history of the corps. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert this tribute to the dedicated officers and men of the corps for the information of the Congress:

THE NAVY'S DENTAL CORPS

(By T. Edward Pertuit)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Navy Dental Corps marks its both birthday anniversary Wednesday. The following article was written in recognition of the occasion and is based largely on the Navy Department's publication, "The Dental Corps of the U.S. Navy," a chronological history.)

The U.S. Navy Dental Corps celebrates its 50th anniversary this year. But the fight for a corps started about 118 years ago.

It was then that Edward Maynard, an outstanding practitioner of dentistry in Washington and dentist to several Presidents and national figures of his time, began trying to interest the men he knew.

But the earliest mention of dentistry in naval correspondence is in a letter of February 16, 1853, from President Fillmore's (Secretary) of the Navy, John P. Kennedy, to Surgeon General Thomas Harris, urging more dental knowledge for naval medical applicants. (The letter was prompted by Dr. Maynard's interest.)

The Surgeon General replied that requiring every doctor that applied for Navy service to have a full knowledge of dentistry would be rather infeasible.

Mr. Kennedy then asked if a qualified dentist could not be attached to each vessel, or at least one to a squadron. The Surgeon General thought one to a squadron sufficient.

But, despite this glimmering of interest, it was not until April 22, 1873, that the first dentist, Dr. Thomas O. Walton, was appointed to Navy service.

He became acting assistant surgeon at the U.S. Naval Academy until his discharge in 1879. A year later, he was appointed in the same position as a contract dentist, at a salary of $1,600 per annum.

He and his successor, Dr. Richard Grady, continually urged legislation to get proper dental care for men of the Navy, but to no real effect.

In 1879 a bill was introduced in Congress to establish a Dental Corps as a branch of the Medical Department in the Army and Navy. It didn't pass, but it was a start.

Surg. Gen. P. M. Rixey pressed for legislation, getting consideration (but no bill) from 1904 through 1911.

Long and detailed reports of what lack of proper dental care was doing to the general health and morale of the Navy were summed up by the Secretary of the Navy in 1911.

"The imperative necessity for the establishment of a corps of properly qualified dentists in the Navy has been dwelt upon in previous reports, and experience emphasizes and confirms what has previously been written," the Secretary wrote.

What has been written over the years was voluminous and revealing of oral disease, and its effects (including deaths).

With all the pressure piled up, the bill introduced in 1912 passed the 62d Congress on August 22 and the Dental Corps came into being.

The act provided for up to 30 dental officers, with additional temporary officers appointed when necessary, not to exceed the proportion of 1 per 1,000 of the authorized enlisted strength.

The Dental Corps was given $15,000 to purchase equipment that first year. Dr. Emoray A. Bryant of Washington, D.C., became the first dental officer, appointed October 23, 1912.

On March 4, 1913, Congress authorized a Reserve Corps, which developed closely with the Dental Corps. The fact is that in many years there have been more Reserve Corps members on active duty than Regular officers.

On March 5, 1913, Dr. H. E. Harvey reported aboard the U.S.S. *Solace*, becoming the first dental officer aboard a ship. Dr. James L. Brown reported to the U.S. Naval Station, Guam, to become the first dental officer ordered to an oversea base.

During 1913 the buildup moved forward, with 15 officers on duty by November. By June 30, 1915, there were 31 dental officers in the corps.

The Surgeon General reported that work was being done, particularly on the larger stations, but added that officers were needed to reach the smaller stations.

Another step forward was the act of 1916, allowing dental officers to be commissioned. The establishing act gave only appointments.

The fledgling Dental Corps moved into World War I April 6, 1917, with 35 dental officers. With a buildup underway, the number grew to more than 80 by October, and by 1918 new officers were being sent to an instruction school established at Great Lakes, Ill. Schooling included advanced work in oral surgery, and other practices.

History was made again on April 13, 1918—Lt. (jg.) Alexander G. Lyle, DC, while serving with the 5th Regiment, U.S. Marines was awarded the Medal of Honor for doing emergency surgery (not dental) under fire in the Verdun sector. He also was awarded the Silver Star for this act and for action in the Soissons sector.

Lt. (jg.) Weedon E. Osborne, also a Medal of Honor recipient, became the first dental officer to give his life for his Nation, June 6, 1918.

During the war the number of dental officers expanded to more than 500, with 124 Regulars and the rest Reserves.

Ninety percent of those in the regular corps served at sea or overseas. Of 43 transports used, only 22 carried a dental officer.

One major innovation that developed in medical records during World War I was the dental chart. By war's end thousands of sailors and marines had complete dental records and these charts of all personnel have proved invaluable over the years as a means of identifying the dead—aside from their intended purpose.

It has been calculated that 80 percent of the casualties at Pearl Harbor were identified this way.

The Dental Corps and Dental Corps Reserve had grown into a proven part of Navy medicine by the end of World War I.

On February 3, 1923, the U.S. Naval Dental School opened. It not only included instruction in every phase of dentistry, but the prosthetics laboratory was to serve as a central dental laboratory for the Navy.

The school trained both enlisted technicians and medical officers receiving postgraduate courses.

The Dental Corps, like the rest of the Nation during the early part of the 1930's, felt the effects of the depression.

In 1932 economics forced temporary closing of the U.S. Naval Dental School. Yet, in the same year, the Surgeon General noted that education of enlisted personnel and officers had resulted in an even heavier workload per officer, as interest in oral care developed.

It became increasingly obvious that a limitation of dental personnel based on authorized total personnel wasn't constant in actuality. As the actual number of personnel decreased the ratio dropped. As the number increased, it rose.

On July 22, 1935, Congress set up a ratio of 1 dentist to each 500 persons actually on active duty, not merely authorized. The allowed number of dentists rose from 186 to 234.

In August another act of Congress authorized a new medical center, to include a dental schol. Construction was begun at Bethesda, Md., June 29, 1939.

Shortages of dentists had always plagued the corps, and did so until well into World War II. At the war's outbreak supplies, too, ran short and drill burrs, amalgam, and metal trimmings were ordered salvaged.

The corps was in the war from the start. Two officers were killed and four wounded at Pearl Harbor. Six accompanied the 1st Marine Division in the August 7, 1942, Guadalcanal landing.

Supplies and equipment ran shorter as a buildup in forces continued. Shifts were instituted, keeping available dental equipment in use from 12 to 16 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Dental requirements for enlistment were lowered, throwing even more work on the corps.

By June 30, 1943, there were 3,449 dental officers on active duty. In July of that year the V–12 Navy specialized training program was instituted, permitting dental studies at Government expense.

Women came into the Navy and into the Dental Corps. The first woman dentist was Lt. Sara Gudlin Krout, who reported for duty June 1, 1944. She's now retired.

The first mobile dental units were placed in operation in February 1945. Clinic ships were planned, but the proposals were dropped at the cessation of hostilities.

During the war Navy dentists, among other operations and treatments, extracted 4,229,809 teeth—the equivalent of pulling every tooth possessed by 132,181 men, and 17 more teeth from another.

World War II left the Dental Corps with a number of proficient dentists, sufficient supplies, and a great deal of knowledge.

It was realized, for instance, that many of the Navy's dentists and their equipment had to be mobile, to go where the men went. It also was realized that training had to include working under combat conditions and other medical duties not ordinarily given to dentistry.

There was a need for continual changes in organization as well as procedures, and in 1946 Congress agreed.

That year legislation was passed giving the Surgeon General, through the Secretary of the Navy, power to reorganize the Dental Division himself, within certain limits.

Dental clinics were established at all major installations, and mobile units placed around the world.

A selective service act in 1950 permitted drafting of medical officers. And proportionment was changed within the corps; the ratio of dentists was cut to 1 to 150 at training stations.

The past several years have seen rapid and major changes in dentistry—new types of materials, new drugs, new anesthetics, new training methods, high-speed drills, advances in preventive dentistry—and the Dental Corps has kept place.

An international exchange training program has been established with Canada, and many other advantages made in the corps.

The notable points in the corps history since 1950 are legion. This year is no different from the others in that respect, with one exception; this year the Dental Corps celebrates 50 years of active duty.

Public Works Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the emergency public works employment bill, H.R. 10113, will come before the House tomorrow. The extremely high level of unemployment which has persisted for the past 5 years threatens to become chronic unless we take action to curb this trend and to strengthen the economy generally. This bill is designed to do exactly that through Federal assistance for public works construction. Not only will this bill provide an immediate increase in the number of jobs available, but it will also create many urgently needed local public works. Nearly every community in the country has a backlog of water and sewer projects, public buildings, streets, sidewalks, and the like, for which there is an urgent need. Nowhere is this need greater than in places which have suffered most seriously from unemployment. These hard-hit areas need not only the jobs which would be created but they need to add to their public investment in order to encourage their long-term growth through the development of industry. The Area Redevelopment Act enacted last year provided some assistance for these public works, but restricted it to projects which could tie in to an identifiable source of additional employment, such as a factory.

As a result, many of these depressed communities who have applied for assistance have found that their applications were sharply cut back or turned down altogether because they were designed to serve the whole community. Even though these projects may not tie in with a specific source of employment, I think everyone will agree that adequate water and sewer facilities, for example, are essential to the economic growth and development of a community. Under the Public Works Employment Act, however, aid could be given to these worthwhile projects in the form of 50-percent grants.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at the end of my remarks a list of 60 projects for which application was made under the Area Redevelopment Act but which were either cut to the bone or rejected outright. All of these projects are in areas eligible for assistance under the public works bill and appear to qualify for the 50-percent grants. In addition to these, of course, there are a great many other projects greatly needed in eligible areas for which application was never made when the restrictive terms of the Area Redevelopment Act were explained so that this list is only a few of the projects that might qualify. However, it is an indication of the backlog that does exist.

The list of projects follows:

Project

Place	Type	Amount
Alabama:		
Myrtlewood	Water system including pumps, filtration, tanks lines.	$101,430
Jasper	Community hospital	200,000
Glen Allen	Water system	45,000
Alaska: Fairbanks	120-bed hospital	5,150,000
Arkansas:		
Batesville	Extension and improvement, city water system.	355,000
Monticello	Extension and improvement of water and sewer system.	469,500
Morrilton	Improvement of sewer system and access road to industrial site.	281,060
Waldron	Storage reservoir, treatment plant, and distribution lines.	650,000
Augusta	Treatment plant and extension of water, sewer, and gas lines.	195,000
Florida: Blountstown	Improvement and extension of water and sewerage facilities.	451,207
Georgia:		
Dawson	Sewerage treatment plant and distribution system.	930,234
Wadley	Water system and improvements to sewer system, fire hall, storm drainage.	375,000
Leesburg	Improvement of water and sewer system.	131,000
Wrightsville	Water and sewer system	134,000
Clarksville	Sewerage treatment system	290,600
Lavonia	Improvement of water and sewerage treatment facilities.	655,500
Warrenton	Sewer and gas line, access road	99,314
Idaho: St. Maries	Relocation of a section of city waterline	18,909
Indiana:		
Bloomfield	Repair and extend present sewage system.	516,000
Jasonville	Extend and repair sanitary disposal system.	702,450
Perry County	Watershed project	164,000
Louisiana: Leonville	Municipal water system	77,000
Maine: Saco	Heavy duty roadway (construction)	37,000
Massachusetts: Lowell	Facilities for industrial park (road, water, and sewer).	187,500
Michigan: Manistee	New water supply and improvements	700,000
Mississippi:		
Bay Springs	Extension of sewer facilities	123,000
Walnut	Improvement of water and sewer system.	190,000
Nevada: Lincoln County	Road to atomic test site	131,400
New York: Auburn	Construction of water and sewer lines; removal of railroad tracks.	$50,000
North Carolina: Polkton	New water system	63,107
Ohio: South Point	Sewage system	590,000
Oklahoma: McCurtain County.	Waterworks	350,415
Pennsylvania:		
Shamokin	Development of industrial park	164,000
Brownsville	Construction of hospital	2,850,000
Newell	Water suply system	250,000
Uniontown	Construction of hospital	1,316,667
Mountaintop	Preparation of plant sites	600,000
Borough of North East	Improvements and new construction, water system.	2,760,000
Butler County	Industrial park	49,538
Addison and Henry Clay Townships.	Construction of roads	1,689,675
Charleroi	Development of industrial park	89,152
Pottsville	do	400,000
South Carolina:		
Blaney	Constructive municipal water system	150,000
Lancaster	Purchase and improvement, water and sewer system.	1,700,000
Loris	Expanding and improving water and sewer facilities.	549,610
Tennessee:		
Tazewell	Water system	321,000
LaFollette	do	563,000
Tennessee Ridge	Water and sewer	440,000
Tazewell	Sewer system	803,000
Monterey	Water and sewer system	905,000
Utah: Emery County	Water system	389,756
Virginia:		
Coeburn	Water and sewer	631,995
Big Stone Gap	do	1,350,000
Wise	Water extension	38,000
West Virginia:		
Morgantown	Construction of vocational training center.	1,018,232
Cowen-Camden-on-Gauley, Webster Springs.	Sewage systems	1,051,712
Logan County Planning Commission.	Sewage systems for 6 communities	[1]
Whitesville	Medical clinic	123,000
Hepzibah	Water system	132,000
Wisconsin: Ashland	Water, sewer facilities to service industrial park.	90,000

---

[1] Not specified.

The Communists Are Not Mellowing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on July 29, 1962, the distinguished political scientist, Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame, was interviewed on the "Manion Forum" over approximately 250 radio stations in this country by Dr. John Kolbe, of Arizona, graduate student at Notre Dame. The title of this broadcast is "Rostow Is Wrong—The Communists Are Not Mellowing."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this radio interview be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROSTOW IS WRONG—THE COMMUNISTS ARE NOT MELLOWING

(Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame, interviewed by John Kolbe, of Arizona, graduate student at Notre Dame)

Dean MANION. A few weeks ago I called your attention to the fact that under the direction of Mr. Walt Rostow, our State Department is reversing our long-continued policy of opposition to communism. The reason for this reversal is an official conviction that the Soviet Government is mellowing and if we deal unoffensively and patiently with the Kremlin the Red leaders will eventually consent to cooperate with us in preserving world peace.

If the Communist leopard is actually changing its Red spots, that fact should be evident to reputable authorities on communism outside of the State Department who have been analyzing the Communist conspiracy closely and scientifically for years. Such an authority on the subject of communism is Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame.

I have asked my young friend John Kolbe, who is one of Dr. Niemeyer's graduate students, to bring you the following interview with Dr. Niemeyer at Notre Dame. Here is John Kolbe, of Arizona:

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you, Dean Manion. Dr. Niemeyer, would you, for the benefit of the Manion Forum listeners, qualify yourself as an expert witness on the subject of communism? Tell us a little something about your background and what qualifies you to speak on it as we do today?

Dr. NIEMEYER. Well, I studied the subject of communism for more than 15 years and what put me on to it was my experience in my native Germany with the Nazi dictatorship. Having gotten rid of one totalitarism, I was interested in getting rid of the other one.

I have studied Russian and traveled in the Soviet Union. I have testified before the Congress, various committees, the Committee of Un-American Activities, for whom I also wrote a little brochure called "The Communist Ideology."

I have been retained as an expert by the State of Florida, in the elaboration of their obligatory course on communism that's going to be installed in the high schools in this coming year. And, I've spoken at dozens and dozens of meetings all over the United States on the subject of communism.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you, Doctor. I certainly think that is sufficient. Tell us, now, is the Communist ideology merely "window-dressing," or is it really something that the Communists must live and really work by?

Dr. NIEMEYER. The Communist ideology is best described as the cement that holds communism together. Maybe I should qualify this, because it is certainly the party organization which is the cement in the most strict sense of the word; but on the other hand, the Communist ideology is what party members recognize each other by. Every relationship in the party, every action in the party is always expressed in ideological terms and the Communist will not look at the world or any problem in the world, or even at a person or any other party comrades without defining all these things in ideological terms.

So, the ideology is to a Communist what breath is to normal people. It is simply what he lives by and what makes him a Communist. There is no Communist apart from the ideology.

Mr. KOLBE. Well, proceeding along this line, if we continue to try to contain communism, which seems to be the present American policy, would you say that there is any hope that communism will evolve into a sort of viable democracy with which we can live and coexist?

Dr. NIEMEYER. That seems to be the hope of many people, particularly of the people in official positions. Let us look at the record. Communism, if we take this to be the system that we find in the Soviet Union and in

China today, as well as the Communist parties all over the world, communism has evolved and it has changed.

There have been changes, of course, in communism. For instance, let me just remind you of the famous change which Lenin made in 1921 to the so-called new economic policy, when he reinstated capitalism for a while in Russia, and then, of course, after a while it was just as surely ousted again.

There have been other changes in communism such as when the Communist Party changed from its previous policy of declaring the Social Democrats the major enemy and switched over to the United Front policy in 1935.

I'm mentioning only these examples to show that there has been evolution in communism. But the main thing that has never changed by evolution, that will always remain the same, is the basic attitude of the Communists toward the rest of the world outside of the Communist Party, and toward their own role or mission in history.

The Communists have, from the beginning, unchangingly, unswervingly, always considered themselves the destroyer of this present world. They consider themselves as committed to an irreconcilable struggle against all societies that now exist. And this dogma which came originally from Karl Marx and was then taken up by Lenin has never changed in the slightest.

COMMUNISTS CHANGE STRATEGY—NOT IDEOLOGY

In other words, what has changed is in the field of strategy, in the field of tactics. Even in the Communist ideology there are certain elements that have changed, but the basic attitude, the core of the ideology, and, therefore, the essence of communism has not changed. It has not changed as a matter of record and, therefore, we have not the slightest reason to assume that it will change.

Now, of course, we can say all human things are subject to change and to decay and to demise, and one of these days we may see that communism is no more. But I would say, let us wait for that day before we say that it is so.

Mr. KOLBE. In other words, the Communist goal of world domination is still very much with us and it is not something that has been tempered in any particular way.

Dr. NIEMEYER. It is the only thing that makes sense to a Communist. It is the only way in which a Communist can look on his own life as meaningful. It is a life that is dedicated to the ultimate victory of the Communist Party over all its enemies anywhere in the world, and its enemy is anyone who is not a Communist.

Mr. KOLBE. Would you say, Dr. Niemeyer, that the report going around these days of the split between Communist China and Russia offers any real hope to the free world?

Dr. NIEMEYER. Let's first examine the facts about this split. You know that there is in the Soviet Union some dispute about the policy which Khrushchev has chosen; namely, the policy of the soft-sell—peaceful coexistence, as he calls it.

He is refraining from openly aggressive gestures and attitudes and is trying to make advances by destroying our own defensive determination, by lulling us into a false sense of security and thereby hoping to get us either to dismantle our alliances or else to dismantle our armaments and certainly to dismantle our will to resist.

Now, in this way he hopes to make advances and he has not done at all badly. But this policy, nevertheless, has been attacked and has been doubted by a good many Communists who feel that this policy on the part of Khrushchev is little short of treason of the Communist cause.

You find these Communists not only in the Soviet Union, but the same kind of opposition exists also in China. The Chinese, when Khrushchev made his turn in 1956, made the turn along wih him but very reluctantly, never wholly, and always opposed him in this. In other words, they stuck to the old Stalinist line.

What friction you have now is mainly between the old Stalinist faction and the new policy of Khrushchev—with China sticking to the old Stalinist line. Now, when you have this kind of friction between two Communist groups and each has at his disposal the resources of a country, then the country's policies, resources and you might even call it interest will be involved in the struggle.

Therefore, it begins to look sometimes as if this were a struggle between China and Russia, which it is not. The conflict, insofar as there is a conflict, is, first of all, over strategy, not over basic ideology; over strategy between two factions of communism, both of which are represented not merely in China but also in the Soviet Union itself.

Secondly, it may be a conflict between personalities insofar as Mao Tse-tung is the one with the highest seniority—the man who resents this upstart Khrushchev and is trying, by showing a certain amount of independence, to assert his own dignity as senior Communist. But now, if we come right down to the bottom of it, this man Mao Tse-tung, who is supposed to be a rebel against the Communist leadership of the Kremlin, is the same man who has for years repeated and repeated the line that "In our alliance with the Soviet Union is our only salvation." Who has again and again stated, "We want the same thing, namely, we want the victory of communism and the overthrow of capitalism and imperialism."

And that must remind us that between Hitler and Mussolini, who were also brothers under the skin, there was also a great deal of friction, and this time, not only ideologically but also between their countries' interests. Nevertheless, these two stuck together to the very end. So that gives us an indication of how much hope we have in this so-called split between China and Russia.

Mr. KOLBE. In other words, this so-called split does not really reach down into the very fundamental nature of the ideology itself, but is really on a very superficial basis.

Dr. NIEMEYER. It's purely on the basis of the level of methods and day-to-day movements. The will to oppose the Western world together and with united forces, is always basic in both countries.

NO DIFFERENCE IN RUSSIAN AND CUBAN COMMUNISM

Mr. KOLBE. I'd like to move to another area of the world and it's along the same line. Would you say that there is any really significant difference between, for example, the Russian brand of communism and that which is advocated by Fidel Castro in Cuba?

Dr. NIEMEYER. No, not at all. Both, the Russians and Castro himself, have told us this. The Cubans are in the opening phases of a Communist revolution which always starts with appeasing certain groups until they have taken care of other groups. Then eventually they move against the first group which they have appeased for a while.

The appeasement in Russia took much longer than it took in China and it took longer in China than it is taking in Cuba. In other words, as the Communist regimes come into existence they move in faster and faster against the groups they want to liquidate. And we have here a full-fledged Communist regime which is determined to do away with anything that Cuba ever was traditionally; that the Western World ever was traditionally; just as they are willing to do away with anything that western tradition has called for in all parts of the world.

Mr. KOLBE. Would you say that there is anything that the United States can do about the sorry situation in Cuba?

Dr. NIEMEYER. Well, let me answer this question indirectly. You remember that the Chinese Communists, when they were first defeated, moved into Yenan, where they holed up for many, many years, undisturbed.

They administered the place, they developed an army there, they developed agitators there. From there they operated political procedures and political manipulations into the Chinese mainland, and from there they ultimately started their conquest of China. I would say that Cuba is the Yenan of the Western Hemisphere.

In other words, it is the scene of preparation, the scene of subversion, the scene of training, the place from which—with small operations and big operations—all of the Western Hemisphere will be organized.

If we don't take care of Cuba, we will not only have this danger at the southern shore of our country, but we will have here the focal point of an eventual Communist conquest of the entire Latin hemisphere, the entire hemisphere as far as Latin America is concerned.

We must take care of Cuba. I would say if it cannot be done with the repetition of another Pig Bay invasion, this time with air cover, then let it be done with marines. Our national interest calls for it.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer and Mr. John Kolbe, for this informed answer to those who tell us that the Communists are mellowing and, therefore, we must be nice to them.

My friends, "The Communist Ideology" written by Dr. Niemeyer for the House Committee on Un-American Activities is a masterpiece of scientific analysis. You can get it from the Government Printing Office for 45 cents—and I advise you obtain it and study it carefully.

Address of Charles A. Sweeny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1962

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I call attention of the House to the fine address delivered by Mr. Charles A. Sweeny, Chief, Division of Food and Drug Advertising of the Federal Trade Commission, before the Georgia Association of Broadcasters in its joint meeting with the South Carolina Broadcasters Association.

This speech, delivered at the convention on August 6, 1962, at Jekyll Island, one of Georgia's fine State parks, is of such worth that I have requested permission to insert it in the RECORD so it will become a permanent document in the records of America:

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION LOOKS AT BROADCAST ADVERTISING

Thank you very much for inviting me to your meeting. I have attended several of these conventions throughout the country and am persuaded that these State associations are doing a tremendously effective job—for their memberships and for the public. In fact, they may be helping to demonstrate that the interests of the two are closely parallel. You can be proud that your own association has a reputation as one of the best.

It is my purpose to outline generally some of our efforts and responsibilities in the field of broadcast advertising and discuss what we are trying to do to enforce the law in this area. When I say we, I refer to those of us on the staff most directly concerned with this work. I am not speaking most officially for the Commission.

I want to remind you that we are spot-checking radio and television broadcasts every day of the year, just as we are continuing a surveillance of advertising disseminated in print. I would like to make it clear that I am addressing my remarks more directly to broadcasting only because that is our mutual interest today. I do not intend to suggest that we are any less concerned with the advertising appearing in other media.

In brief, the Federal Trade Commission Act authorizes and directs that agency to ferret out and put a stop to unfair methods of competition in commerce and to unfair and deceptive practices in commerce. False and misleading advertising is an unfair method of competition because it has the capacity and tendency to divert trade from truthful competitors. It is an unfair and deceptive practice because it misleads and deceives the purchasing public. The basic principle we are applying to all advertising is only that the advertiser present his product truthfully and fairly to the prospective purchaser.

This rule applies equally to advertising regardless of the media of dissemination—whether by a door-to-door salesman, in print, or broadcast over the air. As the medium varies, however, so do the actual practices, and we at the Commission must adjust to each new situation as it arises.

Now let us take a look at this rule as applied to television advertising. More than 3 years ago the Commission issued an order to cease and desist in a case involving television commercials.[1] An accompanying opinion stated that it is deceptive and unlawful to conduct a test or demonstration in advertising for the purpose and with the effect of inducing the public to believe that something is proven, when in fact the test or demonstration does not prove any such thing. The opinion explained that purchasers may be induced to buy a product simply because they have been led to believe that they have witnessed a valid test or demonstration.

In other words, when an advertiser says to his television audience: "Let me demonstrate how my product works," we think the viewing public is entitled to an honest demonstration, without gimmicks, without trickery, without deception.

In some of these television demonstration cases, the actual merits of the product are not directly determined. We may not charge that it is not a good product. The essence of the case is that the merits of the product are not in issue—the challenge is to the offering of something which purports to be proof which is in fact no proof at all.

We have now had a number of cases which have not varied from that basic principle. Two of these cases, both involving the advertising of shaving cream, occasioned discussions in the Commission's opinions which are enlightening.

In one of these,[2] the advertiser employed commercials which represented that the moisturizing action of the product is such that when applied to very course, dry sandpaper it is possible immediately to shave off the rough surface with a single stroke, and that the demonstration proves the moisturizing properties of the cream. It was found that actual sandpaper was not employed in the demonstration, but instead a mockup of plexiglass to which sand had been applied; also, that sandpaper could not actually be shaved in the manner and time demonstrated.

Now, you may ask, who cares? No one buys shaving cream to shave Plexiglas or sandpaper. The hearing examiner, in fact, was of the opinion that the demonstration "would appear to be little or nothing more than a case of harmless exaggeration or puffing." He said that "Obviously the sandpaper sequences were employed simply for the purpose of emphasizing and dramatizing the recognized moistening or wetting properties of the cream." This, I feel certain, was the attitude of many others. It was not that of the Commission when it reviewed the case.

Commissioner Elman, in an opinion adopted by the full Commission, summarized the sales pitch in these words: "If you have a tough 'sandpaper' beard, you need a shaving cream with supermoisturizing power. A shaving cream that is effective in quickly and cleanly shaving rough, dry sandpaper can do the same for your beard. (This cream) has such supermoisturizing power, and we will prove it to you before your very eyes."

The opinion then goes on to explain that the pictorial test had the effect of proving to any doubting Thomas in the vast audience that "By golly, it really can shave sandpaper." It was the clinching argument made by the commercial. Without this visible proof of its qualities, some viewers might not have been persuaded to buy the product.

Does this mean, as some have suggested, that mockups may not be employed in television commercials? Not at all. The opinion further explains that "There is a world of difference between a casual display of steaming coffee that is really heated red wine * * * and a commercial showing a closeup of what is actually red wine to the accompaniment of a claim that the high quality of the sponsor's coffee is proved by its rich, dark appearance—which the viewer can verify for himself simply by looking at the coffee on the screen * * *. The difference in all these cases is the time-honored distinction between a misstatement of truth that is material to the inducement of a sale and one that is not."

Now how do the rules apply to depictions of competitive products? The other shaving cream case[3] answers that. This case deals with the representation that competitive creams dry out during the course of a shave while the advertised product stays moist and creamy.

The alleged deception occurred in the presentation of "product X." Lather applied to the face of a shaver had the appearance of being dried out. It was established that the so-called "ordinary" lather used in the commercial was not a shaving cream. The substance contained 90 percent water and a solution of a surface or foaming agent having the property of producting foam. It did not contain any soaps or fatty acid salts, the ingredients ordinarily used to keep a shaving cream from breaking down, and was formulated in such a manner that it would come out of a can "in a good puff and would disappear rapidly." It was also established that there are a number of aerated shaving creams that do not dry out in the course of a shave.

Commissioner Anderson's opinion, again joined by all of the other Commissioners, dealt first with this question of "ordinary." The respondents argued that when they said "ordinary lathers" they intended a reference to lathers produced by shaving creams of inferior quality which would in fact dry out, not to competing lathers of equal quality.

According to the opinion, when the commercial was viewed in its entirety, it purported to demonstrate a comparison with, and to depict, all other aerated shaving creams; that it conveys the impression that all competing aerated lathers dry out. Since the record showed this to be untrue, the representation was found to be a false disparagement of those aerated shaving creams that do not dry out during the course of a shave.

It was concluded that the demonstration purported to show why this shaving cream is superior. The viewer could observe and see for himself that other lathers dry out while "ours" remains moist and creamy. To remove any doubts that this was the purpose of the demonstration, the words "ordinary lathers dry out" were superimposed on the picture. Since the product which was shown as dried out was a substance other than a shaving cream, having none of the characteristics of a shaving cream except the property of foaming, the demonstration did not show that competing lathers dry out faster, although it conveyed the impression that it did.

The demonstration did not prove what it purported to prove and was, therefore, found to be false and deceptive; and unlawful since the demonstration would serve to induce the purchase of this product in preference to competing shaving creams.

There was an announcement yesterday that the hearing examiner has issued his initial decision in our "automobile glass" case.[4] This case involved commercials purporting to compare and demonstrate various types and brands of glass used in the windshields and side windows of automobiles.

The hearing examiner found that photographic techniques used in filming the commercials made comparison shots deceptive. The use of telephoto lenses for a distortion shot had the effect of magnifying distortion making a proper comparison between it and the plate glass shot difficult, if not impossible. The picture of a zebra board taken through sheet glass turned to an angle which was more acute than the angle of plate glass was similarly an unfair and deceptive comparison, in that at the sharper angle sheet glass would ordinarily tend to show greater distortion. Likewise, the photograph of a scene through the right front window for a sheet glass shot and through the right rear window for a plate glass shot, both from the rear seat, had the similar result of creating a sharper angle of view for the former, which accentuated any distortion present.

In all of these instances, the hearing examiner concluded, the principle is essentially the same. A comparison should be as comparable as possible. Disparity should be eliminated, particularly if the disparity has the tendency to exaggerate the comparative differences claimed. Otherwise, the viewer is apt to be misinformed.

The camera techniques cannot be said to have resulted in a portrayal which the viewer could depend upon as a fair comparison, even though what was claimed of the product may have been, and in many instances was, actually true. It is necessary, in addition, that the demonstration of what may be actually true be fair, representative and accurate. Where a sharper angle of vision exaggerates perceptible distortion, the use of such an angle for one piece of glass but not for another with which it is being compared misinforms the viewer. This deception is obviously illustrated in instances where the plate glass shot was taken through a rolled down window. The public was told to observe for itself the clarity of the glass when, in fact, there was no glass. Even if the view through the glass would have been the same as without a glass, the public was entitled to make that decision and judge for itself and not have the matter prejudged by the advertiser.

---

[1] Hutchinson Chemical Corp., docket No. 7140 (June 11, 1959), 55 S. & D., 1942.

[2] Colgate-Palmolive Co., et al., docket 7736, OCD Dec. 29, 1961.

[3] Carter Products, Inc., docket No. 7943, OCD Apr. 25, 1962.

[4] Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., et al., docket No. 7643, initial decision July 17, 1962.

Similarly, in a commercial where vaseline was streaked across some sheet glass to emphasize the distortion in the glass, even if the distortion thus shot was no greater than that usually found in sheet glass, the public was entitled to make its own judgment in the issue or, in the alternative, to be told that vaseline has been used to accentuate the distortion.

I should explain that this initial decision may, and probably will, be appealed to the full Commission for review. It is not yet a final order.

Within the past few days the Commission issued final orders based upon consent agreements in two cases involving television advertising of toys.[5]

The advertisers were ordered to cease and desist from representing, orally or pictorially, that any toy or related product contains a component or performs in any manner not in accordance with fact.

Such advertising being directed to children, the cases recognize formally that the intended audience must be considered in judging or interpreting advertising. In these complaints there is included a paragraph wherein the Commission charges that these toys are designed primarily for children, and are bought either by or for the benefit of children. False, misleading and deceptive advertising claims thus unfairly exploit a consumer group unqualified by age or experience to anticipate or appreciate the possibility that the representations may be exaggerated or untrue. Further, advertisers unfairly play upon the affection of adults for children, by inducing the purchase of toys and related products through false, misleading and deceptive claims of their performance, which claims appeal to both the adults and to children who bring the toys to the attention of adults. As a consequence of exaggerated and untrue representations, toys are purchased in the expectation that they will have characteristics or perform actions not substantiated by the facts. Consumers are thus misled to their disappointment and competing advertisers who do not engage in false, misleading or deceptive advertising are unfairly prejudiced.

I think it is worthy of note and a credit to broadcasters that the television code[6] contains the following admonitions: "The broadcaster and the advertiser should exercise special caution with the content and presentation of television commercials placed in or near programs designed for children. Exploitation of children should be avoided. Commercials directed to children should in no way mislead as to the product's performance and usefulness."

Some of you must certainly be wondering what all this means to you. Granting that these matters all affect the national image of broadcasting, what can you, as individual station operators do about it? If you are network affiliates, you may feel that you do not even control many of the commercials broadcast by your station. In any event, you ask, how can you determine the truth of drug commercials, or know when a plate-glass film sequence is shot through an open window?

You have many tools to work with. Your network screens commercials so that any which they feed you have been checked. When it comes to national spots, you who are members of the National Association of Broadcasters can secure advice there. Your biggest problem is likely to be in the area of local or other spots for which you contract directly. For these you will have to accept responsibility.

When you are dealing with a local businessman you should have little difficulty. You know, or can readily determine, the reputation of the advertiser, and this should be your first concern. He is close enough so that you can check the reliability of the product, too. Talk to better business bureaus—they have a wealth of information.

The Federal Trade Commission is developing information programs which can help you with the technical problems in getting a commercial on paper—explaining how to avoid the words and phrases that can get you and the advertiser into trouble.

In the past few years, the Commission has been issuing advisory guides, restating the law and applying it to specific instances in clear, lay language rather than legalistic terms. While these guides are nominally promulgated for the use of its staff, they are issued to businessmen to provide informal guidance in testing the legality of advertising. One of the first of these guides dealt with the question of deceptive pricing.

These guides, for example, explain that if a statement which represents or implies a reduction from an established retail price is used in connection with the price at which an article is offered for sale, the reduction statement must apply to the specific article offered for sale; and must be from the advertiser's usual and customary retail price of the article in the recent, regular course of business.

These guides also explain that no statement which represents or implies a reduction from the advertiser's usual retail price should be used if an artificial markup has been used to provide a basis for the claim, the claim is based on infrequent or isolated sales, or the claim is based on a past price, unless this fact is clearly and adequately disclosed.

One of the other provisions in the guides is that no statement or representation of an offer to sell two articles for the price of one should be used unless the sales price for the two articles is the advertiser's usual retail price for the single article in the recent, regular course of his business.

The complete "Guides Against Deceptive Pricing," and others dealing with bait advertising, advertising of fallout shelters, deceptive advertising of guarantees, advertising for shell homes, and for tire advertising may all be secured simply by addressing a request for them to the Federal Trade Commission.

I should like to discuss these "two-for-one sales" and the closely related use of the word "free."

The Commission has recently been considering such claims in several matters involving the sale of paint. Typical representations are "Every second can free of extra costs," "Buy one and get one free," etc.

A little over a month ago, the Commission issued an order in one of these cases.[7] It was found that the second can of paint is not actually "free" under the circumstances and the use of this advertising theme was ordered discontinued. The opinion discusses the reasons for the order in detail.

A person can offer as "free" an article which may be obtained upon the purchase of another article only if the article required to be purchased has an established market price. In this case, when the paint was introduced on the basis of buy one and get one free, there was no usual and customary price for a gallon or a quart of that particular brand of paint.

The Commission concluded that the amount designated in the advertising as the price for a can of this paint is not the usual and regular price per single can but the usual and regular price for two cans; that a usual and regular price had never been established for a single can. The cost of the second can of paint was included in the price paid by the purchaser, and this second can, therefore, was not given as a gift or gratuity or free of charge to the purchaser.

I have mentioned the advisory guides which the Commission is promulgating for your use. You should all be receiving the Advertising Alert, mailed about monthly to broadcasters and others having a direct responsibility for preparing or censoring advertising. We hope to increase its usefulness by including more general discussion of subject matter, and reducing the number of repetitious reports of case actions.

I honestly believe that we are making some progress. I understand that advertising agencies are finding that effective commercials can be developed without the use of questionable mockups and simulations. It appears that the industry has already proven that truthfulness is no bar to creativity and imagination. A unique selling proposition need not be so fanciful as to be deceptive.

But our hard core job is by no means ended. There are still advertisements which are unfair or deceptive. We appreciate our responsibility for the elimination of such practices and welcome the continued efforts of enlightened broadcasters to the same end.

Thank you.

Hoover's Wisdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in the August 8, 1962, edition of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, Mr. George Todt has reviewed remarks of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who has suggested that our country needs a new code of ethics. As Mr. Hoover has stated, "The issue is decency in public life against indecency." I would like to call this column to the attention of my colleagues and under unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: HOOVER'S WISDOM

"Not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."—II Corinthians 3: 6.

We are floundering as a Nation today. Scandal piles upon scandal, failure upon failure, defeat upon defeat.

With all the massive power at our command—enough to conquer the entire world if we desired to do so—we are being hurled from pillar to post on the world stage and at home.

Where lies the key to our problems?

Who will lead us out of the wilderness?

The thoughts of a great American citizen whose words are strong, brave and true were spoken 11 years ago, are appropriate enough today.

Here are a few thought-provoking excerpts from an address made by Herbert Hoover, Sr., former President of the United States.

---

[5] Louis Marx & Co., Inc., C-191; Remco Industries, C-199.

[6] Seventh Edition, May 1962, the National Association of Broadcasters.

[7] Mary Carter Paint Co., Inc., docket No. 8290, OCD June 28, 1962.

"Something stronger than a new code of ethics is needed by America." "The issue is decency in public life against indecency.

"Without bitterness in our hearts, we are raising our eyes to the Creator of man who assured us that in American soil we can find the moral and spiritual forces which make free men and women. In His guidance, we shall find the fortitude to correct our errors, to straighten our courses, to resurrect the spirit that made our America so free and bountiful a nation."

VIRTUE ENTIRE

"No public man can be just a little crooked. There is no such thing as a no man's land between honesty and dishonesty. Our strength is not in politics—our strength lies in spiritual concepts. It lies in public sensitiveness to evil.

"There are already some old and tested codes of ethics. There are the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and the rules of the game which we learned at our mother's knee. Can a nation live if these are not the guides of public life?

"Dishonor in public life has a double poison. When people are dishonorable in private business, they injure only those with whom they deal or their own chances in the next world. But when there is a lack of honor in government, the morals of the whole people are poisoned."

FATAL ERROR

"I am less concerned at stealing public money than with all the more destructive forms of dishonor. What would the founding fathers have thought of those who coquette with traitorship?

"We thus have a cancerous growth of intellectual dishonesty in public life which is mostly beyond the law.

"Debate founded on disclosure of the whole truth and free of propaganda gadgets and slogans is the stuff that can save freemen.

"The term 'liberalism' has turned pink inside. The term 'welfare' never before meant the 'welfare state' with its red or pink colors. The Chinese Communists were not 'agrarian liberals.' From that perversion alone, we suffered a gigantic defeat of freemen in China."

I will give you more of Mr. Hoover's incorruptible and down-to-earth philosophy in my next column.

The UNESCO Convention and the UNESCO Recommendation Against Discrimination in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there seems no end to the misunderstandings about the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO. In the July 1962 issue of School Life, a publication of the U.S. Office of Education, there appears an article which clearly and unmistakedly sets down both the jurisdictional limitations of UNESCO and the U.S. attitude toward the organization's position in the field of discrimination in education.

The following article is by J. Boyer Jarvis, Special Assistant to the U.S. Commissioner of Education:

THE UNESCO CONVENTION AND THE UNESCO RECOMMENDATION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION

(By J. Boyer Jarvis, Special Assistant to the U.S. Commissioner of Education)

During recent months the U.S. Commissioner of Education, other Government officials, and some Members of Congress have received a number of letters which reveal an unfortunate public misunderstanding of the nature and purpose of the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Some of these letters even express concern lest the United States permit UNESCO to exercise jurisdiction over American education. This concern is occasioned by a definite misconception of the status and purpose of the UNESCO Convention and the UNESCO recommendation against discrimination in education.

The following statement seeks to correct such misunderstanding. It also provides a concise report concerning the Convention and the recommendation.

UNESCO, as one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, is dedicated to enhancing the possibility of peace among nations by seeking constantly to extend the range of international understanding and to bring the benefits of modern science and technology to more and more of the world's population. Through its support of important research and development projects, involving participation by scientists, scholars, and educators from many countries, UNESCO is helping to enlarge man's store of knowledge and to make it more readily accessible wherever it can contribute to the advancement of human welfare. UNESCO makes its resources available, on request, to countries which desire assistance in developing, expanding, and strengthening their educational systems. Recognizing and respecting the independence and autonomy of its more than 100 member states, UNESCO is interested in insuring that in the new and developing nations of the world the opportunities for education, at all levels, will be equal to the needs of peoples who are striving, sometimes against great odds, to overcome the handicaps of centuries of poverty, disease, and ignorance.

UNESCO is clearly prohibited from interfering in the educational policies, or in any other domestic concerns, of its member states. This restriction is written without equivocation into the UNESCO Constitution (art. 1, par. 3). "With a view to preserving the independence, integrity, and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the states members of this Organization, the Organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction."

In keeping with its broad purposes and in full harmony with the above restriction, the UNESCO General Conference, consisting of representatives from all UNESCO member States, adopted in 1960 a Convention and a recommendation against discrimination in education. The decision to draft these documents was made by the UNESCO General Conference in 1958, following studies dating back to 1955 and carried on by a special U.N. Subcommission and by members of the UNESCO staff. Both in these earlier studies and in the actual work of drafting the Convention and the recommendation, official representatives of the Government of the United States played a prominent role. At each stage in this rather long process, they received guidance from officials in the Department of State. In addition, they consulted with officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Labor, and other Government agencies having an interest in the general problem of discrimination.

At a very early point in the development of the Convention and the recommendation against discrimination in education, the United States announced that it did not intend to ratify the Convention. That decision was reaffirmed in a letter written by Assistant Secretary of State Brooks Hays to Senator CARL HAYDEN on July 29, 1961. The letter was entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 3, 1961 (pp. A6013 and A6014).

This position was taken in recognition of the fact that in the United States the administration of education is a legal responsibility of State and local agencies. Nevertheless, the representatives of the United States made positive and very helpful contributions to the drafting of both the Convention and the recommendation. Working with representatives from 40 other countries, they exercised great care to insure that the principles and provisions in the final texts of the two instruments would not be in conflict with the policies and purposes of the United States.

The distinction between the UNESCO Convention against discrimination in education and the UNESCO recommendation against discrimination in education needs to be emphasized. While the two documents are alike in their basic content and in their purpose to encourage elimination of discrimination based on considerations of race, sex, religion, national or social origin, or economic condition, they differ in one very significant respect. The Convention is subject to ratification by member countries of UNESCO, and when ratified it has the status of an international treaty among the ratifying countries. Thus far only five nations—the Central African Republic, France, Israel, the United Arab Republic, and the United Kingdom—have ratified this Convention.

The recommendation is simply a carefully written statement of ideals and principles which merit serious consideration by the member states of UNESCO. For the United States, as well as for other nations, it can serve as a basis for comparing our actual achievements with our generally accepted principles of equal educational opportunity for all. The recommendation clearly recognizes that education is the responsibility of each individual country. An objective examination of this document will show that its purposes are entirely compatible with the traditional administrative pattern of public and private education in the United States, where operation and control of public schools rest firmly in the hands of State and local authorities and operation and control of private schools resides with their sponsors.

Manhattan Beach, N.Y., Residents Should Be Consulted Before Disposition of Federal Property There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the July 30, 1962, edition of the Beachview, Brooklyn's shorefront newspaper. Their point is well taken: certainly the residents of Manhattan Beach should be consulted before GSA decides the disposition of the 74 acres of Federal property located there.

The article follows:

WHY DON'T THEY ASK US?—STARK PLEADS FOR HOSPITAL—MORRIS-MOSES AND COMPANY SEEK BEACH—TENANTS LEAGUE WANTS LAND

Most everyone has jumped into the fray—the battle for the 74 acres of federally held land at Manhattan Beach. Four separate factions are trying their darndest to acquire the vacated area at the end of Manhattan Beach. Their interests of course to their way of reasoning are our interests.

Why in the world don't they ask us? Is it too much to expect that the residents and the businessmen of this community who will have to live with, whatever is decided upon, to be built on these 74 acres, should have some say as what they themselves would like to see take form here?

Mr. Newbold Morris and Mr. Robert Moses hardly are the best judges of what's best for the community on an all-year-round basis. Sure, recreational facilities such as beaches are fine. We would heartily endorse such an undertaking if we lacked beach space. One thing we have in abundance and then some, is beach area. Last fall a gigantic beachfill operation almost doubled the size of Brighton Beach and Coney Island Beach. Has Mr. Morris and Moses inspected the beach area on busy Saturdays and Sundays? Do they know with the new beach size it is almost impossible to fill the sand with seaside visitors? There is a public beach at Manhattan Beach that rarely fills to capacity except for the parking lot.

A new beach would be a needless waste of taxpayers' money. Mr. Moses and company, if you are wholeheartedly for the little guy, as you often say you are, then your little boy is the high school student about to graduate, who finds most avenues of learning closed to him for lack of college seats. You are helping stunt the growth of thousands of high school students' plans for college when you push for an additional beach site in an already abundant beach area. It will be another feather in your cap if the Kingsboro Community College reaches fruition.

"Mr. Moses and Morris Back New Kingsboro Community College," "Shorefront College Promises Great Things To Come for Shorefront," "Sagging Economics Bolstered Here—Kingsboro College To Open Soon," "Kingsboro College Opens—Dignitaries Overwhelmed by School's Potential," "Applications Arrive From Every State in the Nation—New Students at Kingsboro To Have Greatest Facilities for Inside and Outside Learning," "Board of Education Lauds New Kingsboro College."

Mr. Moses and Morris, wouldn't these forthcoming headlines give you great pleasure? Instead of 10 seasonal weeks, 52 weeks all year round would see an educational and physical program for thousands of college students who might not now be able to enter college. And you know, sirs, you could feel just as proud as the residents will feel, because you will have had a major part in establishing Kingsboro College.

For 2 years both the department of hospitals and the welfare department have turned thumbs down on the idea of converting the vacant 350-bed U.S. Public Health Service hospital into a medical care center for senior citizens. The site of the hospital and grounds covers 8 of the 74 abandoned acres. The hospital departments broached the idea but soon gave up on it as a staff could not be mustered to man the proposed home for the aged. The property had been offered the city as a gift. March 31 is the date the city must make a decision by, or then the hospital and grounds can be declared surplus property. It then will become available to public health or educational agencies.

Yes, Mr. Stark, your thought for a home for senior citizens is truly good, but most agencies concerned with your proposal are stymied as to how they make use of the hospital's facilities. Is it possible that you continue to pressure for this hospital because it is your brainchild? We think not. If you will weigh all the facts, your answer should come quite easy. Nothing so befits these 74 acres as does Kingsboro Community College. Mr. Stark, you are one of Brooklyn's most favorite sons. We know that whatever your thoughts, they are always uppermost for the people of Brooklyn. With the addition of the proposed college for this disputed area, it should bring renewed economic largesse to the whole Brooklyn shorefront and the neighboring vicinities. Speak to the Brighton Beach merchants, the Manhattan Beach merchants, the Sheepshead Bay merchants. They will enlighten you. Business is off and they says it's because so many residents are senior citizens, living on their social security benefits. This is splendid but the average age of the neighborhood keeps getting older and older. Most of our younger folks have moved to greener pastures. The older folks patronize food stores. Brighton especially has become one great food market. Of the 250 stores on the main shopping street (Brighton Beach Ave.) 98 of these primarily sell food and foodstuffs. That's a whopping 40 percent of the avenue's stores, dispensing nothing but food. An injection of a few thousand young folks to our area will be the greatest medicine to counterbalance the age differential. This is only a secondary reason for the erection of Kingsboro College.

Uppermost, the new college will alleviate an overtaxed school system. Some of "your boys" from your wonderful Brownsville Boys Club in time will become students at Kingsboro. When your young men are ready for college you would like them to have the opportunity to do so. Here is the ideal situation for a college if there ever was one. Please give the proposed Kingsboro Community College your undivided attention. It is a worthwhile undertaking.

Another organization who call themselves the Organized Tenants League have jumped into the fray. They would like the land to be acquired for low cost housing. Low cost housing indeed, in one of the most expensive and prettiest areas in all of Brooklyn.

WHY DON'T THEY ASK US?

To the residents and the merchants who live here, 52 weeks a year, ought to go a voice. After all it's our community. Mr. Politician you ask us for your vote. Ask us how we feel about all your different proposals for the landgrab at Manhattan Beach. Gentlemen we believe it is more important to us than you imagine. Just about every community group, every board of trade group, every chamber of commerce group, and most individual residents in the area are 100-percent behind the erection of the Kingsboro Community College.

The Supreme Court's Illegal Power Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable J. K. Breedin, an outstanding spokesman on regional and national affairs, writes a weekly commentary on events effecting South Carolina and the Nation.

Mr. Breedin resides at Manning in my district. His comments are entitled "The Spectator."

Last week, his candid observations lashed the recent Supreme Court ruling against prayer in our schools. His remarks reflect profound thinking and deserve to be read throughout an America whose heart is troubled by this shocking decision by the Court.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert his candid observations for the information of the Congress:

COMMENTS ON MEN AND THINGS

Our U.S. Supreme Court is trying to assume powers—and is assuming powers—not prescribed by the Constitution.

The Supreme Court was set up as an appellate court and its power to act is indicated as a court of law to hear appeals from Federal courts on matters of law, except for several instances otherwise, as clearly stated in the Constitution.

A careful study will not show any jurisdiction in cases adjudicated by State courts, unless a Federal question is involved.

Everyone knows that the first 10 amendments were intended to safeguard the States or the people from Federal action. The first amendment prohibits the Congress to set up an establishment of religion; it has no reference or relevancy to the States. Most States have laws that would forbid the establishment of religion, but the Supreme Court cites the first amendment of the Federal Constitution as authority in a New York case. That is evidently wrong.

In the case of the 14th amendment I make two points: it is invalid, never having been adopted lawfully; the second point is the concluding clause in the 14th (so-called) amendment, namely to wit: "The Congress shall have the power, by appropriate legislation, to give effect to the amendment." The Congress, by act of Congress; not the President or the Supreme Court.

Someone asked if I took an oath to defend the Supreme Court; not at all: upon being sworn in as a lawyer (and officer of the Court) I took an oath to defend the Constitution—the Constitution according to its clear meaning, rather than some whimsical, fanciful, fantastic notion of a group of judges, trying to make socialistic follies a part of the Constitution.

It is passing strange that so explicit an inhibition on the Congress as the first amendment should be applied to New York State. And it is just as remarkable that the so-called 14th amendment should be exploited by the President and the Supreme Court when there has been no act of Congress. The Court is distinctly off base.

Nicholas Tucci: A Fighter Against Discrimination and For Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration of Independence electrified the world with a great promise. It declared that all men were created equal and promised the American people as well as the world an equality of treatment which was unknown during the 18th century. In our own Nation there has been a big gap between the promise and the performance. Men in all walks of life have been fighting to narrow the gap between the promise and the performance. Some dedicate their lives to combatting discrimination and promoting the ideal of brotherhood. It has been my good fortune, not only in public life, but in my private activities, to meet men who believe in the principle of equality of oportunity and have been fighting against discrimination in every form.

The Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York is dedicated to the elimination of discrimination in Government and in industry, and seeks to recognize the achievements of men who have demonstrated their dedication to the principles for which the organization stands. On July 29, 1962, in Garden City Hotel, Garden City, Long Island, N.Y., the Federation of which I am president honored Nicholas Tucci for his "outstanding activities in community work designed to improve intergroup relations among various ethnic groups and fighting individually and collectively to combat discrimination among minority groups." The federation presented to Mr. Tucci the George B. De Luca Brotherhood Award of the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations. There were many outstanding citizens of Nassau County who attended and the three guest speakers were the Nassau County Executive Eugene H. Nickerson, Nassau Supreme Court Justice Mario Pittoni, and Nassau County Democratic Leader John F. English.

The words spoken by Mr. Nicholas Tucci in accepting the award indicate the character of the man. The short speech which he made I believe will prove of interest to the reading public.

His speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman SANTANGELO, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: I sincerely appreciate the honor you have bestowed upon me.

If I could be granted one wish today, it would be that my mother and father could share this moment with me. For is not a man a product of his environment? And, is not a man's son his monument?

Throughout my formative years, I was taught that the key to successful coexistence is learning to accept others as I would be accepted.

I do not consider my conduct extraordinary. I have simply attempted to abide by the laws of God and the laws of this great land, to wit: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" and, "All men are created equal."

I think it sad that a great organization such as this must direct a part of its energy away from its prime purpose—philanthropy—and devote precious time fighting discrimination. If men would only practice the Golden Rule and be constantly aware of the dictates of God and our Constitution, then one day the absolute sole purpose of this organization will be to assist those in need and to further our democratic principles.

At this time we are fighting for the abolition of poverty—that kind of poverty which denies to human beings the necessities of life and of personal development. We are fighting for intellectual freedom and the preservation of those civil liberties that are all essential to the existence of a democracy.

High hopes, yes, but success can be achieved through preseverance and prayer. Prayer that Almighty God, through His infinite goodness, will constantly bless our efforts.

Individually and as a group, we should express our appreciation to President Kennedy and to his administration for their appointment of the Honorable Anthony Celebrezze to the post of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Congressman SANTANGELO has informed me that there are at least 25 other men of Italian extraction who have been called upon to assist the President in advancing the New Frontier. Let us here and now pledge our support in this endeavor.

I would like to leave you with the thought expressed by the Honorable Anthony Celebrezze, who wrote to the mayor of an Alabama city: "Sir, may I suggest to you, that when you begin to feel that you are a little better than your fellow man, you should pause and reflect for a moment, and you will come to a determination that you had nothing to do with what you were born to, the place in which you were born, the parents you were born to, or the color of your skin. If you are in a little better status and class than the other fellow, you can only thank the Almighty, because you might have been born that other fellow."

Thank you.

We Commend the VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes, on August 23, 1962:

WE COMMEND THE VFW

It comes as something of a surprise to learn that the Veterans of Foreign Wars at its recent national encampment in Minneapolis adopted a resolution which would provide pensions of $100 per month for veterans of World War I with certain income restrictions.

The resolution, which was approved by the delegates with ilttle dissension, is substantially the same as called for in the provisions of H.R. 3745.

In our opinion this was a notable victory for those veterans who have felt that the veterans of World War I have not received just treatment from the Congress. From reliable reports information comes that the pension movement was spearheaded by Past Commanders in Chief Lou Feldmann and Congressman RICHARD ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana, and Past National Commander John E. Erickson, of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

According to reports, Erickson initiated the movement by placing bulletins in various areas seeking the aid of the some 1,700 World War I veterans who were delegates to the convention. Meetings were held at which Erickson briefed those present on just what was taking place. The attendance at these meetings grew from 25 initially to over 200.

Feldmann and ROUDEBUSH were able to persuade some influential members of the organization that the cause for which they were fighting was just and when the resolution came to the floor it was quickly approved despite reported opposition by the outgoing commander in chief. It is also understood that the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and members of his staff were in attendance at the convention and were actively campaigning against the adoption of a resolution of this nature.

The action by the Veterans of Foreign Wars marks an important milestone for the veterans of World War I in their long struggle for pension recognition by the Congress.

All indications point to a determined move by the pension advocates to have a resolution of the same description adopted by the American Legion when it meets in Las Vegas in October. Already some of the key departments of the Legion have announced in no uncertain terms that they will spearhead a movement to gain Legion approval.

It is our belief that the World War I veterans within the membership of the American Legion will emulate the tactics employed at the VFW convention and persuade their counterparts of World War II and Korea to take immediate action on this most important matter.

We emphasize that unity between the veterans' organizations will serve to present a united front to all detractors. In view of the controversy over recent House action on the GI insurance bill it would appear that some of our larger veteran groups may well have come to the conclusion that complete dependence cannot be placed upon implied promises and we feel that the veterans' cause can be better served by a better understanding of the aims and objectives of all interested parties.

Unless such an understanding is achieved, veterans of all wars may ultimately stand to lose those benefits for which they have heretofore successfully fought.

We extend to the VFW our commendations for their forthright action at the Minneapolis convention.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy BeLieu Receives VFW Gold Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which is becoming an increasingly influential and constructive factor in national security and foreign affairs, as well as in domestic legislative matters, recently concluded its 63d national convention in Minneapolis, Minn.

One of the high points of these VFW national conventions is the presentation of high VFW awards to outstanding citizens for distinguished service to our Nation. It is widely recognized that such VFW awards are made on a highly selective basis, and are all the more meaningful because of the care with which the recipients are determined.

Members of this House will probably recall that some few weeks ago, prior to the beginning of the VFW national convention, Mr. Robert E. Hansen, the then commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, announced that the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, had been selected to receive the commander in chief's gold medal for distinguished service to the United States. Commander Hansen, in making the announcement, emphasized Secretary BeLieu's long record of ability and devoted service, both as a regular military officer and, following his retirement due to losing his left leg in action in Korea, as a greatly respected and trusted counsel to the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Special Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Like many other Members of the House, I have had the privilege of knowing and working with Kenneth BeLieu. I share the opinion of Commander Hansen that Secretary BeLieu "represents the kind of able, dedicated, and patriotic public official so necessary to our form of government." Additionally, I associate myself completely with the commendatory remarks of the Honorable JOHN STENNIS, Senator from Mississippi, who commented so favorably on the floor of the Senate concerning Secretary BeLieu's services and expressed his personal satisfaction that the high VFW award was being made to Secretary BeLieu.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Veterans of Foreign Wars' Commander Hansen's speech of presentation to Secretary BeLieu is both eloquent and accurate in its references to the long and able services of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. I recommend it to the attention of Members of the House.

The address of Secretary BeLieu to the thousands of delegates attending the VFW convention is a highly informative document. It reflects an unusually profound understanding of our form of government, the role of military services, as well as the entire Department of Defense. In reading this speech one can quickly perceive the sound philosophy and practical commonsense which has characterized Secretary BeLieu's performance of duty as the head of one of the largest managerial jobs in the world.

I am confident that many Members of the House join with me in expressing our congratulations to a distinguished military officer, an extraordinarily able Defense official, and our good friend, Kenneth E. BeLieu, upon his receiving the VFW commander in chief's Gold Medal for Distinguished Service from the then commander in chief, Robert E. Hansen, who made the presentation on behalf of the 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Commander Hansen's presentation speech and the address of Secretary BeLieu to the VFW convention:

PRESENTATION OF COMMANDER IN CHIEF'S GOLD MEDAL AND CITATION TO HON. KENNETH E. BELIEU, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, 63D NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 14, 1962

One of the most pleasant duties of a commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is to present, on behalf of our organization, an award in recognition of distinguished service to our Nation.

It is my privilege to perform such a function this morning.

The man on whom we confer one of our organization's highest awards, currently holds the highly responsible position of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics. But the extremely able manner in which he is performing one of the most difficult and yet important assignments in the entire Department of Defense, is but one of the reasons why we recognize him with this award.

Assistant Secretary Kenneth E. BeLieu is a native of Oregon and a graduate of the University of Oregon. Almost immediately following his graduation he entered the U.S. Army. His World War II service included the Normandy landing, the campaigns in France, the Battle of the Bulge, the advance into Germany and the penetration into Czechoslovakia. For his combat leadership he was awarded the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart. The French Government recognized his gallantry in action with the award of the Croix de Guerre.

Following World War II he served as a lieutenant colonel with the Department of the Army in Washington, D.C. Immediately following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, then Lieutent Colonel BeLieu volunteered for action in that conflict. Again leading troops in combat, he was seriously wounded, and as a result he lost his left leg and was returned to the United States. Although not permitted, due to that battle wound, to serve in the field, good soldier that he was, he continued his Army service and was entrusted with high responsibility as the executive officer to two Secretaries of the Army.

In late 1955 then-Colonel BeLieu retired from active service. However, retirement did not mean the end of his service to our Nation. Nor did it conclude his efforts in the cause of strengthening our national security.

Upon retirement he was appointed a counsel to the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Senate. In January of 1959 he was assigned increasing responsibility, reflecting the high esteem in which he was held by Members of the U.S. Senate. He became staff director of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. This is the Senate committee which has the jurisdiction of reviewing all U.S. aeronautical and space activities and the analyzation and preparation of legislation dealing with the Aeronautics and Space Administration. In this highly important position Colonel BeLieu made historically important contributions to the space program of the United States.

In addition, he also served as staff director of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee. This subcommittee has the heavy responsibility and broad authority to review, investigate, and make recommendations on all aspects of the Nation's military policies, programs, and operations.

To hold the staff directorship of either of these vitally important committees would be, in itself, a high honor and responsibility. To hold both directorships simultaneously was an unprecedented responsibility and certainly an unprecedented distinction.

In these positions of such high responsibility and authority, Colonel BeLieu quickly came to be recognized as a tireless worker for our Nation's betterment. His impartiality, his high standard of ethics and his deep sense of propriety earned him the admiration and respect of those in industry, the armed services, and Congress with whom he worked.

There is an incident which illustrates this point. In his position as staff director of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee it was his responsibility, on one occasion, to investigate a major policy decision in the Department of Defense. Ultimately this resulted in a very high official in the Pentagon being interrogated by Colonel BeLieu. The questioning was pointed, vigorous, but entirely professional and impersonal. Although this was a difficult episode for the Pentagon official, it is noteworthy that that official became a sincere admirer of Colonel BeLieu. It is reported that high official on a number of occasions not only expressed admiration for Colonel BeLieu's characteristics and abilities, but also his regret that Colonel BeLieu was not one of his own assistants.

In February of 1961 Colonel BeLieu was sworn in as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics. In this position he directs and is responsible for one of the most difficult, diverse, and largest managerial assignments in the world. Indeed there are few positions that bear so directly and fundamentally upon our national security as does the one which Secretary BeLieu occupies. There is hardly an aspect of our Nation's ability to defend itself from attack and wage war overseas that is not directly influenced by the decisions which Secretary BeLieu must make.

In war and in peace, as an official of the legislative branch and as a high appointee in the executive branch, the man whom we honor here today has served his Nation well. The manner in which he has served and continues to serve has provided one of our Nation's finest examples of inspiring service. He is the kind of devoted and able public servant so vital to the successful functioning of our form of government.

Because of what he has done for our country, because of what he continues to do, and with the hope that our Nation will continue to benefit from his ability and devoted service for many, many more years, it is my privilege on behalf of the 1,300,000 oversea veterans of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to present to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu, the Commander-in-Chief's Gold Medal and Citation, for distinguished service to our Nation.

CABBAGES AND KINGS

(Address by the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Installations and Logistics, at 63d Annual VFW National Convention, Minneapolis, Minn., August 14, 1962)

Commander-in-Chief Bob Hansen, M. Raymond Tribouet, ministre des anciens combattants et victimes de la guerre, distinguished guests, as one who first learned the manual of arms and carried a rifle in 1928, and later served in Europe and Korea, this award, coming as it does from the Veterans of Foreign Wars is especially significant.

I can only associate this honor with those who have had such an important role in bringing me to this moment.

Certainly, my parents, my family, I only wish they were here to share these moments. The teachers and comrades of yesteryear and today, the great statesmen of our Congress—the military and civilian leaders of our Government with whom I have been and am now associated. I give my thanks to all of them, and this obviously includes each of you.

Response to the honor you pay me can never be expressed by mere words and can only really be understood in the minds of those, like you, who have fought and continue to fight our Nation's battles. Because in the collective minds of our veterans, we remember at least half a century in defense of freedom. We remember the immortal words of World War I: "Ils ne passeront pas." We remember a song that said: "Goodbye Broadway, Hello France," and "We won't come back until it's over, over there." We remember a Hitler, a Hirohito, and a Mussolini. They are not operating at the same stands any more. We remember a then little known French general named

De Gaulle who said, "Ou sont les reserves generales?" Sometimes, this is still a good question.

The combined service to country represented by the VFW and manifested by our commander in chief, Bob Hansen, and you, is the unlimited yardstick measuring the distinction of this award.

No man could receive this high honor without first giving evidence of a humble hertfelt thank you and, at the same time, resolving that the future will be worthy of the past.

A combination of fate and good fortune has given me the opportunity of viewing and serving our Defense Establishment from varying positions. The 18 years I wore the uniform of the U.S. Army were proud and memorable ones. In that uniform encompassed by its great traditions, I—along with many of you—viewed and participated in the emergence of our Nation from a slumbering giant desirous of peace to a nation fielding the most powerful forces in the world.

Following that war, we witnessed the dismemberment of that fighting machine by a nation eager to return to peaceful pursuits. We saw the Iron Curtain drop. We saw, in June 1950, our men once again committed to combat in defense of our democratic ideals.

History again was on the make. This time in every rice paddy of Korea, in the skies over the Yalu, and in the mine-salted waters off Wonsan. Now, 12 years since that summer of 1950, "the moving finger" of history continues to write, as it has in all our generation, and "having writ, moves on" from crisis to crisis.

In each of the dozen years since Korea's start it has been essential to maintain and bolster our strength. For me, the years following my retirement from the Army brought the opportunity of participating in the development of our defenses from within the Halls of Congress—as a staff member. Here was a rare privilege, a distinct honor which I wish all of you could have shared with me. It was my privilege to observe the firsthand workings of our elected representatives wrestling with the spiraling costs, and ever-increasing complexities of defense.

In spite of the criticisms sometimes leveled at our representative form of government, the statesmanship, vision and dedication and integrity, evidenced by the great majority of Congress cannot help but serve to strengthen the belief that this, our country, is and always will be worth fighting for.

But such you know only too well. In my job now, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Polaris submarines continuously deployed under our sea frontiers are tangible evidence of your participation with the Congress to insure the development of this vital arm of seapower.

Only yesterday, it seems, Polaris—then, nonexistent, was thought impossible by many, or unneeded by others, not all outside the Navy. Today, thanks greatly to the original and continued support by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, while others scoffed, the free world has a ballistic missile able to take advantage of the seas around us and the military necessities of fire and movement, cover and concealment.

Friends often ask me how a long-term Army officer came to sit in the upper echelons of the Navy. To this query, I have a standard reply, "Just lucky, I guess."

In a more serious vein, the challenge of the freedom of the seas must arouse any student of history. Certainly, the challenge stands clear to any man whose adult span of life has been intertwined with our national defense.

America is, and always has been, a maritime Nation. Our export and import commerce is geared to a sea-based transportation system, augmented by aircraft systems. Our defense posture is based largely on maritime alliances.

A paramount fact of Communist strategy since the end of World War II has been the emergence of the Soviet Navy as a major world power. Any student of communism will recognize that the scientific and material expenditures being made by the Soviets are not the result of an erratic decision from the Kremlin.

The recent pronouncements of the Soviets on the occasion of their Navy Day serve as a further warning. Regardless of the value assessed against these statements; in the face of what we know to be factual, we must continue to take those actions which will insure continued freedom of the seas.

The importance, therefore, of maintaining a Navy capable of insuring the free world's continued use and control of the seas is growing, not constantly, but at an ever-increasing rate of acceleration. As the struggle between freedom and slavery moves into insular and peninsular areas accessible only by sea, our country's naval and maritime commitments grow accordingly.

We are stretched thin. Our ships are aging rapidly and our crews are spending more and more time away from home. We hope to alleviate this situation by finding ways to buy more ships with the money saved from reduced costs.

There is an oriental saying regarding friendship which literally states that true friendship stands as immutable as the mountains that rise from the plains, as unchangeable as the relentless flow of the rivers to the sea. So it is with freedom of the seas. Whether serving as a barrier to foreign encroachment as in the early days of our Republic or as the lifeline of the free world.

There was a time in the not-too-distant past that seapower could be assured by control of one dimension of that great body comprising 75 percent of the earth's surface—the surface of the sea. Today, we know that true control of the seas comprises a three dimensional problem. The limitless space over the seas, the surface of the seas from the Arctic to the Antarctic, from the Indian Ocean to the Caribbean, and under the surface, in the stillness and darkness of the depths of the world's oceans.

I give sincere thanks to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for its recognition of the role of seapower. It is a distinct privilege to be associated with an organization which has had the foresight and courage to resolutely create better public understanding of the role of seapower and to give such vigorous support to legislation affecting seapower. But, I do not limit my remarks to seapower. Our thanks go to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their support of our ever valiant Army, our second-to-none Air Force and the ever gallant marine.

In my job, I deal primarily in the Navy's hardware and facilities. The ships, aircraft, missiles, shipyards, air stations, supply depots, and all else that sustains and maintains the finest Navy this world has ever seen. I operate from what we refer to as the "business side" of our Navy organization. At this point, I could spell out a myriad of staggering statistics. But, statistics are like a bikini bathing suit. What they reveal is suggestive, but what they conceal is vital.

I think it was Mrs. Bob Taft who said, "I always find statistics hard to swallow and impossible to digest—the only one I can remember is that if all of the people who go to sleep in church were laid end to end they would be a lot more comfortable."

I do not measure the importance of my job in terms of statistics. At the same time, I would not appear in your eyes as so naive as to have lost sight of the present day realities of business management. Our objective, in Navy procurement, is to acquire weapons and material which fully meet our qualitative, quantitative, and delivery requirements at the lowest overall cost. I emphasize the fact that in the crucial balance which exists in the world today, we cannot risk putting second-best weapons in the hands of our fighting men. The quality, the performance, and the reliability of our weapons must be of the highest order. This is expensive. It is also vital.

Obviously to get the most of the best, for the least, requires that we must exploit all known management tools and techniques.

But, there is one cardinal principle that semes to me all too often overlooked when we become top intrigued with the scientific marvels of the age and the complexities of weapons. We tend to ignore the man and grasp the formula, discard the spirit and hold to the material and, truly, this is a comparison between "cabbages and kings."

In the final analysis it is man, albeit aided and abetted by the calculations of the inanimate computer who must make the decision. It is man, or men, who must bear the burden of responsibility for the decision.

O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota, in speaking of bankers, said: "Our freedom in government and economics depends on a greater faith in the nature of man than is common in most societies, and no profession is more dependent upon this confidence of men in men than is your own. If you lost the confidence of other men, your institutions would shrivel and die. Without confidence in other men you would become sour counterparts of the medieval money changer, and more often a burden to trade than a spur to commerce."

So it is with those who wear our country's uniforms—occupy its high positions. They must have an abiding belief and faith in man, a compassionate understanding of his strength and weaknesses, for such is the true cohesion in government.

This, we of the VFW know. I am comfortable in this audience because we are comrades. We have shared an experience in the service of our country. A service, if you will, to insure that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." Whether our experience was born in a hedgerow in Normandy, a beach at Bougainville, in the skies over Europe, in a destroyer off Guadalcanal, or a minesweeper off Inchon, we know the importance of man.

I am reminded of the first verse of "The Laws of the Navy," by Capt. Ronald Hopwood of the Royal Navy:

"Now these are the laws of the Navy,
  Unwritten and varied they be;
And he that is wise will observe them,
  Going down in his ship to the sea;
As naught may outrun the destroyer,
  Even so with the law in its grip,
For the strength of the ship is the service,
  And the strength of the service, the ship."

"The strength of the ship is the service." A ship, however, splendidly built, whatever its scientific marvels, is but a dead thing without her crew.

In these difficult times, we read and hear a great deal about almost every aspect of our defense effort. Weapons, strategy, organization, economy and efficiency, plans, concepts, all are discussed at length by the news mediums, interested citizens, public officials, and private groups.

This is basically good. The great bulwark of freedom is an alert and informed citizenry. No nation knows this better than our own. I cannot avoid the impression, however, that too many of us fix our gaze upon such things as weapons and equipments in the firm belief that here we must excel—here we must exert the effort, overcome the barriers, make the breakthroughs, and if we do—all will be well.

Those who believe so are partly right. These things are vital. It is imperative that we excel. But none of this has meaning in the absence of competent, trained people, men of high spirit and devotion to tough, demanding duty—professionals in every sense of the word.

True strength, the spirit which gave birth to this country, will not be found in the myriad tools of war. There must ever be that spirit and courage which controls the weapons, the inner spirit which guides and directs us in pursuit of just cause.

This great organization—the Veterans of Foreign Wars—understands the importance of the individual. Many of you have faced that moment when the reaction of a man spelled life or death. The reaction of man, not the machine. The command of a leader, a command of experience, spelling the difference between victory or defeat.

Andrew Rooney in his recent book "The Fortunes of War" said: "One of the tragedies of battle is that the bravest go first—and are the first to go. The greatest, single American weapon in war has been the smart, tough, aggressive platoon sergeant willing to lead his small handful of men anywhere—at Tarawa, as elsewhere, it was the invaluable leaders, the platoon sergeants with the fighting junior officers, who were cut down first as they led their men into gunfire."

We veterans of foreign wars know this also. We also know that the art of living is as with the art of war—not an exact science and, that "the art of war, is in the last analysis, the art of keeping one's freedom," so it is with the art of being a free man in a free nation.

We know that the art and drama of living requires intense preparation, dedication and constancy of purpose even as it was with us as we prepared to go overseas to write history for our country in days past.

Rooney also wrote that: "While it might be said that D-Day was more than a day, the drama that took 2 years to write and produce played only one performance: That was on the beaches of Normandy on June 6, 1944.

We know that men did these things for we did write history.

Let us when we leave this rendezvous and return to our homes, resolve that this is "one nation under God, with liberty and justice for all."

Let us further resolve that we will so live our lives in our separate communities with the same compassion and understanding found in the crucibles of past sacrifices, that our past efforts are but the basis for added strength in the foundation of our institutions else, what we did yesterday will be but smudgy fingerprints on the dogeared pages of history.

Let us resolve that each day, each month, each year, we shall accomplish some quiet but permanent act of patriotism for the benefit of those who follow us.

Now we have talked of many things—even "shoes and ships, and sealing wax, and, cabbages and kings"—but, the emphasis is on free man, who in our free society, is king.

On-the-Job Training of a Treasury Secretary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of my colleagues have been as troubled as I have been with the seeming lack of awareness of the economic facts of life evidenced by the present administration's fiscal policies. Reflected in the attitudes and activities of some members of the executive branch, the overall approach by the Treasury Department is hardly likely to clear up the present unsettled economic picture. On the contrary, present policy simply beclouds it.

One shaft of light into the reasons behind this governmentally induced gloom is a recent article written by Raymond Moley, appearing in the August 20 edition of Newsweek magazine. Mr. Moley describes the process by which the administration's chief economic and political planners have managed to deliberately confuse the American public's view of the approach to fiscal policy now being followed. He adds some timely and historically analagous remarks concerning the 1930's and the effect of similar attitudes and fiscal unorthodoxy by another Democratic President on the American economy:

Mr. Dillon's Education

(By Raymond Moley)

One of the most frequently asked questions I have encountered over the past months is: "What has happened to Douglas Dillon?"

The answer is in one item among the mass of written propaganda by the academicians who have entered politics in this administration. The item is a naively self-revealing book by Seymour E. Harris, Littauer professor of political economy at Harvard, "The Economic Policies of the Political Parties," published this year.

Harris writes that when the time came to select Mr. Kennedy's Secretary of the Treasury, "Messrs. Samuelson, Galbraith, Schlesinger, and I spent several hours trying to come up with a good name." Dillon was later selected no doubt because his past associations in Wall Street and in the Eisenhower administration would be a good orthodox screen for unorthodox fiscal policies.

But to make sure that the appointee could be rid of any embedded germs of orthodoxy carried over from the past, scrubbing and disinfecting were provided by making Harris senior consultant to the Secretary to supply on-the-job retraining. "I can say," writes Harris, "that I have never known a high official who was so anxious to learn." The new Secretary read the homework supplied by his tutor and reported favorably thereon.

STATISTICAL TRICKERY

Harris' progress report is: "Dillon promises to become the Alexander Hamilton of the 20th century."

This is a dangerous comparison. For Hamilton studied no economics at the King's College of his day. He learned his economics from the businessmen whom he later so ably supported.

Harris shows an aptitude for demagogic downgrading of businessmen in public office which might be envied by a Kefauver or Morse. Academic men are more distinterested.

To promote his concept that deficit spending promotes economic growth, Harris resorts to a statistical trick. In answering the arguments of Senator Goldwater and Proxmire that deficit spending did not promote economic growth in the 1930's Harris says: "In fact, gross national product rose from $56 billion in 1933 to $91 billion in 1939, unemployment declined by 3 million."

The facts are these:

In 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936, Roosevelt followed orthodox budget policies. He struggled to keep spending down and twice vetoed a soldiers' bonus. In those years the gross national product rose from $56 billion to $82.7 billion, or more than 47 percent. Unemployment fell 3.8 million.

In the midthirties, John Maynard Keynes came over with his silk hat and white rabbits. He had a long session with F.D.R. Subsequently Keynes said, according to Harris, that Roosevelt was "an economic illiterate." But slowly the Keynes infection set in, with plenty of help from Harry Hopkins. After 1936 the gross national product rose to $91 billion, which was only 10 percent more than in 1936. Unemployment increased 450,000. The deficit in 1939 was higher than in the depth of the depression. In constant dollars, the contrast is almost equally striking.

CONFIDENCE DID IT

Harris might reply that the improvement in the first period was due to the recovery from the depression and that after 1936 there was a leveling off. But recovery was accompanied by a rise in public confidence after the saving of the banks and the Economy Act of 1933 which slashed Government expenses across the board. This was not merely businessmen's confidence. It was reflected in immense Democratic majorities in the elections of 1934 and 1936.

In 1936 Roosevelt began to make harsh attacks on business. Even Rexford Tugwell has said of his "princes of privilege" speech that it "was a speech that Bryan might have made." After F.D.R.'s great triumph in the 1936 election, two events marked a shattering of confidence. One was the attack on the Supreme Court; the other was his criticism of copper and other prices. Recession set in and, with it, a great loss of House seats in 1938. Republicans had only 103 House Members in 1935–36. But after the 1938 election they had 164.

There is no recognition in the Harris book of the part played by public confidence in economic growth. His concern is to use mathematics to prove a bad case.

Private Enterprise and Creative Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, President Ernest S. Marsh of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., made a very interesting commencement address at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles on June 14, 1962, on the subject of private enterprise which to my mind should have wide circulation:

Private Enterprise and Creative Thinking

(By President Ernest S. Marsh, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.)

President Topping, members of the board of trustees, officers and faculty of the university, members of the graduating classes, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed an honor to have the opportunity to address the graduating classes on this important occasion. For many personal reasons, I approach it with deep humility.

These commencement exercises mark a decisive turning point in your lives. You have completed an arduous but stimulating task. Those assembled here—including the faculty, your parents, relatives and friends—can rightfully take pride in your success. I salute you on your accomplishments.

You have attended a great university. Its high standing among educational institutions; its strong position in civic and business affairs; and its reputation for adherence to the fundamentals of our American way of life are well known. I am sure it has equipped you with intellectual training, discipline, knowledge, and an understanding of the society in which you now become more active participants.

American enterprise provides opportunities for selecting the occupation or profession you believe will be the most rewarding in giving you a challenging and satisfying way of life. It also affords the freedom to change lines or locations at your pleasure.

Whatever selection results from individual decisions, I believe you will approach any problems that may confront you without fear or trepidation. The progress achieved here should provide encouragement and a quiet confidence that you can meet any challenge that presents itself.

You have already demonstrated determination and good judgment in devoting the time and effort necessary to secure your degrees. You have shown that you want to compete in a competitive world. Your degrees and formal education are of great value. They should be cherished as a major step in your progress. Without them you would be handicapped far more than you would have been a generation or more ago.

It would be a mistake, however, to say that a diploma is a one-way ticket on a through train to advancement. In a broad sense, it is an open letter of introduction with a qualified recommendation. It will open doors to opportunity but what you make of it is in your hands.

As of this day you have a headstart but the education that will come from experience and endless further study is just commencing. It is a process that continues long after school years. It needs pursuit as diligently as you have pursued the degrees you receive here today.

Our society becomes increasingly complex. Men are circling the globe in a matter of an hour and a half. Almost instantaneous communications are far beyond the comprehension of a few short years ago.

The need for education and a vast store of knowledge is greater. The burden on the individual becomes correspondingly heavier, yet the nature of man has changed not at all.

We are moving fast. We are living fast. We expect things to happen fast.

I would like to tell you, you are now prepared to go out and tackle the world and succeed in conquering it in a year or so. Some might say, "Never look back—get to the top in your field in a hurry."

It is not likely to happen that way.

It is more likely to be a step by step development over a long period with increased effort being needed on each stepping stone.

I would prefer to say to you—do look back.

Look back often to see what made our country the great Nation it is today. Each new generation should read the minutes of the last meeting. Look back to see how others have attained a measure of success and satisfaction.

My observations over a considerable number of years convince me the ones who advance in their chosen fields will exhibit the same qualities which resulted in advancement for their predecessors.

First of all, they have enthusiasm for the task.

They demonstrate a desire and eagerness to learn everything they can about every phase of the enterprise and prepare for the job just ahead.

They think for themselves and apply carefully considered judgments; still they approach the new experience with the idea of gaining a working knowledge of existing practices and policies.

They get themselves accepted on the team before their own new ideas are accepted. The inquisitive, creative mind forges ahead.

They exhibit a spirit of cooperation and willingness to work, and have a pride in doing all things thoroughly and properly.

They have an appreciative understanding of people around them and a get-alongability. They follow a practical application of the Golden Rule.

They attract attention to their capabilities by doing a little more, a little better than expected—and cheerfully. Unhappy, disgrauntled people are almost never chosen for greater responsibilities.

They carefully avoid envying the progress of others or worrying about the fortunes of others—doing so invites disappointment and frustration. They try, try again.

These are some of the qualities I have observed.

With your educational background and with reasonable patience and proper application of talents, the opportunities for success and happiness are unbounded. Yet, I know of no magic formula for quick success in any field or industry.

That name "industry" as applied to production of agriculture and manufacturing, and the services, has a very broad coverage.

Almost everyone is dependent to some degree for a livelihood upon moneys that can be traced back to industry, whether they follow careers in government, the professions, or some endeavor on their own. Many of the young lady graduates will enter the business field and those who become homemakers will find their interest the same as the breadwinner of the family.

It seems fair to assume that the great majority of you will be associated in some manner with business and many with corporations.

In our complex society, corporations employ almost as many Americans as all other sectors of our economic life, including Federal, State and local governments.

These corporations are not impersonal organizations. Each is an aggregation of people with a direct concern for producing a product or performing a service that is in demand.

Most executives in today's typical corporation have risen from the ranks.

Corporations are owned and managed by fellow citizens. Their part in the complex pattern is in the fact that they have placed in the hands of their employees more than half a trillion dollars in the tools and materials which make our high output and standard of living possible.

Just one illustration.

The balance sheet of the Sante Fe Railway System runs to $1,600 million.

It would take over 21 years to count that much if you spent 8 hours per day, 5 days per week counting $10 bills at the rate of one every second.

When you finished, you might look at the pile and say, "What good is it, anyhow?" You might as well have a room full of soap wrappers, unless the bills are put to work for some useful purpose.

Now let us use part of the pile to purchase a narrow strip of land running 13,000 miles from the Pacific Ocean to the shores of Lake Michigan and various points in between.

Then devote the remainder to rails, ties, signals, diesel locomotives, freight and passenger cars, stations, shops and all the items necessary to move people and goods.

Converting the pile of bills into physical things has made it possible to perform a needed service for the public and the national defense. It has made it possible to employ 50,000 people with average annual earnings of over $6,000.

It has generated $140-million of annual purchases of materials and supplies which keep many others employed.

Of course, it was not one person or a few who put up the $1,600 million, because the Santa Fe has over 110,000 stockholders—more than twice the number of employees. Dividends average $377 per year per stockholder.

It is a fourway mutual affair, including the stockholders, the employees, the suppliers and, of course, the customers.

Almost 100,000 of the stockholders are individuals holding an average of 170 shares individuals holding an average of 170 shares—a few thousand dollars in the investment; 36,000 own less than 50 shares; 8,000 less than 10 shares—a few hundred dollars.

No individual owns as much as one-fourth of 1 percent of the total.

Among the larger holders are the insurance companies, investment funds, hospitals, charitable and religious organizations, and educational and scientific institutions.

These generally are representative of many people, especially the life insurance companies whose investments come from a reservoir of savings put up by millions of people expecting that life insurance ultimately will pay something to them or their beneficiaries.

The stockholder is not some faraway fellow in a high silk hat counting his dividends in an ivory tower, but instead the family living next door or right down the street. It might be your family. Many of our employees are also stockholders.

Keep in mind that the whole enterprise stems from the pool of capital attracted by the profit motive from the savings of fellow citizens. Call it capitalism, if you like. It is voluntary enterprise—no one was forced into it.

When I speak out on matters which may adversely affect the soundness and stability of the economy, I am talking for the people interested in the good of my company—the employees, the public served, and the citizens who have devoted their savings to the enterprise.

There should be no conflict of purpose. All are contributing somethings for a common good. All should share in the benefit.

In many areas, notably transportation, the business corporation is subject to certain regulation and has a legitimate interest in public affairs to such an extent as to call for devoting effort toward a better understanding of economic facts.

Long ago our company felt the need of efforts in this direction. Back in 1952, with the collaboration and cooperation of the University of Southern California, we decided to do something toward giving our management team a more comprehensive understanding of the forces underlying the creation and existence of our business, which is a product of private enterprise and dependent upon that system for perpetuation in a manner that best serves the interests of everyone concerned.

Each summer we have a group here at the graduate school of business administration where, for a period of 6 weeks, they participate in the Santa Fe Institute of Business Economics to gain a keener knowledge of our society and the traditions of our American way of life.

More than 300 of our officers and keymen have attended these sessions which are conducted by a very capable team of professors in the business school. All of our men have learned something about freedom and initiative which are essential to the business community. Essential for the simple reason that the robust health of the business community is essential to the well-being of the Nation and its people. The contribution of American industry is a matter of record.

True, it has made some mistakes, but it has progressed.

True, there are those who condemn industry and a few are critical of bigness or profits as something evil or distasteful.

Growth is recognized as a mark of success and usually the size of a company depends on how well it serves the intended purpose of providing goods and services that people need—how well it contributes to the general welfare of the populace.

The key to corporate strength lies in the ability to generate profits, without which it would be virtually impossible to measure up to the obligations of today or tomorrow. The forces of demand and competition usually prevent excessive profits, but adequate profits are needed to do the job.

After meeting the payrolls, tax bills, and cost of wear and obsolescence on facilities, it is profits that keep a business going.

Profits provide a part of the funds needed for replacement and improvement.

Profits give a return to the people who put up the capital, as a means of compensating them for the use of their savings and attracting additional funds to keep pace with growth and expansion—to employ and serve more people. To promote economic progress.

It is the profit motive that provides the impetus for progress and prosperity. There need be no apologies on this point.

Greatly oversimplified, we get around to where the economy of the people is centered on money. Government, business, and all else would be impotent without it.

Whatever your endeavor, I am sure you will find that money is a necessity of life. There is no reason to camouflage the cold facts—in the pursuit of happiness, money is at least useful.

There are many definitions for the word—capital, cash, coin, specie, or a medium of exchange. Regardless of definition, some say that in importance it ranks ahead of whatever it is that is in second place.

Personally, I prefer the definition given by Arthur Stone Dewing in his work on corporate financial policy. He said: "The success or failure of a business is expressed in the numerical values of money; and money is merely a convenient denomination of value in the limited sphere of economic value. The expressions of money values are the objective representations of more fundamental economic values. These economic values are, in the end, human judgments of the relative importance of material things and of services in meeting the needs and the desires of human beings."

This profound quotation refers to the "success or failure of a business"—a sobering reminder that the balance sheet mentions two words—"profit" and "loss."

Even at the beginning of our country, our founders placed a reliance upon this concept. The very essence of our economy is based upon the initiative and aspirations of free men. Each new generation is a temporary guardian of this freedom. Each is faced with the challenge of preserving it.

You should be thankful that the odds favoring your success in this are far better on this National Flag Day than those confronting the courageous men and women of the American Colonies on the birthday of the Star Spangled Banner 185 years ago.

Our generation welcomes your participation in sharing with us the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship, but within a few short years it will be your generation that determines the economic and political destiny of this country.

It is my hope, and surely the hope of this large assemblage, that through the unparalleled opportunity that science and technology now provide, your creative thinking will produce an even better world in which mankind can achieve its highest aspirations in an atmosphere of peacefulness and freedom.

I hope and pray that you will have the moral and spiritual strength to defend the heritage that has been handed to you and thus insure survival of values based on individual liberty and human dignity, and that you will realize lasting satisfactions in your accomplishments.

Good luck and God bless you.

Republic of Liberia Independence Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on July 26 the Republic of Liberia, the oldest Republic in Africa, celebrated its 115th birthday by inviting guests throughout the world to help observe this memorable occasion. In Washington, Ambassador and Mrs. Peal were hosts to many of their friends including Members of the Congress, the Diplomatic Corps, and official Washington.

Because President Tubman was en route to Liberia after having made successful state visits to both the Republic of Israel and the United Kingdom, the Liberian Secretary of State, the Honorable J. Rudolph Grimes, delivered the Independence Day message in which he stated:

> This occasion recalls to our minds and brings into historical focus the gallant and heroic efforts of our forefathers, their sacrifices, their untold sufferings and their indomitable courage. We are also able to recall the spontaneous help and assistance which were offered them by the chiefs and people from whom they have been separated by the cruel slave trade. We should always remember that these are two of the factors which, when combined, gravitated toward our independence. Thus it has become ingrained in us as part of our national life, on this day to give thanks, to rejoice and to listen to a message from our dear President, whose sacred trust is the discharge of his duties as the executive leader of the nation.

After this introduction, Secretary Grimes read the President's address which follows in part:

> Independence Day calls for a reflection into our past and a dedication to our future.
>
> Let us look back briefly to the early 19th century.
>
> People from Africa had been sold primarily to plantation owners as slaves and they were held to have no rights that white men were bound to respect. They were therefore debarred from all civil offices, taxed without representation and excluded from participation in government. They felt that they had no chance of improvement under such circumstances.
>
> At the time there were men whose consciences bothered them about the plight of Negroes. Some saw the presence of the Negroes in America as a social evil, some were afraid of and concerned about the continuation of the slave trade with the possible effect this might have on their society, while others believed that continued presence of free Negroes would exert a dangerous influence on the unfreed ones. Those people who were moved by humanitarian and other considerations began to seek means of solving what they regarded as a pressing problem and one of the results was the formation of the American Colonization Society. Many of the Negro people had serious misgivings about returning to Africa, but some of them resolved to sail an unknown ocean, no matter how long the journey, with little education, no experience in government and political administration, to return to the continent of their origin—a continent which was to them at the time a strange land.
>
> Upon their arrival the settlers underwent 25 years of trials and tribulation and experienced the hardship of a new life under terrible conditions. There were diseases of many kinds which reduced their numbers.
>
> The settlers grew weary but were never discouraged. They became despondent but never faltered, for they were resolute in their determination to be freemen, to build a nation on the basis of justice and equality, and to kindle the flame of independence on a continent which was gradually being carved up among the colonial powers. Their purpose was to demonstrate that given the opportunity the Negro was capable of governing himself. We thank the Great Arbiter of human events that, in spite of great difficulties, severe disappointments, and many setbacks, this flame has never been extinguished.
>
> Rather it continues to glow brighter and, on the continent of Africa, the flame is spreading in such a manner that we hope it will not be long when the darkness of colonialism is completely eliminated in Africa.
>
> This was their hope and aspiration when, out of the depths of desolation and pessimism, they banded together and decided on behalf of the people of Liberia, to publish and declare a solemn instrument of optimism, our Declaration of Independence, proclaiming the independence of the Republic of Liberia.
>
> This historic and literary document recognized the natural and inalienable rights of all people as well as equal rights and justice for all who reside here.
>
> This Declaration of Independence is, in my opinion, unmatched in the annals of African political development. It embodies most of the principles which have influenced and shaped our national policy over the past century. It has aroused millions of Africans to a realization of their capability. Our actions over the years have, in the words of President Joseph Jenkins Roberts, "wiped out the foul imputation of our race."

Following President Tubman's message, Secretary Grimes continued by adding that:

> Independence in Africa which has followed the new surge of nationalism has not brought about a magical evanescence of our problems. Instead it has created some additional problems. Among them are the relationship among African states and the relationship of African States to other states in the world.
>
> The tasks confronting the African States are many, serious, and complex. In order to find solutions for them we cannot afford to dissipate our energies and creative talents in useless conflicts and duplicated efforts or to waste our resources while leaving untouched larger opportunities for the advancement of our common objective.
>
> President Tubman has advised that all African leaders—not a selected few—should be invited to attend any meeting which was to be convened for the purpose of finding solutions to African problems; and he warned that, if this course were not followed, events would be set in motion which would result in divisions in Africa.
>
> Be that as it may, the fact is that the groupings do exist and may be harmful in the long run to the interests of Africa. The task is therefore to eliminate the divisions.

I know that President Tubman is resolved to do all that lies within his power to assist in bridging the gap and to work for an intensification of the areas of cooperation in Africa. President Tubman realizes that cooperation among Africa States can make a change for the better in our general conditions and in our relations with the rest of the world by being a positive force for good in shaping these new relations.

One of the important challenges of our new African community, as I see it, is that we must utilize our potentialities, combine our forces and exploit to the fullest our best talents in fruitful endeavor in order to develop our physical and human resources, to advance the frontier of human knowledge and human progress and to increase the chances of human survival.

No continent is self-contained nor can any continent live by itself. There are some events and occurrences which have worldwide effect, and the constant advance of science and technology has made our world more interdependent. African cooperation with the rest of the world, as a consequence, must be strengthened in the interest of peace and mutual understanding.

Because of this, the Liberian Government has supported the United Nations wholeheartedly and will continue to do so.

I am firmly convinced that an important significance of the United Nations is the role it has performed in facilitating the peaceful transformation of former colonial people to the status of independence, human dignity, and freedom.

Today as we gather for the festivities of this occasion, let each and every one of us resolve to dedicate ourselves as a united people to the unflinching support and advancement of the policies of our Government.

I call upon you and me, I call upon the people of Africa, I call upon the people of the world to make a new declaration, a declaration in which we rededicate our efforts and ourselves to the cause of world peace, human understanding, and world brotherhood, a declaration in which we pledge to strive for a world free of greed and ugly ambition, a declaration where we vow to work for a new and glorious era for the present and future generations.

No Added Publicity for Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter addressed to the Jewish Press of Brooklyn, N.Y. by the Attorney General of the United States. The letter appeared in the August 17, 1962 edition of the Press:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C.

THE JEWISH PRESS,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR EDITOR: I read your thoughtful and provocative open letter to me in the July 20 edition of the Jewish Press with great interest.

This administration, and I personally, strongly concur in your view that the odious Nazi doctrine of racial and religious hatred has no place in this country. The American Nazi Party represents only a few distorted individuals and is an anathema to almost every other citizen.

The Department of Justice is fully aware of the activities of the Rockwell group and will act promptly if any Federal law is violated. Local authorities are vigilant for infractions of their laws and ordinances.

Consideration has been given to placing the American Nazi Party on the list of subversive organizations, but proceedings have not been initiated for a number of reasons.

The primary function of the list is to alert Government agencies to the danger of hiring people who belong to subversive organizations. Designation as a subversive organization carries no sanction and does not curtail the activities of the group so designated.

Extensive public hearings are required before an organization can be placed on the list. These hearings would give the Nazi Party widespread publicity and a forum in which to expound their primary objectives.

The fact that the Nazi Party is not on the list in no way constitutes approval or grants them any status as a worthwhile organization. Nor does its absence from the list mean that any unlawful activity will be tolerated.

In the final analysis, the most effective antidote to the poison of nazism is the patriotism and good sense of the American people. We shall be alert to the dangers of nazism, but I am sure that you share my confidence that our fellow countrymen will never allow the ravings of hatred which the Nazis preach, to flourish.

Sincerely,

ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

Dr. Linus Pauling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the outcome of the libel suit by Dr. Linus Pauling against the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald is probably unknown to most of my colleagues, though it is of great significance. The suit was settled out of court by the newspaper, and a retraction of the defamatory statements has been published.

It is, of course, encouraging that there is recourse from these completely unwarranted and vicious attacks for people who have the courage to fight it through and the financial ability to do it. At the same time, it is important that we continue to insist that all mediums of publicity, including newspapers, should maintain responsibility for what they print.

The Bellingham Herald's printed retraction is as follows. How much better it would have been if this retraction had not become necessary:

[From the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald, May 4, 1962]

LETTERS: CORRECTION

In late November and early December 1960, when Dr. Linus Pauling, recipient of the Presidential Medal for Merit and of the Nobel Prize, was the principal speaker at the ceremonies to dedicate Haggard Hall of Science at Western Washington College, this paper published in its Letters to the Editor column five letters in which the writers attacked Dr. Pauling. These letters contained untrue statements which, if believed, would have reflected on Dr. Pauling's integrity and loyalty to the United States of America. These defamatory letters were published in error in reliance upon the writers, without investigation by the paper. The Herald takes this opportunity to state publicly that it regrets that it published these statements reflecting on the integrity and loyalty of Dr. Pauling.

Railroad to Asylum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in a column which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner on August 12, 1962, George Todt made a comparison of the treatment of mental patients in this country to the oppression of people under Communist regime. I believe the care of our mentally ill is of importance to everyone, and under unanimous consent, place this in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: RAILROAD TO ASYLUM

"I feel also that this is without question an example of a clear denial of human rights, legal rights, and the right to due process of law as contemplated by either the Federal or State Constitution."—Judge JOSEPH L. CALL, letter, July 11, 1962.

Heavy mail indicates the public is understandably agitated concerning the proposed commitment procedures pertaining to mentally ill persons as set forth in California Senate preprint bill No. 1.

Many people are worried and do not hesitate to say so.

Those who truly champion civil rights—and are not hypocrites in the process—may have their work cut out for them.

Who will volunteer for this task?

A storm of criticism has swirled about the controversial mental health issue in recent years.

Basically, there is an undercurrent of fear and dread. It stems from the undisguised suspicion of many citizens that Marxist subversives might someday utilize fuzzy commitment procedures to get rid of their political opposition.

Can we forget the brutality of the Reds to their own people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains in the past?

What happened to human rights in those regions of despair?

The truth is that Marxist mentalities are cruel and sick. They are the same wherever we may find them. Their lust for power causes them to become oppressors of the people.

The people of the United States must ever be on guard against any encroachment of their liberties and freedom. This pertains to the field of mental health, or anywhere else.

Like Caesar's wife, it needs to be above suspicion.

The fundamental question—when we go directly to the heart of the problem—is whether we have proper commitment procedures which will protect an alleged insane person from being railroaded to an asylum by cunning or guile. What guarantees are there now?

Many outstanding citizens are not satisfied that we are adequately provided with legal safeguards in this debatable matter.

One prominent legal authority is Judge Joseph L. Call of the Los Angeles County superior court.

He wrote a masterful letter July 11 to Senator Ronald G. Cameron of the State legislature's senate committee of judiciary. It challenged the legal safeguards of senate preprint bill No. 1.

"I feel there is a complete lack of due process of law through the entire bill," wrote the concerned judge. "There is a complete emasculation of the basic rights of the individual defendants."

I will attempt to get a copy of this remarkable letter, which ought to be widely circulated, for those who write me and request it.

A Manifesto of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, any Member of this body can, I am sure, by driving through his or her own district, see and hear and come into contact with living proof of the success and efficacy of that economic system we call free enterprise. Yet lingering doubts remain in the minds of many as to how well Americans themselves, and government in particular, understand the importance of this system. The expanding role of government over the years and the splintering of our economic groups along social and political lines, each more concerned with its place and future than that of the system of free enterprise itself, are reflective of these doubts and misgivings.

Wtih this in mind, then, I offer for the consideration of this House an article by Donald I. Rogers, appearing in the New York Herald-Tribune of August 24, which calls for a new and unique declaration of belief in and purpose of the free enterprise system. Mr. Rogers calls on the administration to give guidance to all those concerned with the Nation's economy by setting this framework forward as a declaration of policy. I am hopeful that this thoughtful article will be considered by our citizens and officials wherever the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is read:

HE'LL GET LETTERS

(By Donald I. Rogers)

A Washington report says that President Kennedy is disappointed at the response to his invitation to the public to join in a great debate sparking fresh ideas on the economic realities now facing the Nation. The White House is now inviting thoughtful citizens to write their suggestions for economic improvements so they may be studied by two groups to be selected by the President.

It would be fascinating and enlightening to read all of the replies to this offer. Surely a large number of Americans will respond to this in much the same manner that they would tear a boxtop off "Krackly Krumblies" and mail it in with the vague hope of getting something for nothing.

My particular department of the newspaper gets a great many letters about the economy written by thoughtful citizens and all but a few of them are self-serving. That goes for the suggestions made by topmost corporate officials, as well as for apartment-dwellers who think the city should provide a free parking garage in every block.

One of the great problems with the magnificent American economy is that it has been subjected to pressures from group after group of self-seekers and to onslaught after onslaught from selfish interests. Never has there been an official policy, spelling out a national dedication to the whole economy. Never, in fact, has there been an official definition of America's unique and powerfully-strong enterprise system.

The essence of the economy's strength has been its flexibility and susceptibility to change, for change is the power-element of growth. Assuredly, the American economy can stand some improvements and it will not suffer from exposure to some fresh, practical thinking. As in the past, it will suffer only from political influences and motivations in the economic thinking.

To a distressing number of Americans the words "American economy" or "enterprise sysetm" represent only some sort of glorious year-round Christmas tree under which is found gaily wrapped boxes containing the parts that, when assembled, provide absolute security and freedom from responsibility. There's a "government-owes-me-a-living" box; there's a "government-owes-me-medical care" box; there's a "government-owes-me-more-on-my-crop" box; there's a "government-owes-me-financial-independence" box and so on.

There's a special Christmas tree for a growing group in Congress. The gifts thereunder include a "government-should-control-more-business" box; a "government-should-provide-more-services" box; a "kit-for-controlling-wages" box; a "set-of-instructions-for-controlling-prices," and so on.

Rather than recommending some specific improvement in the Nation's money practices, in credit, banking or spending, some thoughtful citizens might suggest that the President and his two blue ribbon groups appointed to study the letters, come up with a clear and documented manifesto of free enterprise.

Therein could be spelled out not only the aims of the system (which does strive for greater security and financial independence for all) but also the specific tolerances and limitations of the role of government and of organized pressure blocs on that economic system. It should list the caveats and "thou shalt nots" of an economically responsible people as well as their ambitions and dreams under their economy.

Is it, or is it not, the will of the people of America to have government control all business after it reaches a certain size? If not, why is not the Kefauver group discouraged from its efforts to pry loose the competitive details of independent steel companies which, if made public, could neutralize competition in the industry?)

Is the purpose of the income tax to redistribute the wealth and place limits on the size of income? Or is it to raise funds for the U.S. Treasury?

An alarming number of voters and apparently a significant number of lawmakers don't know that jobs in a free enterprise system are created only by the investment of savings and are maintained only by the continuing flow of savings into investments. Such a policy statement, then, could clearly spell out guidelines for the protection of the sources of investments, with instructions on how to nurture the economy in the just the way that a farmer is counseled on how to fertilize his land for the sake of improved growth.

It could be an economic policy statement, the first in American history, and could embrace money and credit, foreign trade, taxes, labor, agriculture, prices, wages, and government spending. It could state the beliefs and opinions of the able economists on the purposes, plans, programs, and hopes of the American economic dream.

A major manifesto of free enterprise at this time would dispel the uncertainties which hover over Washington and cause businessmen and investors to hold back on their investments, a practice which stymies our national growth and keeps a prospective recession foreever teetering on the economic horizon. For uncertainty breeds hesitancy and hesitancy sires stagnation. The living American economy cannot exist with stagnation. Once it sets in, the economy atrophies, withers and dies.

Some Thoughts on Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the viewpoint expressed in the attached editorial from the Wall Street Journal for Friday, August 17, 1962, very definitely reflects my own analysis of the performance of this administration. I think it is also the accepted viewpoint of many persons throughout the land. The lessons in this editorial could well be viewed by both the minority and the majority parties:

SOME THOUGHTS ON POLITICS

Psychologists have discovered that even the closest marriages have periodic moments of strain; for some mysterious reason the 2d, 7th, and 20th years are the hardest. The phenomenon is also noticed in politics.

Just at the moment President Kennedy is having his troubles. The honeymoon is over and Congress is kicking up its heels. The incompatibility is not just with Republicans either; the Democrats are paying little heed to the man of the White House and are noisily fighting among themselves. In the press Mr. Kennedy's oldest friends have become his severest critics. Abroad he's not only having the normal spats with Mr. Khrushchev but is being nagged at by Mr. Macmillan, Dr. Adenauer, and General de Gaulle.

The public opinion polls reflect a certain disillusionment. It's not just a question of whether people agree with what President Kennedy has tried to accomplish. It's just that after 18 months it's hard to name any accomplishments at all.

The President hasn't yet succeeded in getting anything that might please the liberals, such as medicare, or things that might please the conservatives, such as his communications satellite bill. The economy isn't moving ahead any faster and the Alliance for Progress is progressing backwards. Berlin is still there; so is Cuba. So, for that matter, is the gold problem, the labor problem, and the farm problem, not to mention all the problems of the cities, juvenile delinquency, inflation, corruption in government and all the rest of the things Mr. Kennedy talked so much about.

All this has brought a great rush of hope to the Republicans and some fright, if not quite despair, to the Democrats. A year ago Mr. Kennedy seemed unbeatable. Today people are saying right out loud that maybe he can be beaten.

Well, we would like to offer a little comfort to Mr. Kennedy and a little caution to those who are basing so much political hope on his troubles.

First off, a midterm letdown is par for the course; F.D.R., Truman, and Eisenhower all suffered it with no fatal effects on presidential election day. There are a good many things Mr. Kennedy can do to recoup his losses.

For instance, no one ought to be really surprised that the President has not solved all the Nation's problems. If his failure to do so is a political liability it is only because Mr. Kennedy in his enthusiasm as a candidate promised to solve them all, and then right off after his inauguration rushed into all of them with equal fervor, vigor, and lack of preparation. This is partly responsible for the impression that he does not really have any problem quite in hand.

He also badly misjudged the temper of the country. He forgot, or ignored, the narrowness of his victory and assumed that "the people" were all really ready to rush to his support on a host of liberal programs of the past. They were not. That is one reason why the President hasn't had support from his own party in Congress, which is the majority party there and could pass anything it wanted to pass.

He also misunderstood many of the problems. Such difficulties as the foreign balance of payments proved not so easy to set right as his advisers told him. In some cases, as in his approach to "getting business moving again," the things done led to the opposite effect, so that today the outlook is darker than when he took office. All this has contributed to his prestige loss because it shook the confidence, even of his supporters, in his judgment.

Mr. Kennedy has been hurt, too, by his helpers. Some of his associates thought they could bludgeon any opposition, whether from the steel industry or congressional committee chairmen. Since their arrogance was matched only by their ignorance, they did the President more harm than good.

Mr. Kennedy has also not been helped by some of the well-publicized activities of his entourage in what might be called the lighter side of life. Too much of any kind of publicity tends to wear thin, but too much publicized lightheartedness around the Presidency can be fatal. The country likes a bit of down to earthness in its public figures, but it also looks to the Presidential circle for dignity and a sense of the fitness of things.

But none of this is beyond correction. Mr. Kennedy is still President of the United States, and if he learns from his missteps, the prophets of his downfall could be surprised at how rapidly the political situation might turn around. It has happened to Presidents before.

And there is one other thing. If the Republicans think they can rely solely on Mr. Kennedy's missteps to give them a White House victory, they lean on a slender reed.

To the voter all things are relative. If there was ever an officeholder seemingly ready for defeat it was Mayor Wagner in the last New York City election. But none of his opponents had any clear program to offer; they were confused, disorganized, and riding off in all directions. With Mr. Wagner, as with President Truman in 1948, the impossible happened; he not only won but by a bigger margin than before.

So we are not at all so sure that Mr. Kennedy's troubles, real though they be, are a cause for too much glee by his would-be rivals or too much gloom by his political friends. Politics, like marriage, often fools the prophets.

Oregon's Lumber Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there have been many explanations of the critical lumber situation in the Pacific Northwest, but I believe that a speech to the distinguished Portland City Club by Joseph W. McCracken, executive vice president of Western Forest Industries Association, is a most outstanding, clear, and forceful explanation of the situation.

I consider it a basic document in any attempt to understand the complex nature of the problem.

The speech follows:

OREGON'S LUMBER CRISIS

(Address to Portland City Club, August 3, 1962, by Joseph W. McCracken, executive vice president, Western Forest Industries Association)

President Morrison, members of the Portland City Club and guests, I am pleased to be here today to discuss Oregon's lumber crisis. I regret that Bob Dwyer of the Dwyer Lumber & Plywood Co. was unable to be here to make this statement himself. Mr. Dwyer and his Lumbermen's Economic Survival Committee have done an outstanding job in alerting Oregon and the various congressional delegations and departments in Washington, D.C. to the seriousness of our lumber problem.

I. DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

Most of you have heard that there is a crisis in Oregon's lumber industry. Let us begin by trying to define the problem. The forest products industry provides 60 percent of the manufacturing payroll in Oregon. The lumber segment is still the largest in the forest products industry. It should be, therefore, self-evident that if the forest products industry and in particular the lumber industry is healthy economically, Oregon will be healthy economically. The reverse should be equally self-evident.

From 1959 through 1961 the forest products industry of the three Northwest States lost 13,800 jobs. Oregon lost 7,800 jobs during that period. Employment in Oregon's lumber industry in June, 1962, was the lowest for any June since World War II.

According to the West Coast Lumbermen's Association over 200 producing sawmills in the Pacific Northwest have gone out of business in the recent past. Early this year one of the last remaining sawmills in Portland closed its doors. A few weeks ago one of the last sawmills in Clatsop County shut down Earlier this week it was announced that one of the last mills in Molalla, Oreg., will be closing. Last month one of the large sawmills in Crescent City, Calif., shut its doors, and recently one of the oldest sawmills in Seattle announced the cessation of operations.

Another measure of the problem is found in lumber production statistics. The Douglas-fir region, which is western Oregon and western Washington, produced slightly over 10 billion board feet of lumber in 1950. This same region produced 7.8 billion board feet of lumber in 1961. On the other hand, British Columbia, our major competitor at this time, produced only 3.5 billion feet of lumber in 1950 but by 1961 had increased their production to 5.5 billion board feet.

These facts should be sufficient to demonstrate that the lumber industry in Oregon and Washington is in serious trouble and that this does not augur well for the economic well-being of Oregon in particular.

II. WHY THE PROBLEM

The serious decline in lumber employment is simply a result of the fact that far too many lumber producers have been unable, are now unable, or feel they will continue to be unable to manufacture lumber at a cost low enough to return any profit when the lumber is sold. Far too many sawmills have sustained substantial losses because of the unfavorable relationship of costs and sales returns.

Three facts should be noted before further analysis:

1. Oregon's lumber industry has produced mainly for the domestic market.
2. The lumber industry is highly competitive, competitive as measured by the number of individual units, and changes in either the supply or demand of lumber by a few percentage points can alter the lumber market significantly.
3. On the demand side the bellwether market for Oregon lumber is housing and the key item in housing is single family residential construction.

Leaving aside for the moment the present dramatic threat to our industry from increased imports of lumber from British Columbia, we should review some of the other economic problems which have plagued our industry and weakened it seriously in recent years.

(a) There have been severe fluctuations in housing construction. In late 1957 and early 1958 and again in late 1959 and 1960 housing starts were at a low ebb. These low ebbs were followed, at least in late 1958 and early 1959, by dramatic rises in homebuilding construction. The instability of the housing market created even more instability in our lumber markets. You have probably noticed that housing starts this year have been on the increase. April and May starts were particularly strong; but it must be remembered that within the period of the last 2 years the percentage of total housing starts in apartment units has nearly doubled and is now running over 30 percent. Apartment units are not strong users of lumber.

What of the future for housing construction? It is well recognized that: (1) The pent-up housing demand stemming from the depression and World War II has been basically satisfied; and (2) family formations which are the key factor behind housing starts are now at a low ebb.

Further, as family formations increase dramatically in the middle 1960's, the demand will shift even more heavily to apartment units. The inevitable increase for single-family residential housing will not hit until the late 1960's. In short, leaving other problems aside, the forest products industry and particularly the lumber industry in Oregon already faced rough sledding for domestic markets in the early and even middle 1960's. It should be clear that if housing demand was considerably stronger not only would we have no Oregon lumber problem, the Canadians would enjoy increased prosperity as well.

This thumbnail sketch into the near future of housing is illustrative of one of our basic national economic problems. The satisfaction of the pent-up consumer demand of the depression and war years combined with the population age mix now existent militate against strong economic growth rates until later in the 1960's. A keystone in the dramatic growth rates of the European Economic Community is unsatisfied pent-up consumer demand.

Another serious economic problem which has and will continue to face the lumber industry concerns the inroads of substitute materials in our historic markets. While the cost of lumber is more than competitive with the cost of substitute materials, lumber to date has not been as susceptible to automated construction practices as substitute materials. Again Oregon's lumber industry perhaps more than other industries is a victim of the "planned chaos" referred to in a very stimulating address by Dr. Pierre Rinfret of the Lionel D. Edie Co. in a speech in Los Angeles last year. Dr. Rinfret in his speech pointed out the dramatic increase in research and development expenditures in this country and then went on to state "the function of research and development is to change the existing order—to create chaos in the market." Lumber is well aware of the validity of Dr. Rinfret's remarks in its problems with substitute building materials. The industry has a real job on its hands.

The tremendous and very desirable expansion of the plywood industry in Oregon while definitely an advantage to the State of Oregon also helped to weaken the position of lumber manufacturers both in terms of competition for markets and severe economic competition for raw materials—a competitive test most sawmills had difficulty in coping with.

Another very serious problem in Oregon's lumber industry in recent years involves the high cost of logs or raw material. There was a large expansion of lumber capacity in Oregon following World War II. This capacity was very heavily based on an open log market and small tracts of private timber. As these stands of private timber were liquidated and the open log market declined, many mills were faced with a serious problem of acquiring raw material. The result was intense competition for stumpage. It may well be that the intense competition for stumpage has done more to weaken our competitive position than any other single item. In this connection the lumber industry was further weakened last year by the dramatic increase of purchases of logs by Japan.

III. THE IMPACT OF CANADIAN LUMBER IMPORTS

With an already constricted domestic market for lumber the problem of Oregon's lumber industry has become chaotic under the dramatic onslaught of increased lumber imports from British Columbia. In 1961 Canadian lumber producers satisfied 12.7 percent of the domestic market for softwood lumber. This amounted to nearly 4 billion board feet. This was double the percent of our market which the Canadians enjoyed in 1951. British Columbia authorities are expecting a further increase in lumber production in British Columbia alone by 1975 of an additional 2½ billion feet per year. Other Canadian Provinces—particularly Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario—are rapidly developing railroads and access roads into the vast untapped stands of timber in the northern parts of those Provinces. These Provinces are aggressively promoting lumber and other wood developments, and significant volumes of lumber from these virgin stands of timber can be expected to find their way into the American market.

The impact of Canadian imports is particularly dramatic in the east coast cargo market of the United States. British Columbia mills today have taken over nearly 75 percent of our historic east coast cargo market. In 1951 British Columbia producers enjoyed less than 10 percent of that same market. With a constricted and fairly fixed demand for lumber in the next several years, as the Canadians increase their lumber production and shipments to our market we will have a corresponding decrease in our industry here unless solutions are found to our competitive cost problems. Or we shall have to develop additional foreign markets for our lumber. The pressure on our domestic markets from British Columbia stems from two facts. One, the British Columbia Government has aggressively promoted the development of their timber. Greatly increased capacity has resulted. Two, British Columbia's historic markets, particularly the United Kingdom and Europe, have also been disrupted. Russia and the Scandinavian countries, have eased British Columbia out of much of these markets. British Columbia has been forced, therefore, to seek substitute markets, the U.S. market being the most promising.

Why are we unable to compete with the Canadians in the cost of producing lumber for our domestic market?

1. Our water mills suffer a serious disadvantage in water transportation rates. By law, specifically the Jones Act, our cargo mills must use American bottoms to the east coast British Columbia mills can use the foreign charter market. The result is a saving to the Canadian mills of between $7.50 and $10 per thousand board feet. Part of this differential is in shipping costs; the other part is in higher loading costs in the United States.

2. The devaluation of the Canadian dollar in the past year has given the Canadians another economic advantage. With the Canadian dollar now pegged and supported by U.S. loans at 92½ cents in U.S. funds the advantage British Columbia mills have gained in the past year amounts to nearly $7 per thousand board feet.

In many areas of British Columbia, particularly along the coast, log or raw material costs are lower than those in Oregon. This differential reflects partly a difference between U.S. Forest Service policies of appraising timber and British Columbia forest service. policies of appraising timber. Perhaps more significant in this raw material cost differential is the fact that in Oregon stumpage is a highly competitive commodity whereas in British Columbia by Provincial policy competition is discouraged. It is a fact that competition for logs in British Columbia is practically nonexistent in comparison to competition for logs here.

In addition there is a wage rate differential which favors the Canadian producer.

The result of all these cost factors is that when lumber markets fall off as they did last fall and winter and as they will again this fall and winter the Canadian mills keep on operating and selling lumber as the prices drop. As the prices drop the Canadian producers still make profits when our mills are going broke and have to shut down. The lumber market then is finally stabilized at the expense of the Pacific Northwest.

IV. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

In terms of basic solutions to Oregon's lumber problem, it is clear that two things need to be done: (1) Every effort must be made to expand markets for Pacific Northwest lumber—both in foreign markets and domestic markets; (2) our Federal Government needs to remove or change those laws and policies which have mitigated against the ability of our industry to compete.

Solutions in both of these directions need to be sought concurrently.

Let us analyze at this point what has happened to date and what is the significance of progress made to date in arriving at solutions. Starting last year the lumber industry initially asked the Federal Government to change those laws and policies which hurt our competitive position. They asked originally for only the right to compete on a fair and equal basis with Canadian producers. Specifically, the industry requested that the Jones Act be amended to permit west coast lumber mills to ship lumber to the east coast in foreign bottoms. There was a request that rail transportation services be equalized between the two countries. The industry asked that the U.S. Forest Service expedite its sales of timber, modify its ridiculous appraisal policies, and reexamine its allowable cuts under recently announced sustained-yield policies. The objective of these requests to the U.S. Forest Service was a hoped-for equalization of log costs between the two countries. Finally, the industry asked the Federal Government to either eliminate or compensate for advantages which Canadians had received by devaluing their dollar.

As time elapsed it bacame clear that sufficient changes in Federal law and policy. many of which go back many decades, were not going to be made quickly. With a rapidly deteriorating economic situation. a large segment of the industry this year was forced to ask for emergency relief in the form of an emergency quota on the importation of Canadian lumber. This emergency quota was proposed as a means of holding the line until Federal laws and policies could be changed and the industry placed in a competitive position.

What has been the response of the Federal Government to the pleas of the industry to date. I will discuss this in two parts. Part 1 will be progress made prior to July 26, 1962; part 2 will be a discussion of the dramatic proposals set forth by President Kennedy on that date.

1. Effective last month rail transportation services were equalized between Canada and the United States insofar as lumber shipments were concerned. The industry had been concerned that the Canadian producers enjoyed a 15-day freehold in the shipment of lumber whereas American producers were denied that privilege. Last month the freehold in Canada was eliminated. It should be pointed out, however, that a substantial group in the Pacific Northwest is seeking a restoration of freehold in the United States.

2. The U.S. Forest Service has responded significantly. The Forest Service speeded up timber sales in this region to a recordbreaking pace. They sold more timber last fiscal year than ever before with the big increase coming in the second quarter of this calendar year. The second quarter of this calendar year saw a volume of Forest Service sale offerings in this region far surpassing anything prior to this time. The timber sale offerings that the Forest Service made were well within then-existent sustained yield and allowable cut declarations. The ridiculous appraisal policies of the U.S. Forest Service have recently been changed considerably to fit more nearly the necessities of our times. We still have some distance to go here.

3. Last January, the President asked Congress for a substantial increase in Federal access road appropriations for the Forest Service. While the importance of this to our particular problem is not well understood, if these increased funds are used wisely by the Forest Service, they can contribute considerably to a solution of our competitive log problems.

4. The Federal Housing Administration in June finally forced a recognition of the fact that spruce in British Columbia was, in fact, Englemann spruce and should be so considered here in construction uses. This action also is not well understood but is very important and rectifies a glaring inequity which has worked against the American lumber producers for many years.

5. On the other side of the ledger the problem posed by the devaluation of the Canadian dollar has worsened. Their dollar was pegged earlier this year at 92½ cents—a drop from the 95–97-cent range of last year. Further, our Government has recently sup-

ported Canada's devaluation by loans and credits of several hundred million dollars.

Now, we come to a discussion of the dramatic announcements made by President Kennedy on July 27, 1962. I hope that what is said here will not be construed politically. Our lumber problem is a political issue. We can agree that President Kennedy is a political figure. It is my intention, however, to discuss his announced program solely but as I view its present and potential impact upon our problems. It is my feeling that the President's announcements may be looked upon in the future as one of the most significant announcements in the history of our region, at least from an economic standpoint. President Kennedy opened the door to real solutions of our problem. Whether his program is dramatic or palliative as some have stated depends upon the followup. In this followup to his announcements our congressional delegation has a key role, the forest products industry has a heavy responsibility and also the governments of the States of Oregon and Washington have a function.

(a) I agree with Senators MORSE and MAGNUSON that potentially one of the most significant announcements of the President was his request to the agencies of the Federal Government to favor American lumber in purchases under their various programs. This carries extreme significance as regards the Agency for International Development and its responsibilities for administering the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America. It was spelled out in the press release that the President's announcement would be pertinent to a 400,000-unit housing project under the Alliance program which is now getting off the ground. If, as implied, the lumber for these houses which are being financed by our Government should be purchased here, we would for this single project have a new market for 750 million board feet of lumber. It is my understanding that the Alliance program envisions in the years immediately ahead housing starts in Latin America at the rate of 1 million units per year. Again, if as implied, the lumber for these houses were to be purchased here we could have an additional market for nearly 2 billion feet of lumber a year.

If this dramatic possibility proves out, this market for lumber could well bridge the gap in lumber demand domestically which we have anticipated for the early and middle 1960's. It is up to our congressional delegations, our industry, and our State governments to follow up this possibility vigorously and to see that the door which has been opened up by the President is fully developed to the benefit of our region. We recognize that the overall objectives of the Alliance for Progress program must be paramount, but we are delighted that the President recognizes that domestic economic considerations must be blended with foreign-aid considerations.

The President also announced that he would request an amendment to the Jones Act. Should the request be enacted into law, and this is by no means certain because of the anticipated opposition of southern lumbermen, it would open up to our lumbermen the 70-million-board-foot Puerto Rican market which is heavily weighted to low-grade lumber. This action alone would be exceedingly beneficial. Further, if his request should be enacted, it would be my interpretation that our cargo mills would be able to ship to our east coast market on foreign bottoms, and a major competitive disadvantage brought under a semblance of control. The Jones Act amendment would not eliminate our lumber loading cost differential.

The President announced an increase in the annual allowable cut on the O. & C. and other Interior Department lands in western Oregon of 150 million board feet. The President further announced that the Forest Service was to have its allowable cut review completed by October 15 rather than 1 year hence as originally programed by the Forest Service. It is anticipated that this review by the Forest Service will result in further considerable increases in the allowable cut of all of the western forests and particularly those forests in the Douglas fir region. These increased timber volumes should go far in eliminating the economic necessity for the extreme competitive stumpage markets of past years. If these increased volumes in fact lead to this result, our log costs will be more nearly equal with those in British Columbia.

Some concern has already been expressed that these announcements regarding public timber allowable cuts amount to a sacrifice of sustained yield principles upon the altar of political expediency. If such were the fact, this concern would be shared by all of us. However, the increased allowable cuts announced on the Interior Department lands and the anticipated increases on Forest Service land will in no way violate the concepts of sustained yield or multiple use. I recognize that speaking as a lumberman my assurances may not entirely satisfy some of you. I wish there were time to explore the allowable cut question in greater detail. I can state, however, that the increases in allowable cuts stem from new, up-to-date inventories which will eliminate many conservatisms used in the past and a significant change in rotation age policy announced by the Government last year. What the President has done is merely ask that the allowable cut review under this Forest Service policy announcement of last year be expedited. The Forest Service review is now under the supervision of some of America's outstanding forest technicians. I would ask that before any one makes demogogic remarks attacking these increased allowable cuts they should examine with the Federal agencies involved into the facts. Having examined the facts any legitimate concern will be eliminated.

Some in Oregon object to the sale of increased volumes of timber. Their argument runs: if we have a poor lumber market, it is because of an excess of lumber production—the sale of additional timber will result in more lumber production which leads to a worse market condition. The argument sounds plausible but is without merit. This argument is based on one untenable assumption—that the Dominion of Canada does not exist. We have to recognize that Canada and especially British Columbia is pushing the development of their timber resource. Given a fixed domestic market here, the continued expansion of lumber production in Canada leaves us with a simple choice. We either compete successfully or die. If we are to compete successfully, our raw material costs much be equal to theirs. We shall need every foot of increased timber cut possible if we are to minimize the extreme competitive conditions for timber that have existed and which so seriously disadvantage us in our competitive efforts. Further, why should Oregon forego the employment an increase in timber supply will provide and turn this employment over to Canada? The least we can do is to compete for this employment.

The President announced that he would seek from Congress an additional or second increase in accesss road construction funds for the Forest Service. If these funds are forthcoming from Congress our Forest Service will be in an even better position to help the forest products industry equalize our log costs.

Much attention was given to the President's announcement that he would seek negotiations with Canada leading toward a voluntary quota on Canadian lumber exports to this country, and to his announcement that he was asking the Tariff Commission to expedite their findings respecting the damage done to our domestic industry. With regard to his attempt at a voluntary quota arrangement it should be recognized that the President does not have authority at the present time to unilaterally impose a quota on Canadian lumber without a Tariff Commission recommendation. Some months ago the Agriculture Department wrote a legal opinion to the effect that such authority did exist under the Agricultural Marketing Act. Accordingly, the industry felt safe in finally asking for immediate quota relief. The State Department, however, disagreed with the interpretation of that act by the Agriculture Department. The Justice Department which makes the final legal decision concurred with the State Department that the President has no quota authority prior to a Tariff Commission recommendation under existing law. Further, after a Tariff Commission finding, the President must clear through GATT. Therefore, at this time a voluntary quota is the only possible quota type solution. Keep in mind that no industry group has asked for tariffs up to this time.

We heard shortly after the President's announcement that Canada was refusing to negotiate on a voluntary quota. It is my opinion that the Canadians will negotiate.

At this point, the Tariff Commission hearings and findings will be of critical significance.

Will we need a quota? In my opinion the answer is "Yes." How long the quota should be imposed will depend upon what happens. Certainly a quota will be needed as long as the industry suffers its present disadvantages in water transportation and raw material costs. Since, short of a tariff, we seem to be stuck with the devaluation disadvantage, the other competitive disadvantages—water transportation and raw material—will have to be eliminated before removal of quotas could be considered. The major factor that could relieve the need for a quota at an earlier date would be the demand for our lumber in Latin America under the Alliance program. This demand will probably not materialize to the maximum level for at least 2 to 3 years.

The President made other recommendations but I feel that those I have mentioned were the most significant. If this package of proposals is pursued successfully, I am confident that our lumber problems will be solved. I am encouraged by the fact that Mr. Daniel L. Goldy who is well known in the Pacific Northwest and who is now a key official in the Department of Commerce is coming out to the Northwest this weekend to discuss with all interested lumber industry groups the question of where do we go from here.

In conclusion I should like to comment on a question which has been raised recently by many in and out of the industry. That question is: Why are so many sawmills closing down at this time of year when our lumber market is better than a year ago? There are many reasons—some rational, some irrational—for decisions to close a manufacturing enterprise. Our lumbermen have been struggling against heavy odds for many years and what disturbs me is that apparently, many lumbermen have lost hope. An industry, just as an individual, which loses its hope is lost indeed. I would, therefore, make a plea to the independent lumbermen of this industry to hang on awhile longer. I think our problems can be solved; I am encouraged now that they will be solved.

Thank you.

Will Success Spoil L. B. Whatshisname?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Art Hoppe of the San Francisco Chronicle on August 24 turned his very interesting and humorous column toward Vice President L.B.J.:

WILL SUCCESS SPOIL L. B. WHATSHISNAME?

(By Art Hoppe)

Oh, we've got a cockle-warming chapter for you today in our nostalgic series, "Where Are They Now?" which is all about the game comeback struggle of a once-famous celebrity, Vice President Lyndon B. Whatshisname.

You will recall that "Mr. Vice President," as he is affectionately known to his closest friends, is currently capping his comeback with a gravely important good will, diplomatic and ball point pen distribution tour to create peace in our time in the eastern Mediterranean.

So it was a touching scene as Mr. Kennedy bade him a fond farewell at White House ceremonies. AP thoughtfully recorded the President's exact words for posterity: "We wish him well and extend to him our best wishes and hopes," said Mr. Kennedy solemnly, "for a speedy recovery—er, return."

It isn't every diplomat who gets a sendoff like that. And what worries us millions of fans now is: Will success spoil Mr. Vice President? If his delicate mission to the peace-torn eastern Mediteranean proves a smash, will he return the same old Lyndon B. Whatshisname we have grown to know and love? Speedily?

Already, though it hurts us to say so, there are omnious portents of a change in him. Weeks ago; his head presumably awhirl with thoughts of the giddy doings awaiting him in the eastern Mediterranean, he did the unforgivable: He turned his back on the Nation's bootblacks.

I know that will come as a shock to many. It's a heart-rending story. You see, the Nation's bootblacks are going to have their annual dinner next Monday in New York as part of National Shoe Care Week. Which happened to fall last March, but let's not get into that. And the whole purpose of the dinner is to crown "the Nation's Oldest Working Bootblack."

I assume the bootblacks began trying to think who that was. And one old-timer must have remembered blacking boots as a sprite in Texas with old Lyndon Whatshisname. And where was he now? Obviously they finally found him for they unselfishly invited him to be their guest of honor. It brought tears to your eyes.

But what did Mr. Vice President do? Two months ago he'd have leaped at the chance. But now, with the bauble of fame once again before him, he writes back: "I know that this would be a most interesting event and I am sorry my schedule during that period is heavily booked and I will not be able * * *" and so forth. Well.

It might be argued that the bootblacks' loss is the eastern Mediterranean's gain. Perhaps. But, I say, pride goeth before a fall.

Already the Nation's bootblacks have turned against him. Should he be successful in failing to start a war in the eastern Mediterranean, will his pride grow overweening? What bloc of humble voters will he offend next?

There he is, defeated for reelection, tattered, forlorn, shoes scuffed, unemployed. But that's the cockle-warming part. As I see it, once he's rid of the handicap of the Vice Presidency, he will at last achieve the fame for which he has so gamely fought: He will be a cinch choice for "the Nation's Oldest Working Bootblack."

And he'll be happy. For, like politics, it's a shining profession.

Cuban Paralysis and Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we all laugh at the old tale about the housewife who sweeps the dirt under the rug, yet an effective analogy could be used from this story to describe the attitude of the Kennedy administration toward the Cuban situation.

The longer we tolerate the Red buildup of Cuba, and the longer we refuse to provide leadership necessary to rid Latin America of the Communist threat, the more dangerous our position becomes on many fronts.

This point is well made by a distinguished journalist, Milburn P. Akers, writing in the Chicago Sun-Times of Monday, August 27, and under unanimous consent I insert his analysis of the Cuban situation into the RECORD at this point:

CUBAN PARALYSIS AND WASHINGTON

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Ever since Fidel Castro first bared his Red fangs the Government of the United States (the Eisenhower administration as well as the Kennedy administration) has been afflicted with a near total paralysis insofar as this subtropical puppet of the Kremlin has been concerned.

As a consequence, Soviet Russia has been emboldened to pursue a course in Cuba which has resulted in the Pearl of the Antilles becoming a distinct threat to the United States and the peace of the world. For the evidence is now convincing that the Soviets have been pouring men (technicians and military instructors) and military hardware into that unhappy Caribbean island but 234 miles from Miami, 1,333 from Chicago and 1,317 from New York City.

Cuba has been turned into a Soviet base. Whether that base is or isn't currently equipped with missiles that can be lobbed into the continental United States is a matter of small moment. If it isn't it soon will be.

Almost since Castro's regime began, there have been those (including this column) who predicted this result unless the United States took action. The Eisenhower administration took steps toward action. But the Kennedy administration's pantywaist conduct of that ill-conceived expedition aborted whatever chances of success it might have had. Since the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs—a fiasco for which Mr. Kennedy took personal responsibility so as to prevent revelation of the fact that military affairs had been entrusted, at that time, to college professors—the Soviet buildup has been going on. Now it has taken on such magnitude that Washington is professing concern. But unless Washington finds some way to shake off the Cuban paralysis very little will be done.

That Castro was hailed by some at the outset as naught but an agrarian reformer, the same as were the present Communist leaders of China, was probably inevitable owing to the tolerance of the Batista administration.

But it makes little difference to oppressed people whether their oppressors are Communists or Fascists; the result insofar as they are concerned is the same. In the present instance, however, it makes a great deal of difference to the United States that Cuba is Communist-controlled. For it is that control, along with our paralysis, which has enabled Soviet Russia to reverse the Trman doctrine of containment. The containers, it seems, are now the contained.

What might the United States have done that would have precluded the present result?

It can be argued endlessly that the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations were jointly responsible for the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs. The plan was conceived during the Eisenhower regime. It was executed by the Kennedy administration. Those facts are incontrovertible. Place the responsibility where you wish. And, while doing so, ascertain, if you can, whether the Eisenhower plan was altered. But all of that is water over the Bay of Pigs.

What was done next?

Economic sanctions were imposed by the United States. And the Organization of American States, after much prodding by Washington, suggested Castro wasn't all he should be. But the OAS, most of whose members then were and still are bargaining with the United States for loans, grants, and so forth, didn't do much else at the time and has not done much since.

Nonetheless, the sanctions imposed on Cuba by the United States slowly took toll. The Cuban economy has been crippled. It has food and other shortages. By itself, Cuba would soon undergo economic collapse and the Castro regime would be over. But Cuba is not by itself. And Soviet Russia isn't likely to let Cuba collapse so long as a Russian base, or its equivalent, can accomplish whatever purpose the Soviets have in mind.

To the extent that we have crippled our freedom of action by subscribing to the OAS—and that extent is considerable—we should renounce that Western Hemisphere treaty. To be thwarted in action essential to our preservation by Latin American governments, many of which are here today and gone tomorrow, and some of which use their OAS votes to pry loans and grants out of us, is imbecilic.

Both the OAS and the Alliance for Progress, agencies under which we have sought to develop a working partnership with Latin America and aid those nations in developing their economies and societies, are worthwhile efforts. Neither should be abandoned. But the OAS should be reconstructed in a manner which would permit us freedom of action to protect ourselves in situations such as have arisen in Cuba.

As it is, we may have to trade off our bases in Turkey (contiguous to Soviet Russia) for Russia's in Cuba (offshore continental United States of America).

Or why else did Russia establish a Cuban base?

The 45th Anniversary of the Founding of the 35th Infantry Division of the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 19, the Honorables PAUL C. JONES, of Missouri; W. R. HULL, Jr., of Missouri, WM. J. RANDALL, of Missouri; ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas; DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri; RICHARD ICHORD, of Missouri, and the Member addressing the House, attended the 45th anniversary of the founding of the 35th Infantry Division of the National Guard. This division is made up of National Guard units in Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Arkansas.

Although not always designated as the 35th Infantry Division, this component of the earlier State militia units and later National Guard units has served the Nation on every occasion or need since its founding 45 years ago. This division has provided many great military and civilian leaders for the Nation, the most famous of which is the former President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

On this observation last Sunday, Maj. Gen. Charles H. Browne, Jr., commanding general of the 35th Infantry Division addressed a group of citizens, soldiers, and friends of the 35th Division in Kansas City, Mo. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert General Browne's remarks in the RECORD in order that the significance of this occasion may be preserved in the permanent record of the House:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. CHARLES H. BROWNE, JR.

Senator Carlson, Congressman Jones, Congressman Avery, Congressman Hull, Congressman Randall, Congressman Ellsworth, Congressman Hall, Congressman Ichord, General Nickell, General McLaughlin, other distinguished guests and distinguished visitors—which in my way of thinking includes everyone assembled here today—it is with disappointment I must inform you our most illustrious alumnus, former President Harry S. Truman, expresses his regret at being unable to attend our organization day because of previous commitments, of which we were aware might interfere.

As our distinguished guests who have taken time from their busy and productive lives well know, this ceremony was developed on very short notice and many of our friends were unable to resolve those twin problems of time and place. Mr. Truman, whom as you have heard, is providing space for a permanent 35th Division memorial museum room, was particularly anxious to be here today because as "Captain Harry" of Battery D, 129th Field Artillery, he participated in the organization of the 35th Division 45 years ago on August 25, 1917, at Camp Doniphan, Okla.

Some of you here today were present at that birth of a great fighting organization. Most of those present in our country's uniform today weren't even born, but many represent descent from the 35th Divisionnaires of 1917. As an easy example, I might mention that in 1917 my father commanded Company E, 139th Infantry Regiment of the 35th Division, welded from National Guard units at Hannibal, Mo., and Leavenworth, Kans. Incidentally, one of the Company E "teenagers" (whom my father always contended wins wars) is here today in the presence of Col. Howard Faulkner, present secretary of the 35th Division Association.

All of the U.S. Army's great divisions were formed in this same time period at the start of World War I. Lest we might forget our heritage, it would seem appropriate to mention the 35th came from our National Guard, or militia as then called, in the present two States of the division as early as 1808. This was the year Battery A, 128th Field Artillery was organized at St. Louis, Mo.

Without its present division designation, predecessor units of the 35th trained and prepared—as we are doing today—to meet State crises in disaster and calamity, and to also wage its Nation's battles. Missouri Volunteer Milita units marched to Mexico with Col. A. W. Doniphan, and victory in the Mexican War. Missourians fought each other in the War Between the States, serving with distinction on both Confederate and Union sides. The two Kansas battle groups now in the 35th (the 1st and 2d of the 137th Infantry) are lineal descendents of 19 regiments formed in Kansas for the Union. Both States also provided Guard units for the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection. Missouri and Kansas regiments were on the Mexican border in 1916 and had been mustered out of Federal service only 2 weeks when recalled for duty in World War I, and assembled at Camp Doniphan. The World War I training camp of the 35th Division was located at Fort Sill, Okla., and named in honor of Colonel Doniphan of Mexican War fame.

The War Department Order authorizing the formation of the 35th Division was dated August 5, 1917; but the Kansas and Missouri units were not ordered to be mobilized until August 25 of that year. As we are gathered here today in a public building commemorating the 35th Division, and those present honoring the 45 years of its glorious service in peace and war to State and Nation, it seems utterly incredulous the highly trained and experienced 35th is being proposed, by some, for elimination and—in effect—burial.

Records show on organization in 1917 that 14,282 men of the new 35th Division were from Missouri and 9,781 from Kansas. All were volunteer guardsmen, or militia as called since the States first raised troops to form the Nation back in 1775.

Arduous training—despite influenza epidemics, lack of equipment and other handicaps at Camp Doniphan in the winter of 1917—paid off when the 35th Division was blooded in the Vosges Mountains of French Alsace and then, individually and as a Division Unit, helped write new and glamorous pages in American history. The 35th fought in all three of the major American campaigns in France. With distinction at St. Mihiel; the first American division to take its army objective under Gen. John J. Pershing in the Argonne; and on the Verdun front.

Most men added to the 35th in World War I to bring it to a total strength of 27,000, came from Kansas and Missouri draft selections, so it remained a 2-State division from mobilization to deactivation. Forty-five years later, we find exactly the same two States furnishing the volunteers for all spaces allowed by the Army. And, with a potential of achieving combat readiness among the top 12 divisions, of the Reserve components, quoting the very words of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Maj. Gen. D. W. McGowan, spoken here in Kansas City 3 months ago.

Following World War I, the 35th Division was reorganized, principally from Missouri and Kansas but with units also from the States of Nebraska and Arkansas. From 1921 to 1940, the 35th Division again trained for the Nation's defense as vigorously and efficiently as variable troop allotments and equipment permitted, at the same time performing missions in the respective States for preventing disorder and giving organized assistance during frequent periods of disaster.

Once again war clouds appeared over the world, and in 1940, the 35th Division was ordered to active duty. In December of that year, under the late Maj. Gen. Ralph E. Truman as commanding general, the four-State 35th Division assembled at Camp Joseph T. Robinson, Ark., for rigorous and productive training. One year later, on December 7, 1941, the infamy of Pearl Harbor plunged the United States into war and the 35th Infantry Division again was headed for combat.

Some of you may have noted I just now used for the first time the designation "35th Infantry Division." In World War II, this designation was necessitated by the new type armored division, and involved a reorganization of the 35th from a square type division to a triangular type. As you know, your present division is now the pentomic type, with all divisions due to conversion as a ROAD type, in the near future. Reorganization is one of the Army Guards best capabilities. We have been doing it in peace and war since our origin as the Minute Men. In fact, official records will show that National Guard has reorganized a total of five times since World War II, as new alinements and techniques dictated such need.

The glorious deeds of the 35th Infantry Division are indelibly inscribed in the records and archives of World War II history. Proceeding to the west coast a few days after Pearl Harbor, it took up defensive positions along our Nation's coastline on the Pacific Ocean. Some of the 35th's best units were siphoned off for immediate needs in the Aleutian Islands and the Southwest Pacific. The 35th furnished over 4,000 of its finest enlisted men for completion of the officer candidate schools.

To the everlasting credit of those officers and men who had originally trained at Camp Robinson and remained with the 35th Infantry Division as it absorbed and trained thousands of individual soldiers into the later superb fighting unit of ETO fame. That is what esprit de corps and morale can do when built into a unit—and I reiterate, principally, Kansans and Missourians. Also, by a unit I mean the division, which is the smallest self-sustaining and self-supporting organization in the U.S. Army structure.

An unusual coincidence in its history was that the 35th Infantry units landed in England in May 1917, in World War I, and then, 27 years later the 35th Infantry Division landed in England again in May—but in 1944, to soon help topple "Hitler's Fortress." Both wars the 35th Division sent advance details to England during the 1917 and 1944 months of April. And as a matter of record, some of the same citizen-soldiers fought both wars in the same division. Many sons of 35th World War I veterans slogged along the same combat trails of the France of 1944.

Many of you here today know the World War II 35th engaged with valor and distinction in the European campaigns of Normandy, northern France, Rhineland, Ardennes and central Europe. Gen. Ike Eisenhower again related that record to Kansas Citians in the big reunion of the 35th Division Association here, after World War II. But, like in World War I, many were the 35th Divisionnaires who made the supreme sacrifice in 10 months' continuous combat in France, Germany, Luxembourg, Belgium, the Netherlands, and central Europe. Over 20,000 casualties were suffered by the 35th in compiling its glorious feats those fateful 10 months.

With a division strength of approximately 19,000, many Purple Heart winners returned to fight anew with the 35th. I can personally think of one St. Louis, Mo., infantryman who was wounded and evacuated five different times, fighting with the 35th in World War II. Such priceless heritage breeds great combat outfits, and that is why I, today, maintain the present 35th Infantry Division is still second to none.

After nearly 30 years service in the 35th Division—and from records and reports—I believe I am in a position to authentically cite to you that never in peacetime history was it better trained than today. As commanding general, I credit every dedicated enlisted man and officer in both States of Missouri and Kansas for making this record possible.

I believe I am dutybound to my command to speak for every dedicated, volunteer soldier of the 35th Infantry Division when I thank those many individuals, organizations, news media, and public officials for their efforts to prevent the proposed elimination of our historic fighting organization, with its dual State and Federal missions.

It is particularly noteworthy that we have here on this organization day so many in the audience who are making every effort to continue this 45-year heritage built in blood, tears, and the never ending individual sacrifice of the Guardsmen—in time of peace or war.

I have been asked by the 35th Division Association—the alumni organization of the 35th—to recognize with appreciation in these perilous times the presence of members of the congressional delegations from two of our States here today. The association, with an estimated eligibility of 100,000 past and present soldiers of the 35th, again thanks them and their colleagues in Congress for their unending loyalty and support. The association again wants to publicly commend the aggressive support of Gov. John Dalton of Missouri and Gov. John Anderson, of Kansas, who also were unable to be with us today because of prior engagements.

Thanks to all those present and the other supporters of this first organization day and may the 35th live to see many more such observances.

South Dakotans Not Invited To Accompany J.F.K. to Oahe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be interesting reading for Members to have available the report of the Omaha Evening World-Herald under date of August 17, 1962, regarding the recent "nonpolitical" trip to rededicate the Oahe Dam in South Dakota.

The article, including the World-Herald headline is as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTANS NOT INVITED TO ACCOMPANY J.F.K. TO OAHE

(By John Jarrell)

When President Kennedy's plane took off from Andrews Air Force Base Friday for South Dakota and a visit to the Oahe Dam on what was described as a nonpolitical tour, the four Members of the South Dakota congressional delegation were left behind.

They weren't invited. All are Republicans. To them, there was a hollow sound to the term nonpolitical.

"Politics, pure and simple," commented the delegation's dean, Senator KARL MUNDT, who served with Mr. Kennedy in both House and Senate.

Mr. MUNDT as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee prevailed on the Eisenhower administration to include the first Oahe construction money a number of years ago, when the dam was omitted from the budget request.

NOR ENGINEERS

Members of the delegation pointed out that not only did Mr. Kennedy not invite them to ride along to the ceremony in their State, but that there was no invitation, either, from the Army Engineers, which normally provides a plane for Members of Congress when such events are taking place.

Flying with the President were Representatives BYRON ROGERS and WAYNE ASPINALL and Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, all Colorado Democrats.

"It should be remembered," Mr. MUNDT said, "that Mr. Kennedy's trip is being paid for by all the taxpayers. It is a Government plane in which he is flying, and the Government, meaning all the taxpayers, is picking up the tab."

ABLE TO GO

All four Members of the delegation had planned to attend the ceremony, they said, and notified its local sponsors. The last commercial plane that would have gotten them to Pierre on time left at midafternoon Thursday.

At that time, House Members were working on a public works bill that included funds for Oahe Dam.

But both Representatives E. Y. BERRY and BEN REIFEL would have been able to go Friday.

"If I'd been invited I would have gone," Mr. REIFEL declared.

"I think the thing was that there is no private section in the President's plane where they could have put us, and fumigated it afterwards," cracked Mr. BERRY.

Oahe Dam lies in the districts of both men.

SPECIAL TWISTS

"We all wanted to attend the ceremony and had written the local committee that we would attend," said Senator JOSEPH BOTTUM. "We wanted to go badly. But in the Senate we were debating the communications satellite bill and couldn't get away Thursday. We'd have gone today if the President had asked us. We'd have worked out pairing arrangements."

In Mr. BOTTUM's case, the situation had a special twist.

His Democratic opponent for the Senate, George McGovern, was at the President's side in South Dakota. In fact, it never was any secret that a major purpose behind the visit was to give a hand to Mr. McGovern.

AID AND COMFORT

Mr. Kennedy will be "lending aid and comfort" to Mr. McGovern on the trip, the New York Times reported Friday.

Senator MUNDT said he thought it was the first time an official plane ever was sent to such a ceremony without the home State's delegation being invited.

"In the Truman administration, Republicans, including myself, were invited to similar events," he said. "And in the Eisenhower administration, Democrats were asked."

To Mr. MUNDT it seemed "most unusual."

"This is one dam in which I had a special hand," he said.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Application of Radiation Protection Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the subject of "Radiation Standards, Including Fallout." There hearings were part of the Joint Committee's continuing effort to bring objective professional knowledge to bear on this important subject.

In the process of conducting these hearings, and in our later evaluation of the extensive materials which were developed, several major questions remained unclarified which are summarized as follows: First. Are the radiation protection guides established by the Federal Radiation Council applicable to fallout from nuclear weapons tests, especially the resulting incidence of iodine 131 levels; and second, what agency or agencies of the Government have the responsibility and authority for invoking countermeasures in the event that certain radionuclides reach undesirable levels?

To clarify these matters, Representative MELVIN PRICE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation, and I wrote to the Chairman of the Federal Radiation Council to obtain further information. The reply from the Federal Radiation Council has been recently received and I believe that it does indicate some progress in clarifying these issues.

For the information of the public, which is vitally interested in this problem, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recently issued a press release incorporating this exchange of correspondence. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of the Joint Committee release with the attached correspondence.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS CONCERNING APPLICATION OF RADIATION PROTECTION STANDARDS BETWEEN JOINT COMMITTEE AND FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL RELEASED BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

An exchange of letters between the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Federal Radiation Council on major unresolved questions concerning the applications of radiation protection standards were released today by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and Congressman MELVIN PRICE, chairman, Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation.

Following testimony by Surgeon General Luther Terry at the Joint Committee hearings on "Radiation Standards, Including Fallout," held June 4–7, 1962, the Joint Committee requested the Federal Radiation Council to clarify its position on the criteria being used to determine when undesirable levels of radioactive debris from fallout were reached. This important question was posed by the Joint Committee as early as its 1959 hearings on "Fallout From Nuclear Weapons Tests."

On June 18, 1962, Chairman HOLIFIELD and Congressman PRICE wrote to Chairman Ribicoff of the Federal Radiation Council requesting information concerning (1) the role of the FRC's radiation protection guides (RPG), particularly in relation to iodine 131; and (2) what Federal agencies were responsible for invoking protective countermeasures in the event radiation levels became unduly high. The need for resolving these matters was indicated as "increased by the recent resumption of atmospheric nuclear tests by the Soviet Union and the United States."

The first question in the letter of June 18 was concerned with whether the numerical values in the radiation protection guides establish the sole or principal criteria for evaluating undesirable levels of radiation from fallout. Secondly, if so, are these numerical values sufficient to indicate when and what action is appropriate to protect public health? Thirdly, if not, is further or supplementary criteria needed and whose responsibility is it to develop and implement such criteria? An additional request was made in the Joint Committee letter of June 18, concerning the views of the FRC on the current status of legal authority and responsibility for invoking countermeasures or taking any other action should radioactivity from fallout reach undesirable levels.

On August 16, 1962, Congressmen HOLIFIELD and PRICE sent a letter to the FRC to further supplement the letter of June 18, 1962. The letter stated in part:

"The urgency of this review is pointed up by the recent resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing by the Soviet Union and reports of sharp increases in radioiodine levels in Nevada and Utah from U.S. tests. The latter situation, as you know, caused local public health officials in Utah to invoke plans for the diversion of fresh milk into forms carrying lower levels of radioactivity.

"We do not imply that the current levels of radioactivity have reached a danger point. Indeed, we are satisfied that they are apparently within the current acceptable limits of the radiation protection guides. However, we are not convinced that these guides presently apply to fallout, nor that they should apply to fallout as presently set forth.

* * * * *

"Thus, there is a necessity to clarify the meaning of the radiation protection guides in order that they may be understood by the public and by those officials of the Government who will have the responsibility for invoking countermeasures in the event radioactivity levels reach undesirable proportions."

The Federal Radiation Council, under the chairmanship of Chairman Celebrezze, replied by letter dated August 17, 1962. The letter pointed out the differences between fallout and other sources of radiation which the radiation protection guides were developed to control, stating:

"As applied to fallout, the guides can be used as an indication of when there is a need for detailed evaluation of possible exposure hazards and a need to consider whether any protective action should be taken under all the relevant circumstances.

"But once we are alerted to the need to consider protective action, the guides do not tell us when to act or what to do. These judgments require careful consideration of local conditions and the impact of available health protection measures. The Council believes that individual fallout situations require individual evaluation before a specific action is taken."

As a summary with respect to the guides, the Council stated: "The guides are not intended to be a dividing line between safety and danger. We have assumed that there is some slight risk to health from any level of radiation exposure, however low, even at or below the low levels set by the guides. At the same time we do not believe there is any risk of a major health hazard until exposure levels are many times above the guide levels. For example, this is borne out in relation to iodine 131 by the report to the Federal Radiation Council of the National Academy of Sciences, 'Pathological Effects of Thyroid Irradiation,' July 1962."

As to responsibilities for invoking protective measures, the Council stated: "Within the Federal Government, authority now exists under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to control the shipment of adulterated food in interstate commerce. By definition, foodstuffs containing excessive radioactivity would be adulterated. States have the authority to control intrastate distribution or sale of adulterated foods, which would include foodstuffs containing excessive amounts of radioactivity. State food and drug laws vary widely in their scope and adequacy with respect to the problem of radioactivity in foods. The Public Health Service has the general responsibility to recommend appropriate health protection measures to States and local authorities and to the general public."

Congressmen HOLLIFIELD and PRICE stated that the Joint Committee would study the FRC letter to determine whether the answers were adequate, but indicated: "We seem to be making some progress in clarifying this important subject."

Copies of the exchange of correspondence are attached.

Attachments: (1) Copy of letter June 18, 1962, from JCAE to Chairman, Federal Radiation Council, with attachment copy of letter January 16, 1962, from Congressman HOLIFIELD to the President; (2) copy of letter August 16, 1962, from JCAE to Jones, HEW; (3) copy of letter August 17, 1962, from Chairman, FRC, to JCAE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
June 18, 1962.

Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Chairman, Federal Radiation Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In reviewing the record of our recent hearings on "Radiation Standards, Including Fallout," there are apparently a number of unresolved questions, which had also been left open after our 1960 hearings on "Radiation Protection Criteria and Standards." The need for resolving these matters is increased by the recent resumption of atmospheric nuclear tests by the Soviet Union and the United States.

Our first question concerns the relation between the radiation protection guides (RPG) promulgated by the Federal Radiation Council and the incidence of radioactive fallout as a result of nuclear weapons testing.

At the 1960 hearings, Dr. Chadwick, then secretary of the FRC, was asked by Mr. Holifield whether the new radiation protection guides applied to "problems which may develop in relation to fallout." His response was: "Sir, as indicated in the testimony, special problems would require special consideration by the Council."

When requested by the committee to further clarify this matter, the Federal Radiation Council commented as follows: "The Council is aware that the numerical values of the radiation protection guides and radioactivity guides may also be interpreted to apply to normal peacetime situations in contrast to 'normal peacetime operations.' When used in this way, the guides may be considered to define environmental levels consistent with normal peacetime situations based on the levels of environmental radioactivity regardless of its source. In this sense, the graded series of ranges related to the intake of radioactive materials provided in Report No. 2 may be taken to indicate the general conditions under which special consideration must be given and possible corrective actions considered."

The testimony on this point at our recent hearings continued to be clouded. The testimony of Dr. Russell Morgan implied that countermeasures should be ordered when radiation doses reached, or showed signs of reaching, the levels prescribed in the radiation protection guides. The thrust of the recent National Advisory Committee on Radiation (NACOR) report is to the same effect.

Surgeon General Terry's statement, in releasing the NACOR report, was as follows: "If daily intakes are above this level (range II of the radiation protection guide) and into range III and are likely to persist, then exceeding the radiation protection guide becomes a distinct possibility, and in such circumstances countermeasures are to be considered."

It is thus the implication of the Surgeon General's statement, the NACOR report, and Dr. Morgan's testimony, that the FRC's radiation protection guides may be applicable in determining when unacceptable concentrations of radioactive nuclides from fallout have been reached.

On the other hand, we have seen plain evidence from the introduction to Report No. 1 of the Federal Radiation Council that, "Only peacetime uses of radiation which might affect the exposure of the civilian population are considered at this time." Report No. 2 repeated the statement contained in Report No. 1 that, "The guides recommended herein are appropriate for normal peacetime operations."

Furthermore, the guides have been repeatedly described as consistent with, and based on, the same evidence as NCRP levels and recommendations, which are universally acknowledged to be based on nonmilitary activities.

Moreover, testimony at our hearings, particularly that of Dr. Gordon M. Dunning of AEC, emphasized that the radiation protection guides are based on a balancing of risk against benefit in the context of peacetime operations and that to use them in deciding when to invoke countermeasures against fallout is an "improper use of those guides." Dr. Dunning emphasized that the questions of the applicability of the guides to fallout "should be clarified at once before there is further confusion and before there may be an ill-advised action taken by some regulatory body."

We deem it of utmost importance to have your response to the following questions:

1. Are the numerical values of the radiation protection guides established by the Federal Radiation Council the sole or principal criteria now used in evaluating when undesirable levels of radioactive nuclides from fallout have been reached?

2. If so, is this use of the present numerical values of the guides sufficient to indicate when and what action is appropriate to protect public health?

3. If not, is the development of further or supplementary criteria needed; and if so, is it the responsibility of the Federal Radiation Council or of the Public Health Service or others to develop and implement such criteria?

You are undoubtedly aware that the chairman of the Joint Committee, in a letter to the President dated January 16, 1962, suggested that the FRC should review the possible effect of fallout from proposed U.S. testing. We, of course, do not necessarily believe that the FRC guides should constitute the criteria if they were not so intended. However, we do believe that all significant additions of radioactivity to the environment including fallout should be reviewed by the FRC and evaluated against appropriate standards.

The other important matter left open after our hearings is, where does the legal responsibility and authority lie for invoking countermeasures?

During the testimony of the Surgeon General, he was asked the following question by the committee staff: "Does the Public Health Service have the legal authority to initiate such countermeasures as banning the sale of fresh milk and requiring special processes to decontaminate foodstuffs?"

His reply was: "We certainly have the responsibility for the surveillance and for making the recommendations. I am not absolutely certain just exactly where our legal authority is or how far our legal authority extends."

It was noted in the hearings that the actual implimentation of countermeasures would have to be accomplished by State health authorities, but no indication was given as to whether the States have the necessary authority and means of administration to accomplish the countermeasures.

We believe it is extremely important that this matter be clarified, in order to alleviate public concern over the hazards of ionizing radiation and to minimize the possibility of uncoordinated and ill-advised actions being taken should certain radionuclides reach undesirable levels in the environment.

We wish, therefore, to request your views on the current status of legal authority and responsibility for invoking counter-measures or taking any other action, including any recommendations you may have in this regard.

Because we regard these matters as being of considerable importance and urgency, we would request your consideration at the earliest possible date. To that end we would like to suggest that our respective staffs should meet together on June 21 or June 22 to explore these problems further.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Melvin Price,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation.
Chet Holifield, *Chairman.*

Congress of the United States,
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
August 16, 1962.

Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones,
Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Jones: This is with further reference to our letter of June 18, 1962, to Secretary Ribicoff concerning the need for a reevaluation of the radiation protection guides established by the Federal Radiation Council and a further examination of the administrative means and legal authority for invoking countermeasures.

The urgency of this review is pointed up by the recent resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing by the Soviet Union and reports of sharp increases in radioiodine levels in Nevada and Utah from U.S. tests. The latter situation, as you know, caused local public health officials in Utah to invoke plans for the diversion of fresh milk into forms carrying lower levels of radioactivity. Recent newspaper reports state that this action by the Utah officials "came as a complete surprise to the U.S. Public Health Service" and was not coordinated with appropriate Federal officials.

You will recall that in our letter of June 18 that we stated: "We believe that it is extremely important that this matter be clarified, in order to alleviate public concern over the hazards of ionizing radiation and to minimize the possibility of uncoordinated and ill-advised actions being taken should certain radionuclides reach undesirable levels in the environment."

The recent evens in Utah demonstrate the very real importance of our earlier admonition. Moreover, in view of the resumption of Soviet atmospheric testing, we believe that incidents such as this may likely occur in the future in widely scattered portions of the United States. It is therefore important that the Federal Radiation Council proceed without delay with the consideration called for in our letter of June 18.

We do not imply that the current levels of radioactivity have reached a danger point. Indeed, we are satisfied that they are apparently within the current acceptable limits of the radiation protection guides. However, we are not convinced that these guides presently apply to fallout, nor that they should apply to fallout as presently set forth. We are heartened by the recent panel report of the National Academy of Sciences which indicates that no case of thyroid cancer ascribable to radioactive iodine has been found in man.

Thus, there is a necessity to clarify the meaning of the radiation protection guides in order that they may be understood by the public and by those officials of the Government who will have the responsibility for invoking countermeasures in the event radioactivity levels reach undesirable proportions. We do not want to see another cranberry emergency develop as a result of Government inertia or ill-timed action. Moreover, the authority under which these public officials act must have a clear legal basis, and efficient administrative machinery must be available to assure that any action taken will be prompt and well considered.

We hope that these matters will receive your prompt attention.

Sincerely yours,

Chet Holifield,
Chairman.
Melvin Price,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Research, Development and Radiation.

FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1962.
Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.
Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Research, Development and Radiation.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMEN: Your letter of June 18, 1962, points out that following the recent hearings of the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, there were unresolved questions concerning the application of radiation protection standards. Following the questions are comments of the Council.

No. 1. Are the numerical values of the radiation protection guides established by the Federal Radiation Council the sole or principal criteria now used in evaluating when undesirable levels of radioactive nuclides from fallout have been reached?

No. 2. If so, is this use of the present numerical values of the guides sufficient to indicate when and what action is appropriate to protect public health?

Comments on first two questions: No, the guides are not the sole criteria used in evaluating the significance of fallout.

Since there has been widespread misunderstanding concerning these guides, it may be useful to explain how they were developed and how they are to be used.

As you know, to be prudent we assume that there is always some slight risk to health from any level of radiation exposure however low. Hence, setting basic radiation protection guidance involves a balancing between the requirements of total health protection (which, ideally, would tolerate no exposure) and the promotion of the use of radiation and atomic energy to achieve worthwhile benefits (which may involve exposure). With this principle in mind, the guides were originally developed for application as guidelines for the protection of radiation workers and the general public against exposures which might result during "normal peacetime operations" in connection with the industrial use of ionizing radiation. In this connection, as noted in Chairman Ribicoff's letter of June 1 to you transmitting "Comments on the major unresolved questions concerning the Federal Radiation Council" the term "normal peacetime operations" referred specifically to the peaceful applications of nuclear technology where the primary control is placed on the design and use of the source. Since the numerical values in the guides were designed for the regulation of a continuing industry, they were of necessity set so low that the upper limit of range II can be considered to fall well within levels of exposure acceptable for a lifetime. Furthermore, to provide the maximum margin of safety, the upper limits of range II were related to the lowest possible level at which it was believed that nuclear industrial technology could be developed.

It is necessary to watch the buildup of exposure levels as radiation exposures occur. A 1-year cumulative total has been recommended for this purpose. Obviously, this 1-year span is an arbitrary measure, and no special significance should be attached to the precise cumulative exposure at the end of a 365-day period. Far more relevant are the sources of the exposure, their frequency and their likelihood of continuing.

The guides are not intended to be a dividing line between safety and danger in actual radiation situations. Nor are they intended to set a line at which protective action should be taken or to indicate what kind of action should be taken. Some actions might in some circumstances be appropriate at levels below the guides. Other actions might be completely inappropriate and even harmful except at levels many times above the guide levels.

While the guides were not specifically designed for fallout situations, they have some relevance for the assessment of fallout conditions. There is, of course, an essential difference between environmental radioactivity resulting from a long-term or permanent industrial operation and that related to intermittent production from individual weapons tests or series of weapons tests. With the former, it is predictable that introducion of radioisotopes into the environment will persist at a known rate throughout the life of the source. On the other hand, weapons tests are likely to be sporadic in nature and the radioactivity produced will rise at the time of testing and decline at varying rates for different isotopes after conclusion of a test or series of tests. While "normal peacetime operations," for which the guides were recommended as appropriate, imply that environmental radioactivity will persist at a predetermined level throughout the human lifetime, that from fallout is likely to be extremely variable.

As applied to fallout, the guides can be used as an indication of when there is a need for detailed evaluation of possible exposure hazards and a need to consider whether any protective action should be taken under all the relevant circumstances.

But once we are alerted to the need to consider protective action, the guides do not tell us when to act or what to do. These judgments require careful consideration of local conditions and the impact of available health protection measures. The Council believes that individual fallout situations require individual evaluation before specific action is taken. Such an evaluation must involve a careful examination of the source and magnitude and duration of the probable exposure levels as well as a careful evaluation of the health significance of these probable exposures, and national security considerations are inevitably involved. The judgment as to when to take action and what kind of action to take to decrease exposure levels involves consideration of all of these factors. The guides have some relevance for making this judgment, but they do not and were never intended to provide the sole basis for deciding how and when to act. It must be kept in mind that radiation exposures anywhere near the guides involve risks so slight that countermeasures which themselves involve any slight hazard may have a net adverse rather than favorable effect on the public well-being.

In summary then, the guides are not intended to be a dividing line between safety and danger. We have assumed that there is some slight risk to health from any level of radiation exposure, however low, even at or below the low levels set by the guides. At the same time we do not believe there is any risk of a major health hazard until exposure levels are many times above the guide levels. For example, this is borne out in relation to iodine 131 by the report to the Federal Radiation Council of the National Academy of Sciences, "Pathological Effects of Tyhroid Irradiation," July 1962.

No. 3: If not is the development of further or supplementary criteria needed and if so is it the responsibility of the Federal Radiation Council or the Public Health Service or others to develop and implement such criteria?

Comment: There is a continuing need for the devolpment of guidance in this field. In accordance with Public Law 86–373, "The Council shall advise the President with respect to radiation matters, directly or indirectly affecting health, including guidance for all Federal agencies in the formulation of radiation standards and in the establishment and execution of programs of cooperation with States." The appropriate Federal agencies will develop specific modes of action in accordance with such guidance.

Your letter of June 18 mentioned another important matter left open after the hearings, that of the legal responsibility and authority for invoking countermeasures.

Within the Federal Government, authority now exists under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to control the shipment of adulterated food in interstate commerce. By definition, foodstuffs containing excessive radioactivity would be adulterated.

States have the authority to control intrastate distribution or sale of adulterated foods, which would include foodstuffs containing excessive amounts of radioactivity. State food and drug laws vary widely in their scope and adequacy with respect to the problem of radioactivity in foods. The Public Health Service has the general responsibility to recommend appropriate health protection measures to States and local authorities and to the general public.

In closing, on behalf of the Council, I should like to acknowledge the Joint Committee's responsible efforts to delineate problems relating to fallout requiring further study and clarification, and in promoting more widespread public understanding of the issues involved.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Chairman.

Least Known Military Unit Is in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, an interesting and little known fact about our national defense which highlights the loyalty and dedication of our Alaskan Eskimos is concisely set forth in an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of July 27 of this year. Having had personal knowledge of the admirable work of the Alaska Eskimo Scouts during World War II as the northernmost and westernmost unit of America's detection and warning system against enemy encroachment or attack, and knowing of the valuable services rendered by that group since World War II, it is inevitable that I desire to call this subject to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

The article in question follows:

LEAST-KNOWN MILITARY UNIT

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—The U.S. Navy twin-engine patrol bomber, with its 11-man crew, was flying at 8,000 feet near the United States-Soviet frontier at the mouth of the Bering Straits when two Red MIG's attacked out of the sun. With three of its crew wounded and his port engine afire, Lt. R. H. Fisher, the pilot, headed for St. Lawrence Island, the nearest land. It sits midway between Alaska and Siberia. He barely managed to make it, crashlanding on the rocky shoreline.

Within 20 minutes of crashing on one of the most isolated spots under the American flag, however, first aid was being given. Within another hour all of the men were on their way by boat to a hospital.

Behind this rapid rescue work were M. Sgt. Willis Walunga and Sfc. Clifford Iknokinok, two members of the Eskimo Scouts, one of America's most vital—and least known military units.

First organized in World War II, today there are two groups totaling 1,050 men, of these Far North warriors organized into the Alaska National Guard. With detachments in 57 villages and towns in western and northwestern Alaska, they are constantly on the alert for downed flyers and patrol work. They provide an unparalleled intelligence service.

In recent years they have spotted Soviet submarines, picked up radioactive debris to substantiate Soviet nuclear blasts in Siberia, and reported low-flying planes that have passed radar screens. Detachments of this unique National Guard force are stationed as far out as Little Diomede Island, just 2½ miles from Siberia.

Actually, as National Guardsmen, the scouts are only part-time soldiers. Most are full-time hunters and fishermen, running their trap lines on the lonely Alaska coast and offshore islands facing Siberia. But, even when not officially on duty, they are on the alert.

Just recently, an off-duty scout-hunter spotted three armed intruders approaching Little Diomede Island over the Bearing Sea ice. M. Sgt. David Trautham quickly organized his local Guard unit to investigate. The intruders fled back toward Siberia.

One of the great values of the Eskimo Scouts is their native ability to operate efficiently in Alaska's formidable cold, snow, and ice.

In a corner of our 49th State, where Uncle Sam rubs elbows with the Russian bear, these unsung Eskimos, filling in the chinks in the vast Alaskan coast defense network are America's first line of defense.

The Problems of State Taxation of Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, during the past year a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has been intensively engaged in a study of the problems of State taxation of interstate commerce. It has been my privilege to serve on that subcommittee. I believe that the work which it is doing is of considerable importance both to the business community of this country and to the fiscal structure of the States.

Recently Ben. F. Johnson, who is the dean of the Emory School of Law and who is also a member of the special subcommittee's advisory group, spoke to a meeting of the Southeastern Association of Tax Administrators. I believe that this speech by Dean Johnson is a clear and informative statement of the work of the subcommittee and some of the problems which confront it.

In order that all Members may have an opportunity to read Dean Johnson's remarks, I am submitting them for inclusion in the RECORD:

SPEECH OF BEN F. JOHNSON, DEAN OF THE EMORY UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, ATLANTA, GA., BEFORE THE SALES AND USE TAX SECTION OF THE SOUTHEASTERN ASSOCIATION OF TAX ADMINISTRATORS, JULY 22, 1962, AT NEW ORLEANS, LA. DEAN JOHNSON IS A MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY GROUP OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE

In selecting the topic "Current Status of Federal Legislation" for my part on this sales and use tax panel program I may have oversold what I am able to deliver. I feel that I am on the advisory group of the Subcommittee of Interstate Commerce somewhat to represent the viewpoint of State tax administrators and in a sense this is intended somewhat as a progress report.

We are in the midst of a tremendously important study project. When Jerome Hellerstein wrote in the April 1962 issue of the Journal of Taxation (pp. 246, 248): "We may be on the eve of the development of a significant new political institution in the accommodation of national and local interests under our Federal system," he described the situation well. History is in the making, and statesmanship of the very highest quality is required of all who participate and contribute to these developments. Jerome Hellerstein went on to say: "We [meaning tax administrators and tax counsel] have a major responsibility to meet this challenge in its broadest political perspective—not as partisans—but as citizens with expertise in taxation seeking to find a solution to a basic issue contained in federalism," and from this we ought to realize that this project is a high and sacred undertaking worthy of the very best we can muster.

I assume that you are familiar with the Scripto decision and Public Law 86–272, as amended. The mandate of this law is "to make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the taxation of interstate commerce by the States" and to make recommendations to Congress based on those studies. By the act approved April 21, 1962 (Public Law 87–435, 76 Stat. 55) the time for the final report was extended from July 1, 1962, until July 1, 1963.

You know, of course, the project is under the authority of the Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Judiciary Committee. The chairman of the subcommittee is Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana. If you have read the report of the hearings held last December, I think you will agree that Representative WILLIS has been masterful in his conduct of these proceedings.

The advisory group appointed to assist the staff merits your complete confidence. There are 10 members of this group, and together they bring to the task a rich experience in the State tax field. We have had two meetings and I am convinced of their sincere desire to find a fair and workable solution to the problems of State and local taxation of interstate operators.

The staff assigned to the project consists at present of five lawyers and three economists led by Mr. Murray Drabkin. My personal observation is that these men are dedicated to the task without predisposition.

I am convinced that those charged immediately with this responsibility are carrying out the task without fear or favor. They are not going to be stampeded by pressures from any group, and they are not going to be satisfied with half-truths, shibboleths, and vague assertions of injury and disaster. They may have come late upon the scene, but their intense concentration and comprehensive overview these past 18 months have made them experts in this field. There will be no wool pulled over their eyes by anyone or any group, and I suspect they have become very sensitive to wool by this time.

I am fully aware of the general opposition among State tax administrators to any congressional action. I have been somewhat out of touch with you for a year now, and this attitude may have changed somewhat by this time. I hope so. I want to get across to you what I really have come to believe, that is, that the present proceedings in Congress are altogether different from those which led up to the enactment of Public Law 86–272. In the present situation the contention on the part of State tax administrators that congressional action is unnecessary is about as absurd in one direction as the contention on the part of taxpayers that Congress should reaffirm the complete immunity of interstate commerce is in the other. There are two sides to this matter, and solutions can be found somewhere in between. I believe the present proceeding will come up with solutions which will balance the conflicting interests, and when this is done it will be a victory for both sides, and none but the selfish will begrudge the achievement.

In April the advisory group met in Washington to consider and identify the major problems arising from sales and use taxes as they relate to transactions in and related to interstate commerce. Three areas of difficulty were suggested: (1) The possible multiple incidence of such taxes imposed by more than one State on the same transaction; (2) the problems of enforcement faced by States which impose such taxes; and (3) the costs and burdens of compliance borne by sellers who ship goods into a number of States or cities which impose sales and use taxes and which require these sellers to collect and remit the tax.

Neither the subcommittee, nor its staff, nor the advisory group, has yet determined that these problems exist to an extent which warrants legislation. The attitude is simply this: let's find out the extent to which these problems exist. The subcommittee is now conducting a series of hearings to find out as much as possible about this.

On the question of compliance costs, you will be interested to know that the subcommittee's staff has recognized that a questionnaire is not an effective means of securing cost figures. They have planned an additional program. They propose to ask 100 companies, representing various industry groups and size classes, located all over the United States, to analyze its compliance costs according to certain guidelines and to present these costs in a specified format. A subcommittee accountant will then interview the person who prepared the study to assure that the company's costs have been allocated on a basis comparable to that of others. This program of on-the-spot cost interviews is now in process.

The point of all this is to find out the facts.

Mr. Murray Drabkin, chief counsel for the subcommittee at the recent NATA meeting said: "the subcommittee will treat demands for restrictions on the taxing power of the States objectively and critically. This means that the subcommittee will act only if it has been clearly and convincingly demonstrated that the national interest requires Federal action. This also means that if the subcommittee does recommend Federal action, its choice of action will be made only after it has fully weighed the impact of its decision upon the States."

I am convinced that this is a sincere statement. And I am not convinced that either tax administrators or tax counsel are equally as sincere in their efforts. Many tax counsel, I think, feel that the subcommittee work is no more than a necessary formarility preliminary to a showdown of political power which they expect to win by turning on a pressure campaign similar to that which followed the *Northwestern-Stockham* decision and culminated in Public

Law 86-272. I think they are in for a jolt. On the other hand, many tax administrators, particularly in this part of the country, have equated this resort to congressional action with Federal court intervention in segregation and apportionment cases. They want none of it. I think this comparison is untenable and unfortunate. Both tax counsel and tax administrators seem to view this resort to congressional action as inevitably increasing the centralization of power in the Federal Government. In my opinion this is a premature assumption which consciously or subconsciously retards progress toward solutions. I say again that this is a tremendously important project, and statesmanship of the highest order is required of us all. It will be a shame to assume that no good can come from this study and that it is not worth our very best effort.

I can see at least three areas in which State tax administrators ought to welcome the good offices of Congress in the sales and use tax field. First, in dealing with what might be called the small business problem; second, the problem of double taxation generated by interstate movement; and third, the problem of enforcement and collection against nonresidents.

The small business problem, as seen by the taxpayer, is often referred to as the exorbitant burden of compliance. Actually, it is the same problem tax administrators deal with as unproductive accounts. It is the same coin viewed from different sides: what can be done for the taxpayer? What can be done about the account where the costs of compliance and administration will undoubtedly exceed the tax liability?

As to this problem, what can be the objection to prescribing by statute a rule of de minimis, or similar device, based on some quantitative criterion?

I submit that there is a precedent of a sort for this in the casual sale exemption. The real reason for the casual sale exemption which appears in most sales tax acts, I suspect, is the disproportionate compliance and administrative costs compared with the revenue potential in this type of transaction. This is a qualitative criterion, but the principle is the same.

Once we see that the principle has been accepted, we may more willingly seek a feasible extension to other areas of disproportionate compliance and administrative costs compared with the revenue potential.

The chief objection to a statutorily prescribed rule of de minimis, as I understand it, is that it would result in discrimination against local vendors who get no such concession. But this is not insurmountable; there are ways this can be eliminated.

Leonard Kust and Graham Sale in an article in the Virginia Law Review (vol. 46, pp. 1290, 1324) make a suggestion that would answer this objection. Their idea is to allow the vendor's own State the exclusive right to tax his sales shipped to other States wherein his volume of business does not come up to the minimum. This is worth exploring.

Perhaps even simpler, establish a minimum volume of sales into a State and absolve an out-of-State vendor of his usual obligations to that State, if he so elects, by filing with its tax officials a prescribed uniform return and paying therewith a uniform flat fee tax calculated to be a reasonable approximation of the tax due on such a volume. Actually legislation along this line is no more than offering on an optional basis a degree of simplification in tax returning, and this is something which might well be extended to local vendors. Optional taxation based on estimates is a coming procedure, and it might well be given a chance here.

My point is that the benefit of this type of development is not to business alone; it will benefit both business and tax administrators, and there should be a general interest in bringing it about.

In my own limited experience the taxation of both the sale and the use of property involved in interstate commerce and movement is a problem that needs attention, and one that will not be solved, in my opinion, short of Federal legislation or court action. To me this double taxation is somewhat like a jurisdictional dispute between two labor unions. I simply cannot believe that fair-minded tax administrators will not welcome relief from having to participate in this patent perversion of the compensating use tax which, in my opinion, poses a threat to the whole system of collecting a consumption tax at the most efficient and effective point; namely, at the point of sale. Those States which have rejected reciprocity may yet kill the goose that lays the golden eggs for all the States. And if Federal legislation can eliminate this threat, we ought to be for it.

Finally, I think the States can use Federal legislation to aid them in out-of-State audits and collections. You know the problems here; the need for some process to compel production of records; full faith and credit for assessments. Will these not help in the effective administration of your taxing laws? I think so.

American Wool Month Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, American Wool Month will be observed in September, a month which is the forerunner of colder weather and the winter season, and when the thoughts of our people are directed to wearing apparel which is appropriate to the colder months. This is inevitably associated with wool products and wool manufacturing.

This observance serves to remind us that wool processing is among the oldest of American industries, even predating the Revolution. Sheep were included among the necessities brought to the New World by its first settlers.

It is well known that American-made woolen fabrics are truly prestige quality products and that the industry plays an important and an essential role in the Nation's economy.

As a Representative of New England, I have a special interest in the success, the prosperity, and the survival of this great American industry. More than 50 percent of all woolens and worsteds made in the United States are manufactured in New England. The textile industry ranks first in the region's manufacturing industries, employing about 200,000 workers, and it is vital to the economy of New England that this employment be maintained or expanded.

The present volume of business in the domestic industry does not mean that its operations are profitable. Prices are driven down by the intense competition of low-wage countries abroad.

The new duty rate of 38 percent ad valorem instituted last year is not an effective control over excessive imports. Moreover, it applies only to woven cloths and does not include wool tops, yarn, knit goods, and apparel.

The industry seeks relief through mandatory quotas on imports. This is urgent and essential if this great industry is to survive and provide needed jobs for thousands of people. I hope the administration will act promptly to control these massive imports which threaten to ruin the American wool industry.

It needs protection to survive. It should be given promptly and effectively.

Senator James H. Kyle: Father of Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to celebrate Labor Day on September 3, I feel that it is most fitting and proper to draw attention to a very fine article written by one of my constituents, Mr. Fred Marshall, of Cedarville, Ohio—located in the Seventh Ohio District—relative to another native of Cedarville, the late Senator James H. Kyle, one of South Dakota's early and outstanding U.S. Senators, and author of the legislation which established Labor Day as a legal holiday 68 years ago.

Senator Kyle, who was also an ordained minister, was born in Cedarville, Greene County, Ohio, in 1854 of hardy pioneer stock, already deep-rooted in that community, and migrated to Illinois with his family as a small boy of 10. Years later, following his graduation from Ohio's Oberlin College, Reverend Kyle settled with his young bride in Aberdeen, S. Dak., and in 1891, at the age of 37, he was elected U.S. Senator from South Dakota as a candidate of the Independent Party.

Senator Kyle served in the U.S. Senate until his death in 1901. He was a friend of laboring men in a great many ways and toiled unceasingly in their behalf throughout his years in public service. In the past, along with Senator LAUSCHE, of Ohio, and ex-Governor Sharpe, of South Dakota, I have journeyed to Cedarville to pay tribute to Senator Kyle at Labor Day ceremonies held there, and I am pleased to insert Mr. Marshall's article, which I have condensed somewhat, in the RECORD on this occasion so that we may again be reminded of Senator James H. Kyle, the "father of Labor Day," and of his great work in behalf of the proper recognition of labor:

In his first years in Federal office Senator Kyle made no assertive play for public acclaim but he applied himself to his responsibilities with the same diligence and dedication which had marked his career as a clergyman. Within 2 years he was made chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. It was a field in which he was especially fitted and he must be given credit for noteworthy progress in this program in a period when public interest lagged. He fought for more and better schools and became a stanch champion of the workingman.

So it was that on June 28, 1894, President Grover Cleveland signed an act which culminated from the bill introduced by Senator James Kyle in the 53d Congress and documented as "S. 730." This act established Labor Day as a legal holiday and is recorded in the following language: *"Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the first Monday in September in each year, being the day celebrated and known as labor's holiday, is hereby made a legal public holiday to all intents and purposes, in the same manner as Christmas, the 1st of January, the 22d day of February, the 30th of May, and the 4th of July are made by law public holidays."

Senator Kyle was elected for a second term in 1897 and the following year was made Chairman of the first Industrial Commission. His labor on this project, which consumed 19 bulky volumes, is said to have broken his health and he suffered a cerebral hemorrhage while on a mission to Cleveland. He labored a year longer and died at his home in Aberdeen in July 1901.

Earlier that same year, as if he had a premonition of death, he arrived unannounced at Cedarville and sought out his schoolboy chum, Andrew "Doc" Cresswell who, as a boy, had followed the Kyle caravan to the end of the Kyle road when it took off for the West.

The two old friends spent many hours at the Creswell farm reminiscing and visited the old Samuel Kyle homestead and the little one-room Kyle District School. "Doc" Creswell outlived James Kyle many years for he rounded out a full 100. And perhaps had it not been for him no one in the Cedarville neighborhood would have taken note that one of its own sons was the true "father of Labor Day." Ironically it was during a 1944 Labor Day homecoming celebration in the village that this bit of history was revealed.

"Doc" Creswell, already well into his 90's, on this day casually turned north on the main road from his long farm lane in his ancient model T. He hadn't missed a day making this trip to town for longer than he could remember.

On this particular first Monday in September he had a special mission. Thus, upon reaching the throng-packed community park, he threaded his way through the crowd to seek out the program chairman on the platform.

"Look here," demanded "Doc" to the mayor and master of ceremonies. "Do you fellows have any idea who founded Labor Day?" His honor admitted that he did not. "Well," asserted "Doc," "he was Jimmy Kyle—Senator James Henderson Kyle—and he was a Cedarville boy and there is no doubt about that either."

The mayor appeared to weigh the matter briefly but decided that in light of program arrangements, "Doc's" announcement was a bit awkward, if not inopportune. So Cedarville did not honor its notable Labor Day founder on that occasion in 1944.

However, in following years a number of great Americans, including Senators, Representatives, and former Governors, have traveled to the little village of Cedarville to pay tribute to Senator Kyle on Labor Day.

Strange as it may seem, there is no monument, no plaque or historical marker either in Cedarville or anywhere else to commemorate Senator Kyle's noteworthy contribution. But right down to age 100 "Doc" Creswell kept insisting that there should be.

Twenty-two Million Veterans Get Improved Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting and enlightening editorial of interest to veterans and their families, which appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., on August 26, 1962:

TWENTY-TWO MILLION VETERANS GET IMPROVED SERVICE

Most people have no idea that the Veterans' Administration is larger than United States Steel, General Electric, or most industrial giants and big Government agencies.

But to our 170,000 employees the challenge of efficiently running a big business for 22 million veterans and their dependents makes up for the lack of fanfare.

This challenge includes operating 170 hospitals, administering the Nation's third largest ordinary life insurance enterprise, disbursing 53.5 billion annually in compensation and pension payments to approximately 5 million ex-servicemen or their widows and orphans, and assisting veterans with more than 150,000 home loans each year.

VA's stabilizing influence on the national economy was dramatically illustrated early in 1961. President Kennedy called for accelerated payment of $250 million regular yearly dividend to VA GI insurance policyholders. VA responded by disbursing it in 6 weeks.

Primarily, this money was a return to veterans of part of GI insurance premiums not needed because veterans were living longer than had been anticipated in the actuary tables.

The increasing age of veterans leads to a major problem. Veterans have reached the age where they require an increasing amount of hospitalization. More than 500,000 go into VA hospitals each year. Three times as many are treated in VA's 91 outpatient clinics.

To accommodate this increasing responsibility, VA is modernizing its permanent hospital buildings and replacing temporary buildings. At the same time, VA, largely through improved hospital management, is treating more patients with about the same facilities. In 1961, VA hospitals treated 28,000 more patients than in 1960, and will treat 30,000 more in 1962 than in 1961. This gain is equivalent to operation of nine 500-bed hospitals.

.Increased hospital utilization is partly due to a decline in tuberculosis and the conversion of one VA tuberculosis hospital to general medical and surgical facilities. This has resulted in a great measure from VA medical research in improved drug therapy for tuberculosis.

Training provided World War II and Korean veterans has helped more than 11 million veterans obtain better jobs. Gains in income taxes on increased earnings more than pay the cost of the GI training programs.

The department of veterans benefits administers vocational rehabilitation and education, GI loans, guardianship, and compensation and pension payments through 67 regional offices in the 50 States, Washington, D.C., the Philippines, and Puerto Rico. While the education program is nearing completion, the GI loan program currently is increasing in volume of business. VA estimates more than 168,000 GI loans will be closed during 1962, 25 percent above the previous year. The guardianship program supervises estates of some 400,000 minors and incompetents valued at $700 million.

VA employs 170,000 professional, white-collar employees in accordance with the President's fair employment policy. Twenty-three percent of VA's full-time employees are Negroes. In this area, and in the employment of the physically handicapped, VA leads all Federal employers.

VA uses efficient tools of management, including automatic data processing. Although difficulty was encountered in converting VA's large insurance and benefits payment, the problems have been solved.

Railroad Poverty Myth Should Be Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 of this year I called the attention of the Congress to the phony cry of the railroads that they were losing money. When I picked up my newspaper on Monday, August 13, I was most gratified to see a full page ad exposing the railroad's poverty myth. There is an old and true saying that figures do not lie. This ad cites figures from impartial sources including the railroads themselves showing that investors, the actual owners of the railroads, have and are now earning not just a fair return, but a lavish return on their investments.

All have received good dividends in over the last 20 years; in some instances a hundred dollars has earned thousands in dividends and the stock at today's market can be cashed in for more than 40 times its cost purchase price 20 years ago.

If that is poverty, I would like to be as poor as the railroads.

While declaring lush dividends the railroads have been piling up their assets at a great rate. The Interstate Commerce Commission's annual transportation statistics show that in the 20 years between 1940 and 1960 the capital surplus and retained income of all the railroads in the United States rose from $2.8 billion to $11.4 billion. And that, may I add, in spite of the high salaries of railroad presidents and other executives and the enormous amounts paid out in bond interest and other charges.

The railroad plea of poverty has been tied to another myth, the perennial plaint that featherbedding—allegedly too many employees—is the main reason for railroad poverty.

If their first charge is a myth, and you have heard the proof, it goes without saying that so-called featherbedding must be a myth, too.

Proof that the featherbedding charge is a fabrication comes from the mouth of the railroads' own advocates. James M. Symes, then president, now board chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad, compared manpower requirements of all forms of transportation in testifying before this House's Armed Services Subcommittee on Transportation in July 1959. He testified that only 3,220 man-days were required to move 100,000 tons of freight between San Francisco and New York. To move the same tonnage by other means took 43,416 man-days by highway; 36,708 by propeller plane; 13,008 by jetplane and 11,158 by water.

The record is clear. And so is the duty of Congress.

I respectfully call this to the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Representative OREN HARRIS, as an urgent matter for investigation by his committee. I am sure that under his able direction the truth will be ferreted out. It is high time that lies and misrepresentation should be exposed.

Let us waste no time in getting at the truth. The country must know whether the railroads are deluding the public and themselves. The workers whose jobs are imperiled are entitled to the unvarnished facts. And the railroads themselves, if brought to face facts instead of fiction, might find themselves free to go ahead instead of slipping back.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the text of this advertisement, which is sponsored by the Railway Labor Executives' Association, in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

RAILROAD POVERTY MYTH SHOULD BE EXPOSED

Railroads have been crying poverty for a long time. "Poverty" is management's own diagnosis and management would like to write its own prescriptions. The railroads use their alleged plight in an attempt to create a favorable climate for escaping regulation, for smoothing the way for monopolistic mergers and consolidations, for reducing service and eliminating jobs. An example of how the railroads plead poverty as an excuse for attacking their employees is seen in a statement made at a recent press conference by J. E. Wolfe, chief spokesman for railroad corporation negotiators. He said, "The Nation's railroads, determined to end the featherbedding that is driving them into bankruptcy, have notified the unions today (July 17) that all the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission will be made effective on August 16, 1962."

FACTS DON'T SHOW POVERTY OR FEATHERBEDDING

Investors are reaping big profits

Look at these returns, as of May 21, 1962, on a $100 investment made in 1942 in railroad stocks:

Railroad	1962 value of $100 investment	Dividends paid on $100 investment	Total worth of $100 investment
Atlantic Coast Line	$488	$441	$929
Baltimore & Ohio	900	495	1,395
Chesapeake & Ohio	193	237	430
Delaware & Hudson	567	891	1,458
Great Northern	410	418	828
Illinois Central	2,000	1,340	3,340
Lehigh Valley	200	157	357
Louisville & Nashville	207	334	541
Milwaukee Road	240	340	580
New York Central	200	187	387
Nickel Plate Road	3,500	1,757	5,257
Norfolk & Western	269	208	477
Northern Pacific	1,267	834	2,101
Pennsylvania	83	135	218
Reading	100	248	348
Santa Fe	625	508	1,133
Seaboard	560	416	976
Southern Pacific	1,300	810	2,110
Southern	2,750	1,345	4,095
Union Pacific	533	382	915
Western Maryland	4,200	1,150	5,350
Western Pacific	250	177	427

Sources: Moody's Handbook of Widely Held Common Stocks and Monthly Stock Digest, June 1962, published by Data Digests, Inc.

Railroad workers lead in output

CHICAGO.—The ton-mile ouput of railroad employees is the highest of any form of transportation, as shown in statistics published by Railway Age, the railroad industry's magazine of news, analysis, and interpretation. The average freight-service employee of a railroad out-produces his motor carrier counterpart almost 6 to 1.

Ton-miles per rail employee double

"Annual revenue ton-miles per rail employee have climbed from 333,000 in 1939 to 727,000 in 1960."—Annual report on transport statistics for the year ended December 31, 1960, Interstate Commerce Commission.

Rail man-hour revenue units soar

"Revenue traffic units per rail man-hour actually worked have risen from 731.9 in 1936, to 1,488.6 in 1960."—ICC, transport statistics in the United States, statements M-220, M-300.

Railroad manpower most efficient

A comparison of manpower requirements to move 100,000 tons of freight between New York and San Francisco:

Method of Transport	*Man-days required*
Highway	43,416
Air (propeller)	36,708
Air (jet)	13,008
Water	11,158
Railroad	3,220

SOURCE.—Testimony of James M. Symes, president (now board chairman) of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., before the Subcommittee on Transportation, House Committee on Armed Services, hearings on the adequacy of transportation in the event of mobilization, July 1959.

CONGRESS SHOULD INVESTIGATE

Is the railroad industry healthy today? Railroad management seems to say "yes" at one time and "no" at another, depending on who's listening. Individual railroad corporation financial statements to their stockholders contradict the poverty picture the carriers in association seek to paint as the public image of the industry.

It is essential that the truth be brought to light before the industry is further contracted through mergers, passenger train reductions, freight service curtailments, and wholesale layoffs of employees. The logical way to do this is by congressional investigation.

There hasn't been a full investigation of the financial structure of the railroad industry since the Truman-Wheeler probe in the 1930's. That investigation revealed that the railroads had evaded the law flagrantly by acquiring control of other railroads through such devices as holding companies.

This year, the President's transportation message to Congress pointed up the importance of railroads to the national economy and the country's military security. Railroad workers heartily agree.

Railroad workers now urge Congress to take a new and thorough look into the industry, its public service functions, and its financial structure and to expose once and for all the poverty myth.

Railroad Labor Executives' Association: American Railway Supervisors' Association, American Train Dispatchers' Association, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Hotel & Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, International Association of Machinists, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, International Brotherhood of Firemen & Oilers, International Organization Masters, Mates & Pilots of America, National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Railroad Yardmasters of America, Railway Employees' Department, AFL–CIO, Seafarers' International Union of North America, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, Switchmen's Union of North America, and the Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

Business Purchasing Decisions and Inventory Fluctuations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article, by Mr. A. N. Wecksler, which appeared in Purchasing magazine, August 13, 1962. Mr. Wecksler reviews for purchasing agents some of the highlights of the recent Joint Economic Committee hearings on inventory fluctuations.

The text of the article fellows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE HEARINGS POINT UP NEED FOR MORE INVENTORY INFORMATION

With the economy picking a tortuous path toward recession, the recent week-long congressional hearings on inventory trends highlighted the P.A.'s role in the business cycle.

The Joint Economic Committee concluded that a greater understanding of the inventory cycle was considered desirable. It was suggested that increased knowledge about inventory trends would enable Government and industry to make more enlightened business decisions.

This point of view was clearly expressed during the Joint Economic Committee hearings by Martin R. Gainsbrugh, chief economist, National Industrial Conference Board:

"The primary weaknesses in inventory policy currently stem from the inability of business enterprises to forecast correctly and from other factors, such as labor conflicts, over which they have no control. Better knowledge of existing stocks would undoubtedly contribute toward further improvement in inventory policy. We need, for example, more reliable information on inventory statistics at the commodity level, particularly for such key commodities as steel.

"At the aggregate level it would be helpful to have estimates of inventory stock in current and constant prices, as compared with the book value aggregates we now have. More information and analysis would seem desirable about the bulge in inventories of goods in process of nondurable goods producers."

A banker's view of the difficulties of achieving exactness in inventory control was offered by Norman Robertson, First National City Bank, New York City, who told the Joint Economic Committee: "Accurate sales forecasting holds the key to more effective control of inventories, yet predictions of precise turning points in sales or economic activity have proved to be elusive goals for the forecaster and are likely to remain so."

William McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, discredited any thinking that the cost and availability of credit is a predominant influence on inventory policy.

Of greater weight in the decisionmaking on inventory policy, said Martin, are such factors as expected sales trends, the volume of incoming orders, backlogs of unfilled orders, the level of production, the presence or absence of materials shortages, and expected price changes.

FINANCING INVENTORIES

Martin went into some detail on how businesses finance their inventories, and explained that this was done in a wide variety of ways. He said that besides bank or other short—or intermediate—term borrowing, businesses can finance their inventories in the following ways: retained earnings; by issuing securities; incurring greater trade debts to suppliers; by drawing down cash and other liquid assets. "Even the reduction or postponement of plant and equipment outlays or the holding down of accounts receivable may provide inventory financing," said Martin. "In recent years, trade debt has become a prime vehicle with which financially strong businesses help finance inventories of customers who are unwilling or unable to resort to bank or other market borrowing."

On the key question of the feasibility of some form of direct control over bank lending for inventory purposes, Martin felt that it would be impractical. He testified: "I am very skeptical of the desirability or practicality of credit controls directed specifically toward inventory investment."

A Government economist's view was presented at the Joint Economic Committee meeting by Louis J. Paradiso, Assistant Director and Chief Statistician of the Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce. Paradiso made the following points:

1. Inventory investment has been a factor in all business declines, but not necessarily in initiating them.

2. Once a downturn is underway, shifts in inventory have tended to aggravate the extent of the decline.

3. Wide inventory swings occur mainly in stocks of durable goods manufacturers and in new passenger cars held by dealers. Elsewhere inventory changes have been moderate and usually closely geared to fluctuations in sales.

4. Speedup and cutback of Government programs have produced major shifts in inventory requirements—down through the entire chain of supply.

5. Labor disputes and the threat of strikes in major industries have produced major shifts in inventory requirements.

FORECASTING DIFFICULT

6. Business firms for the most part have not been able to gage accurately their inventory needs or their sales, and have at times found themselves with unbalanced stocks relative to sales.

7. More recently business firms have made some progress in controlling and limiting inventory investment relative to sales and production volume.

Department of Defense spokesmen indicated that military buying and military inventory accumulation should not be used as a counterbalance either to accelerate the economy or to slow down a boom.

The John Birch Society in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the controversial John Birch Society has had much publicity in this election year in Michigan. But very little is known about how it works. The Detroit Free Press Staffwriter Barbara Holliday was assigned to find out. Identifying herself only as a housewife, she applied for membership and has been an active member of the society since February.

The following report, in which she tells what goes on at a closed Birch meeting, is the first in a series of six:

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY IN MICHIGAN

On a snowy Friday night in February, I walked down a narrow flight of basement stairs and into the strange world of John Birch.

As I entered the harshly lighted basement where chapter 69 of the society was meeting, I knew that it would be months before I would walk back out of that world.

But I did not know as I took a place in a row of folding chairs and looked at the strangers around me that so many of these faces would drop their masks, that the stony stares would turn to friendly smiles, and that finally, I myself would become the nucleus in building a John Birch chapter.

You wonder at first if you are going to make a slip, somehow give yourself away. But each meeting has a set pattern, and as the routine becomes familiar, the long walk up the driveway grows shorter, and the steps to the basement begin to look like ordinary steps anywhere.

As I learned to walk in this strange company, the monthly meetings became landmarks. They were never announced in advance and I came to be prepared for a phone call with the message, "It's time for us to get together again."

Not long after, the call came on a weekend. The next meeting was set for the following Friday night.

I arrived a little early, handed my dues to the chapter leader ($1 monthly for women, $2 for men), checked the Birch projects I had completed on a form sheet, and gave back the book I had read from the approved list—"No Wonder We Are Losing," by Robert Morris.

Also, along with everyone else, I turned in my "Member's Monthly Message." This was a form sheet that arrived with a bulletin each month from the society's headquarters in Belmont, Mass.

It carried space for members to make complaints, suggestions or pledge support of projects directed by Robert Welch, founder of the society and still its leader.

This memo was turned over to the chapter leader in a small, sealed envelope along with a donation over and above the monthly dues. as suggested. My envelope contained $5.

The meeting was called to order.

Hands over our hearts, we stood and solemnly repeated the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Brian Kelly, leader of chapter 69, took his usual informal stance in front of us and picked up a discussion which had started before the meeting on the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren.

"Warren is trying to destroy our Constitution," he declared, "and turn this Republic into a socialized welfare state. He is going to have to be brought to account."

Beyond his shoulder I could see the American flag standing at the far end of the room.

Against one wall stood a table strewn with conservative books and pamphlets, including American Opinion, a monthly pocket-size magazine edited by Welch. Otherwise, except for the chairs we were sitting in, the room was bare.

Brian Kelly, slightly built and about 35. is the father of nine children, well educated and unemotional. His regular features seldom change expression.

His home, where our meetings were held, indicate his success. It is a substantial brick residence in an area of $20,000 to $30,000 homes bounded by Grand River and Southfield, off Schoolcraft. He is vice president of a paint and chemical company.

STUDENTS IN GROUP ATTENDING MEETING

Kelly prefers to call himself an "alarmed conservative." He has been a member of the Birch Society for 2 years and says he searched for like-minded people a long time before he found his way.

In the front row a woman turned to look at me. She was in her mid-forties, wearing a hat but no makeup. She was a visitor from another chapter.

Including 3 Wayne State University students, there were 12 persons in the room. most of them sitting behind me.

The men, for the most part, were well groomed, wearing white shirts, ties., suit jackets, neat breast-pocket handkerchiefs. Most were in the 30-to-50 age bracket.

A student asked for the Birch position on getting the United States out of the United Nations.

One of the men answered: "Did you know it's written in the U.N. Charter that there must always be a Russian commander in charge of U.N. forces? This was true in Korea and he was getting orders direct from the Kremlin."

(The commander in charge of U.N. forces in Korea was U.S. Gen. Douglas MacArthur.)

Heads nodded and an angry murmur agreed.

EDUCATION CALLED THE MAIN PURPOSE

Kelly suddenly launched into a little speech about the society.

"This is an educational group," he explained. "That is its main purpose—to educate and awaken thinking Americans.

"We have been accused of being a secret society. We are no more secret than any lodge group. Any of our publications are available in any newspaper library."

(If this was once true, it it no longer—Founder Welch says they can't afford it.)

A discussion broke out behind me.

"I don't agree with everything in John Birch," Morley was saying, "but it's the only place I can vote."

Ken F., a prosperous-looking strong-featured man who is a traveling representative for his firm, chimed in: "The smear campaign got me to thinking—if the society's so wrong, why is it drawing so much fire?"

"I have thought this way all my life," someone else offered.

Steve Crane, a tall, dominating figure who is now the leader of another chapter, punctuated it all dispiritedly: "I don't expect to see the conservatives win out in my lifetime but my son may have something to work with."

At this point, Kelly interrupted. There was a rare note of urgency in his voice.

"There isn't much time," he said. "What we get done is going to have to get done fast if we're to win out."

Here is a recurring theme with the Birchers.

As you get further inside the organization, this sense of alarm is perhaps the most tangible bond.

In this area, they are grimly serious people, deadly intent on saving, not the world, but America against the world—their own kind of America.

For all Birchers it is 5 minutes till midnight, and only they and the little silver-haired man in Belmont, Mass., understand the nature of the holacaust that is about to engulf the country.

The fear psychosis and the constant suspicion of conspiracy are the sure marks that divide the ultrarightist from the conservative.

"I wondered about that business with Deke Slayton (our grounded astronaut)," commented Ken.

"You know, a few days before they barred him for that heart murmur, he made a speech at a school in which he was critical of the administration. I'm not saying there is anything, but the doubt crossed my mind."

HUNGARIAN REVOLT CITED AS EXAMPLE

Kelly spoke up. "For a long time," he said, "I thought all the mistakes the Government was making just came from fumbling around.

"The thing that opened my eyes was the Hungarian revolution. We not only didn't raise a hand to help the freedom fighters, we actually helped the other side."

Here again is an area where John Birch leaves the gray conservative fold and steps into the stark black-and-white world of the radical.

In varying degrees, every Bircher believes that much of our Government policy is either consciously in sympathy with communism or is dominated in strategic places by Communist sympathizers—the "comsymps," as they call them—if not by actual card-carrying Communists.

There were no members in this particular group with pet peeves. When these are spotted, they are usually moved to isolated chapters. Any discussion of racism, for example, is forbidden.

So it was with some surprise that I heard a newcomer, Bob S., tell a story about the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Kelly had been called to the phone or I think the story would have been cut off.

THEN HE DECIDED TO JOIN BIRCHERS

Bob S. lives at James Couzens and Six Mile on Birwood. This area, he said, had been earmarked by the NAACP, which had moved in one family of Negroes.

"I stood on my front porch," he said, "and yelled 'Nairobi!' I didn't even swing my fist—but I got arrested for assault and was put on 2 years' probation."

"Was your Birch connection known?" I asked.

"I wasn't a member then," he replied. "After that happened, I decided I better do something—find a home."

Kelly came back from the phone. He listened for a moment, then closed off the discussion crisply: "This is a matter of reality. I work 25 years to get equity in a house—then these people come—and my property becomes x percent less valuable.

"I believe in helping the Negro all I can, but until he proves he carries responsibility with privilege, I don't want him as a next-door neighbor."

That was that.

MONTH'S PROJECTS MAPPED BY WELCH

For the next 30 minutes, Kelly reviewed the projects for the next month as listed by Welch in the bulletin.

These included a book for must reading; a condemnation of the National Council of Churches; a query about Peace Corps organization; obtaining conservative speakers for community meetings, and the standing agenda—recruiting, impeachment-of-Warren petitions, support of conservative candidates.

Such are the projects or Welch directives each month. They vary in subject matter, but very little in form.

Such, too, is a typical chapter meeting. The free-for-all discussions, the sense of urgency, the dedication to stop the clock before it's too late—and the projects.

It was obvious that the hard core of Birchism wasn't spending all of its time on such projects as these. There had to be something more.

Sick American Tells Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the Copley newspapers was reproduced in the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram on August 12 by editorial columnist Lawrence A. Collins. It is a good lesson for all who will read it:

SICK AMERICAN TELLS WHY HE IS

The following letter was sent by a resident of San Francisco to Paul A. Terry, director of education of the Copley newspapers:

"I am one of the Americans who heard Mr. Khrushchev tell our Nation that my great-grandchildren will grow up in a Communist world. For some time now this has bothered me. I am not a brave man—not even a big one. I suppose I would have to admit that I am, among my own neighbors and in my own culture, the typical, average, well-educated, genteel suburbanite, to whom family, the mortgage, and security have been the all-important items.

"I am now 50, and soon my wife and I will see the first of our three children married. I paint my own house, repair my own car, grub my own devil grass, and nurse a modest savings account at the Bank of America. I am a law-abiding man on the quiet side, and dissension makes me terribly nervous. Frankly, I am the kind who simply doesn't have it in him to fight anyone ever.

"My wife had me cleaning out an old trunk in the storage room the other day, and I ran across the huge old family Bible that I hadn't thought about for years. My great-grandmother had kept a journal of the trip across the Great Plains with a wagon and oxen when she and great-grandpa were youngsters coming out to settle in California in the great migration. Great-grandma wrote about it as the wild, new land, rich and abundant in mythical proportions.

"On the trail she wrote of sickness and hunger, and heat and cold, and dust and thirst, and the deaths and births like beads strung together on a thread of hope of freedom and a land of plenty for their children yet unborn. And when she viewed the new land she wrote in simple word pictures of the cities and farms and schools, and happiness that would someday bloom in the greatness of the vast new land. She wrote of her tomorrow and my today.

"The ink was badly faded, but the message was clear. As I read, I began to think about America and being an American and what it all stands for; and I thought about our enemies and what they intend to do to America, to those rich lands and farms, to the cities and the people, to its freedom and its hope.

"And, suddenly, I realized that I am a sick American. I mean really sick. I am sick of panaceas and of backing up. I am sick of reactions where there should be initiative. I am sick of bureaucrats who tell me that my enemy is not really my enemy, and that I should live together with murderers and tyrants. I am sick of government that hasn't the guts to clean traitors out of its own offices. And I'm sick of being a nice, patient guy about it. I am sick of placidly accepting excuses instead of successes; of being a silent gentleman for fear of controversy. I am sick of my country being ridiculed all over the world. I am sick of pink-livered politicians who place personal career above the fate of the flag.

"I am sick of 40 years of relentless, creeping, cancerous, communistic godlessness that never once has wavered from its avowed purpose of conquering that flag and seeing it trampled in the mud under Russian boots. I am sick of my genteel desire to stand pat and pray while the enemy advances.

"I am sick of educators who teach tolerance of subversion and of clergymen who would have me quail at the specter of battle and turn my cheek in fear of what our enemies might do.

"In all honesty, the thing of which I am most sick is the man who let these things come to me: myself.

"And by the living God who made me, sir, I am a sick American who intends to get well."

Spotlight on the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perplexing problems facing the United Nations today is what to do about the Arab refugees. This problem grows more costly every day—both in dollars and in wasted lives. We—the United States—must take the initiative in the United Nations to see that a solution is reached in the immediate future.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the American Examiner of August 2, 1962. The author, Mr. Saul Carson, reminds us that our dollars are going to support not only the material needs of the refugees but to support the propaganda of hatred toward Israel which emanates from Cairo.

The article follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON U.N.: AN OBSERVER'S CHALLENGING QUERY: WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT SOLVING THE ARAB REFUGEE ISSUE?

(By Saul Carson)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—A basic decision affecting the entire Middle East situation must be made by the United Nations General Assembly at its next session, opening September 18. And the decisive voice on that issue will be yours—i.e., if you consider yourself as having a voice in U.S. affairs.

The issue in question revolves around the Arab refugee question. You may not know it—but you have carried the main burden of supporting more than 10 million Arab refugees for upward of 12 years. You do that job through an agency of the United Nations called the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees.

UNRWA was established in 1950. Since then, it has spent close to $400 million. You, through the contributions of the U.S. Government, have consistently paid 70 percent of that bill.

To pin these figures down with accuracy, one must use the last full-year report available—for the year ending June 30, 1961 (another report, for the year ending June 30, 1962, is still in the drafting stage). From January 1, 1950 to June 30, 1961, UNRWA spent a total of $368,776,096.

Of the total, Government contributed $356,624,334 (the remainder coming from other sources). Of the total of $356,624,334, the U.S. Government had contributed $250,579,333. That's where you come in. That was your money, raised from Americans by taxation. So that's your stake in this issue—a sum which, by the end of the current year, will have reached well over $300 million.

What did that money buy? Your dollars bought two things. First, it helped keep these people alive; it gave them shelter, food, some vocational training (not nearly enough), some schooling for their children.

But you paid for something else too. Your money has made it possible for the leaders of Arab countries to keep alive among those refugees hatred toward Israel; the insistence that they must go back to their homes in Israel; the corollary insistence that sooner or later, somehow, by force if neecssary (that is, if Israel chooses not to commit suicide), Israel must be dissolved, liquidated(driven into the sea, wiped out. That, among other things, is what your dollars have bought.

Why must this issue come to a head this year? The reason is simple. UNRWA operates on a mandate from the General Assembly. That mandate has been extended at various times for varying terms. The current mandate expires next June 30. The 1962 session of the General Assembly must decide, prior to June 30, 1963, whether UNRWA's operations are to continue, with whose money, under what set of rules. If no decision were to be made by this year's Assembly—UNRWA would have to simply close shop.

There is not the slightest chance that UNRWA will actually have to fold its miserable tents. Somehow, its essential relief work must be continued. It is unthinkable that people will be allowed to starve to death, to sleep in the Arabian deserts, to be turned out of the living world without any care or help whatever. The world could not be that cruel, and the United States—you—could not allow that.

But, having accepted that premise on the basis of the simplest arithmetic of humaneness—you, the one who has been paying for the UNRWA program, certainly have the right to take a good, hard look at the entire problem. You have a right to ask questions: How many of these refugees are real, and how many are phony? What is being done to liquidate—not relief as such, but the problem itself? Is anything being done in that direction? Assuming, as all humane men must, that a million people should not be kept on the dole forever, what are we, those who bear the financial burden because we are humane, doing about the matter?

Let us see whether there are any answers to these questions. How many of the refugees are real? Their official numbers, as shown by the UNRWA registration rolls, have now reached the fantastic number of 1,151,024 (as of June 30, 1961; that number will be about 1,200,000 by the time the next set of figures is available).

How many refugees were there when the problem first faced the world, during Israel's defensive military actions against Arab warfare in 1948? Walter Pinner, a German scholar who has made the most exhaustive study of this problem, has shown that the number of genuine refugees did not exceed 539,000 in 1948. After accounting for those refugees who had become self-supporting (and therefore not eligible for relief), reckoning up those who voluntarily took themselves off the relief rolls by settling permanently in Arab countries, including those who have been readmitted to Israel under Israel's program permitting reunification of families and adding natural increase through births, the number still did not exceed in round numbers more than 550,000 by 1958.

UNRWA itself estimates that natural increase now adds about 30,000 souls a year; that gives another 120,000 since 1958—making a grand total of not more than 670,000. In other words, when the 1962 figure is supplied by UNRWA—it will show approximately twice as many refugees on the relief rolls as there possibly could be if the lists were genuine.

Who are all these extras? Many of them—at least 150,000—are dead. The UNRWA ration card in the Arab areas where the refugees live is a living currency. A ration card is never surrendered! People do die—but deaths are never reported and, thus, never recorded on the relief rolls. People do get jobs, others do establish themselves in business or agriculture or in some sort of service industry—they keep the ration cards. There are many other forms of just plain chiseling. But UNRWA goes on, year after year, and the numbers keep increasing, and the burden on the agency keeps growing—and you pay for it.

What is being done to liquidate the problem? The answer is brief: Nothing.

The South: Stagnation or Progress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on July 13 I introduced into the RECORD some quotes as well as some observations on an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal by their staff reporter, William E. Blundell. At that time I called attention to the serious roadblocks being thrown up against legislative union activities by various localities in the South. I stressed also the abusive use of so-called right-to-work legislation as well as the use of section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act which appears to be the peg used by many of these communities on which to hang their antiunion hats. It has long been the contingent of those of us who believe in free enterprise, including free labor, that this restrictive covenant and Taft-Hartley coupled with State right-to-work laws are distinct and severe detriment to the economic expansion so necessary if this Nation is to survive as an industrial complex.

There were some who criticized my approach and particularly the right-to-work committee spokesman who, sincerely or otherwise, preached the doctrine that the right-to-work legislation is beneficial to the working people of this country.

In the New York Times dated July 28, 1962, Philip Shabecoff covered the situation in the State of Virginia under an article headed "Virginia Is Luring Industries as New Drive Gets Underway."

Not to quote the entire article, but to substantiate my position, I quote from the article remarks and attitudes attributed to Governor Harrison in the following statement:

> The program will stress the natural resources and favorable business climate to persuade industry to take up residence in Virginia.

"One of the most important of these advantages, the Governor believes, is the State's right-to-work law. Because of the law, national labor unions lack strength in Virginia and the percentage of time lost to industry through strikes is the lowest in the Nation," he asserted.

Coupled with that, an article by Dr. Paul A. Brinker in the AFL–CIO American Federationist, headed "The South: Stagnation or Progress?"

The article follows:

THE SOUTH: STAGNATION OR PROGRESS?

(By Dr. Paul A. Brinker, professor of economics at the University of Oklahoma)

The Governors of 16 Southern States recently put their heads together in a search for solution of a problem that for many years has plagued the economy of the region.

"Why," the Governors asked, "does the South's per capita income continue to remain less than 70 percent of the national average despite impressive economic growth during the past two decades?"

The Governors pondered the problem and came up with this answer: Most of the industries that have come to the South pay low wages. If the South replaces low-wage industries with plants that pay high wages, per capita income would catch up with the national average and the South would prosper.

This is how they dealt with the complex problem in two papers at the southern Governors' conference in Nashville, Tenn.:

"We suggest that the reason the annual per capita income of southern workers in manufacturing is $800 below that of workers in the non-South is our past reliance on industries in which the wages are at the bottom of the list," said a report by a special committee on industrial development.

"It is well known, for example, that weekly wages in apparel, leather, and textiles are near the bottom in weekly wage rates while machinery, transportation equipment, and chemicals, along with paper, petroleum, and coal, are substantially above the average.

"Therefore, our future industrial development offers other opportunities to further strengthen the region's economic position through the selection of industries which offer our people a more substantial wage."

The Governors said that solution of this basic low-wage problem revolves around the

South being "more selective in the types of industries being established in the region."

The South should, they said in a resolution, "cease 'shooting with a shotgun' to bag any and all enterprises in their future industrial promotion efforts, but rather use the 'rifle approach' in order to interest industries paying high wages."

In their analysis, the Governors omitted one factor which may be of importance in inhibiting economic growth, namely right-to-work laws.

They failed to examine the widespread prevalence of antilabor legislation, typified by the so-called right-to-work laws and of antilabor community attitudes that for many years have been used as bait to lure low-wage runaway industries into the South—the type of industries the southern Governors now decry.

These laws were purposefully enacted in most States of the South to perpetuate sharecropper wages and to make it difficult, if not impossible, for southern workers to organize effectively and participate in the collective bargaining process through representation by responsible labor unions. The existence of strong labor unions in non-right-to-work States, it should be pointed out, is equated with the high wage levels the southern Governors now profess to admire.

Nor did the Governors ask whether right-to-work laws and kindred antilabor legislation are a factor in the continuous flight of the southern labor force, both skilled and unskilled, to other regions of the Nation where labor-management relations are not clouded by these anti-labor laws, one of the fruits of which has been industrial unrest.

It is the suggestion of this discussion that the southern Governors, in their search for higher-wage industries, overlooked one of the facets of their economic problem by failing to give recognition to the need for removing right-to-work laws and other antilabor legislation from their statute books.

Preoccupation with the bait aspect of right-to-work laws of some well-meaning but too eager searchers for industry had an unexpected and startling result recently in Oklahoma.

Oklahoma has a long history of healthy and sound labor-management relations. Its industrial development not only has kept pace with but in some instances has outstripped neighboring States. But the fever of some other Southern States for high-pressure campaigns to bring in more industry—any kind of industry—infected the business community of Oklahoma. The fact Oklahoma was steadily outstripping right-to-work Kansas and Arkansas in industrial growth was forgotten.

Industry promoters, ignoring the fact that responsible industry applies its own realistic yardstick to the site for a new plant, wanted a bait for their industry hook. They decided the handiest worm was the so-called right-to-work law. So they started agitating for its enactment.

While this agitation was at its height, the Oklahoma State Chamber of Commerce dispatched a group of businessmen to industrial centers with the objective of selling Oklahoma as the site of new industrial plants. As part of the sales argument package, the Oklahomans offered the right-to-work law bait. To their astonishment they found no takers.

Failure of the right-to-work law as an industry lure was reported in the Oklahoma City Times, a pro-right-to-work paper as follows:

"The men were perplexed because right-to-work was hardly mentioned in Chicago and New York," the paper reported.

"As one plant location consultant pointed out bluntly, 'the firm that has labor trouble in one State is quite likely to have it wherever it goes—unless management changes the policies which produce conflict'."

A little more than a year ago, Forbes Marketing Research, Inc., of New York, conducted an exhaustive survey of reasons why industries located new plants or expanded existing plants in Indiana. The detailed study covered 100 industries selected by the Indiana Department of Commerce as being "representative of the more important new industry locations and expansion of Indiana facilities" which occurred after 1957, the year Indiana enacted a right-to-work law. Findings were published in a booklet titled "A Study of the Factors Influencing Industrial Plant Location in Indiana Since 1957."

What did the industrialists tell the Forbes survey teams were the reasons Indiana was selected for new plant sites?

In order of importance, these were the reasons cited:

1. Proximity of established markets and potential of local markets.
2. Supply of skilled labor and favorable employer-employee relations.
3. Access to raw materials.
4. Occupancy costs, including availability of developed industrial sites.
5. Taxes and government.
6. Availability and cost of electric power and fuel, including gas, oil and coal.
7. Living conditions, including housing and cost of living, schools and religious facilities, community development.

Other factors listed were general business climate, available industrial facilities and transportation.

What about the right-to-work law? Only 7 of the 100 industries even mentioned it. The Forbes survey concluded: "The right-to-work law has had a negligible effect on the attraction of plant location or expansion in Indiana."

In an earlier study of the problems of industrialization of the Southern States. "Right-to-Work Law Issue," Daniel H. Pollitt, then a professor of law at the University of North Carolina, concluded:

"In sum, there is no evidence that industry as a whole is concerned with right-to-work laws when selecting a location for expansion. Of the 10 States which led in the percentage of increased industrialization from 1939 to 1953, only 2 (Texas and Florida) were right-to-work States.

"Those industries which are either market or supply oriented, the industries which create the largest number of jobs and pay the highest wages, prefer a high-wage to a low-wage area.

"It is only those industries such as apparel, shoe, and textile which concern themselves with a right-to-work law and these are the industries which create rather than solve problems.

"As concluded by Mr. Carbert '(The Impact of State and local taxes in North Carolina and the Southeastern States.' 1956), if a low wage scale is the only enticement which the Southeastern States have to offer new industry, 'they might as well be reconciled to a status of permanent economic colonialism. The use of low-wage Southern labor to produce products for sale in a national market represents an exploitation that is just as destructive as an irresponsible mining of natural resources * * *. Such exploitation takes the form of extracting the energies of a State without replacement and without proper compensation.'

"There is nothing desirable about industrialization per se. Industrialization, accompanied by low wages, is the cause, not the cure, for economic problems."

Professor Pollitt has other interesting findings that explode the myth of right-to-work laws and raise a question about the wisdom and desirability of retaining the antilabor legislation.

He reported that 45 percent of the new plants locating in the South during postwar years were interested in the increased consumer market of the region. Another 30 percent did so because they were interested in cheap electric power, natural gas, forest products and minerals.

Both groups, he said, accepted collective bargaining and expected to deal with organized labor in their plant employment—in fact desired the stable relations between labor and management that such a relationship provides.

"These market-oriented plants produce such things as automobiles, farm equipment, electric supplies, machinery, rubber products and building materials," Professor Pollitt stated.

"They build the largest plants, employ the most people and pay the highest wages. Ford, General Motors, General Electric, Westinghouse, International Harvester, National Carbon and others which fall within this category report they expected to be unionized and were in fact unionized.

"Many of them have companywide agreements with the home union whereby wage rates are standardized in all plants, wherever located. Running away from unions had little to do with the location of these plants."

Likewise, Pollitt reported, the material-oriented plants "had no concern with avoiding unions."

"The most common reaction of the plant executives was that they accepted the principle of collective bargaining," he wrote. "One company selected a union town over an antiunion community because the company expected the new plant to be organized and did not want to be caught in a battle between union and antiunion forces."

Another possible side effect of the right-to-work laws has been the continued, wholesale migration of skilled workers from the South to non-right-to-work States in search of higher wages, greater security and better working conditions.

In the past decade the outward flow of workers from Southern States has reached proportions that might well alarm the southern Governors and all in this region who are concerned about its future industrial development.

Reporting this movement, much of it from the Southern States, in a paper, "Migration of the Nation's Population—Its Size, Nature and Causes," Commissioner Ewan Clague of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, stated: "During a single year, more than 10 million persons move. The search for better employment opportunities is a major force behind this migration."

Since 1950, the right-to-work State of Arkansas, with a population of less than 2 million, lost 420,000 of its citizens through migration to other States seeking higher wages and greater opportunities for advancement. (U.S. Bureau of Census.) As a result, Arkansas lost two seats in the U.S. Congress.

Detailing the annual migration, the Department of Labor official continued:

"Five million of these persons moved to a different state * * *. The largest outflow was from the predominantly agricultural South. More than a million persons moved from the Southern States to States in other regions.

"It is fair to say that job changing was the most important influence affecting this movement, particularly the shifts from one State to another."

What the southern Governors' conference described as its "shotgun" approach to bagging new industries has misfired in other notable aspects.

Two years ago, citizens of Wrightsville, Ga., raised $100,000 to build a 40,000-square-foot plant on the outskirts of town as an industry lure. The red-brick factory is still empty.

In Baldwyn, Miss., $230,000 of county general obligation bonds were sold to erect a plant for lease to a New York pleasure-boat manufacturer. The manufacturer changed his mind and decided not to open the plant. The citizens of the Mississippi county now face a sharp increase in property taxes to cover bond payments on the empty plant.

William Hackett of the Mississippi State Agricultural and Industrial Board was quoted by the Wall Street Journal as stating that competition among southern communities for any kind of new industry has become so fierce that inducement such as free sites, municipal plant financing and tax exemptions no longer are sufficient.

"The current trend," the official was quoted as saying, "is toward such extras as paying a company's moving expenses, training its work force free of charge and offering outright cash gifts to pad a weak company's working capital."

Many strongly financed companies want no part of this special inducement bait.

"When we go into a town, we want to pay our fair share of the tax burden and we don't want to be obligated to any particular interest group," E. D. Dodd, vice president of Owens-Illinois Glass Co., told the Journal. "A town that offers tax concessions or giveaways is merely robbing Peter to pay Paul and we know that sooner or later we'll be Peter."

It is pertinent to suggest to the southern Governors' conference that an examination by them of labor-management relations of major U.S. industries which they seek to attract to the South will show that in virtually every instance management recognizes the collective bargaining process and deals with the work force through responsible unions.

If the southern Governors are to be successful in their quest for the type of high-wage industry that will bring desirable employment to the southern worker and prosperity to the entire region, is it not time for them to make a basic reorientation of their antilabor philosophy? Is it not time for southern leaders to give heed to the need for wiping their statute books clean of right-to-work laws, whose purpose has been to perpetuate the low-wage structures they now publicly deplore?

In its new "rifle approach," the South might well demonstrate it is willing to meet both management and labor on the collective bargaining terms that, for more than a quarter century, have been accepted public policy—the fair terms on which responsible industry meets responsible organized labor in our flourishing industrial States.

Preservation of Wilderness Areas on Fire Island Beach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished constituent and friend of mine, Mr. Goldthwaite H. Dorr, has sent me a copy of his letter to the Secretary of the Interior on the Fire Island controversy.

Mr. Dorr was one of a group of remarkable young men recruited by the late Henry L. Stimson to serve in the office of the U.S. attorney of the southern district of New York. Mr. Dorr became one of Henry Stimson's most devoted friends and has dedicated much of his life to public service.

He has been special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General and the Secretary of War, the Assistant Director of Munitions during World War I, an economic adviser to the Governments of Newfoundland and Turkey, a consultant to the Secretary of State, an American delegate to the International Refugee Council in 1948, a Defense Department representative to the Council of Foreign Ministers in Paris, 1949, and an American representative to the Tripartite Conference on Migration Problems in Paris, 1950.

I am privileged to call this distinguished American's letter on Fire Island to the attention of my colleagues. I think it is the best statement I have seen on the current Fire Island controversy:

AUGUST 2, 1962.

Re: Preservation of Wilderness Areas on Fire Island Beach.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Interior Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The conflict of ideologies over the preservation of the remaining wilderness areas on the barrier beaches of Long Island and particularly Fire Island Beach is both fundamental and natural.

Some people draw strength and stimulation from the dynamism typified by the whirling wheels of automobiles and gregarious activities. Robert Moses is one of them. From it he has drawn strength to make tremendously valuable contributions to both city and State. Everyone in the State of New York has reason to be everlastingly grateful to him for what he has done.

On the other hand there are those who draw strength and refreshment for their own lives and that of their families and for what they are able to do in public service from the solitudes of the wilderness. Perhaps these are fewer in number. But perhaps there are more of them than one might casually think. They have an element of value to the community which Emerson recognized in describing the barren rocky cone of Mount Monadnock as "pure use." The constitution of the State of New York recognizes this by setting aside great Adirondack areas of forest, stream, and lake to be perpetually reserved as wilderness. These areas are entered by so many of the silent people. As the forest closes in behind them like a curtain they renew the primitive strengths that lie in all of us. They emerge again into our dynamic life refreshed. But the Adirondacks are a long way off.

Further there is another type of wilderness which speaks its own language. It has its own springs of refreshment—the wilderness of the seashore, such as that on Fire Island, the dunes and the ocean on one side, the primitive undergrowth and swamps in the middle and on the other side marsh and the stretches of a quieter bay.

I think I know something of such wilderness. On such a stretch on the Jersey shore, since vanished, I spent the first 12 summers of my life under canvass. I first made the acquaintance of the Long Island ocean shore somewhat rudely. At the end of the Spanish War the ship on which I was serving ran aground at Amagansett. We landed through the surf on the beach a company of the 7th Infantry which we had brought up from Santiago destined for Montauk.

Since then I have roamed the beaches from Montauk to Rockaway practically every summer. I have seen the wilderness area diminishing but increasingly sought out and enjoyed by so many of all sorts and conditions of men. I know what it means to so many. There are still left stretches of it. But unless farsighted measures for their preservation are taken they will not last long. They would be destroyed by the proposed parkway in practical effect a speedway. Once gone they never could be replaced. All Bob Moses' dynamic energy could never restore that disordered, untamed wildness of dune, seascape, tangled undergrowth and marsh grass. Coming generations in this part of the country would never know what the seashore wilderness had been like. They would never realize how many made such use of that wilderness without despoiling it and what strength and refreshment it gave to so many.

I can still see in my mind's eye a great figure striding away from a local beach settlement along high water mark at the foot of the dunes and into the wilderness areas. I remember his telling me what a source of refreshment and strength he found in that solitude. Few persons have put that strength as devotedly and as effectively into the service of their country as Gen. George C. Marshall. I wish he could be here today to plead for the preservation of this stretch of wilderness.

Fortunately, there is length enough along this beach to accommodate both ideologies. There is room enough to accommodate the automobiles on Long Beach and on Jones' Beach and on Captree Island. There is a whole new stretch from the lighthouse down to Point Democrat on Fire Island Beach which will now be accessible by Bob Moses' bridge across the Fire Island inlet. That can now be landscaped and asphalted to take care of the mass motorist needs for an indefinite time to come. There is now also an exit for the motorists to the beach by the Smiths' Point bridge over the narrows between Great South Bay and the Moriches. They also have accessible the great areas of Montauk.

There is thus no need to despoil the intervening wilderness areas on Fire Island Beach. There is ample opportunity for access by motorists at both ends and by ferry through the present intermittent settlements. There is also access through so many little coves and holes for those who prefer to sail or go by motorboat. Both ideologies can be accommodated. It would be a misfortune if the heat developed in the present controversy should end in the extermination of the vestiges of the wilderness upon this great stretch of beach.

It may be conceivable that at some time in the future our progressive urbanization and suburbanization may through the pressure of population, make it necessary to destroy the wilderness of the seashore, what is left of it, and the wilderness of the forest and mountains, what is left of it, even though they are irreplaceable. But should not that drastic decision be left to the prosperity which will benefit or suffer from it?

Faithfully yours,
GOLDTHWAITE H. DORR.

A Monument in Phoenix Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to your attention an excellent article written by C. L. Sulzberger, which appeared a short while ago in the New York Times, noting the contributions of Eamon De Valera—that gallant, devoted and patriotic servant to the cause of the people of Ireland.

For centuries the people of Ireland were forced to submit to alien rule. They all attested the alien regime over them, but all their efforts to rid themselves of foreign rule had failed. Their Easter Monday rebellion in 1916, under the command of Captain De Valera, marked the beginning of their success and the subsequent birth of the Irish Republic in 1922.

Mr. Speaker, in the last half century's history of Ireland Eamon De Valera has been the dominant figure. It is impossible to overestimate the work of this devoted man. Throughout his long and stormy career, from the time when he was a schoolteacher to the time of his Presidency of the Irish Republic, which position he occupies today at the age of 80, his most cherished ideal was to serve the cause of the people of Ireland. He served it by leading and participating in the Easter Monday insurrection 46 years ago; he served it in British prisons, in negotiating for Ireland's freedom, and today he serves as their elected President.

Ireland's fight for freedom was conceived, organized, and carried out by patriotic Irish born in and out of Ireland. Indeed at times it seemed that foreign-born and foreign-trained Irishmen took the leading part in the Irishmen's long fight against the British. This can be explained by the fact that since mid-19th century the number of Irish living abroad has outnumbered those in their historic homeland. And since 1900 more Irish have lived in this country than in Ireland.

But, Mr. Speaker, these Irish, while domiciled abroad and as loyal citizens of their adopted lands, remained attached to Ireland with an unshakeable spiritual bond, and were zealous devotees of the Irish cause. This was particularly true in the case of the Irish Americans. They always gave moral and financial support to the Irish cause, and many of them took part in the Irish struggle. And before World War I, when the Irish Republican Brotherhood was being organized, this brotherhood was largely financed by the Clan-na-Gael in this country. It is reliably stated that the sum of $6 million was sent over by this organization just before the outbreak of that war. There is no doubt that this sum was the gift of the American Irish, their voluntary contribution, to the Irish cause, and to the cause for independence throughout the world.

This article entitled "The Monument in Phoenix Park" written by the distinguished writer, C. L. Sulzberger, follows:

THE MONUMENT IN PHOENIX PARK

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Ireland's most splendid sentimental monument is a gaunt and towering old patriot who lives in the fine residence of Phoenix Park where, until 40 years ago, dwelled the viceregal lord lieutenants of the British Empire.

Today Eamon de Valera, who will be 80 in October and who was one of the young firebrands who organized the rebellion that freed Ireland, is President of the Republic. But now he is more symbol and monument than active political figure, like the massive, walking statue in Mozart's "Don Giovanni."

He peers out the stately windows at the green vistas of a park his dimmed vision can no longer see, recalling the vivid days of his youth which he admits may seem gilded by memory, and imagining future vistas that in some respects differ from the present realities of this talented nation.

The venerable President, who is astoundingly well preserved, apart from his weak eyesight, is still obsessed with those passions of his earlier days as a thin, black-haired rebel: with the insult to his pride of a partitioned Ireland that leaves the north attached to England; with the nationalistic implications of the musical Gaelic language which he holds to be a sister of Greek and Latin.

But around him, transcending Phoenix Park, new generations are moving into new directions, new ideas. Today's active leaders no longer wish to be fettered to frustrated romance, nor are they content to be regarded by literary tourists as delightful characters from Yeats, Joyce, or the Abbey Theater. Their interests and their energies focus on such things as education, industrialization, curbing youthful emigration, and the problems of entering the European Common Market.

ERA OF AGED STATESMEN

The President is content to let his younger ministers pursue these strange, exciting paths. He feels that in this era of aged statesmen, which has seen its Churchill, De Gasperi, Adenauer, and De Gaulle, the old leader has certain advantages, provided he is well served by an able Cabinet. For then, he believes, his experience may benefit a nation and he need, if required, but restrain his vigorous team, not heap it on.

He still likes to talk in homely country terms. Most of his first 16 years were spent as a country boy in Ireland despite his New York City birth, an accident that saved him, as an American, from execution by the British. He only regrets that destiny kept him from rearing his children and grandchildren in the lovely downs.

As he sits by his desk, impressively erect and immobile, apart from swift hands and flickering face, he dreams the concentrated dreams of someone who has become physically isolated from the outer world. He thinks of the music he loves and the mathematics that fascinate him. He believes with Sir Charles Snow that man must be educated to the cultures of science and the humanities.

But above all he dreams of Ireland. And, when one hears him, one feels that in a quiet, passionless way it is still more the Ireland of 1916 when he fought the battle of Boland's Mills than the Ireland building factories at Shannon and drilling for natural gas.

Yet he wisely removes himself from the hurlyburly of the always active Irish political scene he once so much enjoyed. He sees, now that there are no longer any crises among his turbulent people, that there is no longer any need for a dominant national leader.

The ancients, he observes, saw it was desirable in moments of strain to confide their fate to the hands of one man. And he talks with respect and perhaps a tinge of envy of the ascendant role of General de Gaulle in France, where troubles have required an outstanding personality. But that, he concedes, is not the case in Ireland.

So his Prime Minister and Cabinet, who run this Nation, devote their energies to hauling it out of a misty, boggy past. De Valera proudly stresses the qualities and individualism of nationality. But his government slowly edges toward the supranational Common Market stream. There, some latter day, the partitioned pieces of Ireland may draw together in a land called Europe. This is a dream transcending those of the monument in Phoenix Park.

Remarks of Hon. Willliam M. Tuck, of Virginia, at Sayler's Creek Battlefield Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and esteemed colleague, the Honorable William M. Tuck, former Governor of Virginia, made an eloquent and exceptionally well received address at the Sayler's Creek Battlefield Park, Va., on August 19.

It was a manifestation of the highest esteem when Governor Tuck was selected to address the huge gathering. Governor Tuck has dedicated a lifetime of devoted service to his great State of Virginia and to the Nation. As a member of the Civil War Centennial Commission, he made a great contribution to the proper commemoration of the gallantry and courage of the soldiers both North and South. In the following splendid address, Governor Tuck paid tribute to the fortitude and loyalty of the southern soldier as he faced the inevitable.

I commend to our colleagues and to the country Governor Tuck's outstanding address:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS MADE BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. TUCK, OF VIRGINIA, AT SAYLER'S CREEK BATTLEFIELD PARK, SUNDAY, AUGUST 19, 1962

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am indeed grateful to my friend and colleague, the Honorable Watkins M. Abbitt, for the gracious and generous introduction which he has given me. I have known Watt Abbitt for many years. I have been closely associated with him in the public life of Virginia for the last 20 years and our associations have been particularly close during the past 10 years as Representatives of adjoining districts in the U.S. Congress. While I am much older than he in years, he is my senior in service at Washington and I lean and rely heavily upon him for counsel and advice in respect to the great problems which confront our Commonwealth and our country. Watt Abbitt is endowed with sterling qualities of character. He is able and energetic. His heart is attuned to the highest public good. He is devoted to the interest of the people of his district and State. He is a firm adherent to the principles which have made our State and Nation great, and it is a tribute to him which he richly merits and deserves to be renominated and reelected to another term in the Congress without opposition either in the Democratic primary or in the general election.

I would at this time also like to commend the citizens of Amelia, Nottoway, and Prince Edward for their cooperation with our State department of conservation and economic development in the establishment of this shrine and in this expression of appreciation of the improvements made by the agencies of the State and local governments. Likewise, I commend the citizens of this section of the State and the various committees for their leadership in rededicating these premises and these surroundings to the gallant men who fought here on that dark sixth day of April 1865.

I am proud to be associated with you on this occasion for I recall that I was a member of the Senate of Virginia in 1934 when former Senator Robert K. Brock, of

Prince Edward, introduced the resolution to establish this park and to appropriate the sum of $1,500 to assist in acquiring the property. While still a member of the senate, during the session of 1940, I was glad to join with him and the late distinguished senator from Hanover, the Honorable Henry T. Wickham, in sponsoring a bill appropriating $25,000 for the purchase of additional lands. Senator Brock respects and loves history and appreciates the values that a knowledge of history brings to our citizenship and he has thus wrought well for his section and for his State.

Sayler's Creek Battlefield Park is a State park and is the only State-owned battlefield park in Virginia, and is one of only a few such in the entire United States. This is worthy of comment and notice on this occasion because of the growing spirit of our American people in turning to Washington for financial help and appropriations from a sadly depleted if not indeed exhausted Federal Treasury.

It is a distinct privilege for me to join with you on this occasion because of my love for the Confederacy and for the principles for which it stood and for which our forefathers contended on the field of battle. I am glad to be able to say that both of my grandfathers were Confederate soldiers, and one of them, whose identical name I am proud to bear, commanded and led his company in Pickett's immortal charge at Gettysburg on July 3, 1863.

It is incumbent upon us, the living, to pass on to future generations the story of the Confederacy, to commemorate the battlefields, to decorate and make them as interesting and attractive as we can so that the people, not only of our State, but of the Nation, may come and worship at these shrines and thus enhance and exalt the spirit of patriotism which lingers in the breast of every true American.

The 6th day of April 1865, was a bleak date in the annals of the Army of Northern Virginia. Only a few months back, the bugles of fate had blown taps across the heart of the South. A great many did not hear it, or, if hearing, disbelieved the sound. But in the mud that marked this very spot then, in the sounds of the very realistic artillery, in the bark of the infantry rifles and the spatter of the cavalry pistols, a great many knew that the end could scarcely be delayed beyond the summer that was coming.

But still they stood fast, enough of them, certainly, to hold the thin lines.

Just 4 days prior to that April 6, Lee's lines at Petersburg broke. A less enterprising general, bowing to obvious odds, might have surrendered then. But not the South's leader who on two occasions had taken the Stars and Bars into the land of the enemy and brought it back a symbol for future generations. Lee put his army in motion from Petersburg, heading toward the south and west, hoping to reach Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, still fighting in North Carolina, or at least to gain the protection of the mountains.

On April 5 his troops converged on Amelia Court House, expecting there to find rations, but the rations were missing—they had been captured—and the enemy was threatening. Seven miles to the southwest at Jetersville, Sheridan's cavalry and Griffin's corps were in position to block his retreat. A little farther away were the corps of Humphreys and Wright, all adding up to too much strength for Lee to contest. His only hope was speed, to move his hungry troops faster than the Federals could move, to take them to the southwest toward Rice Station, where he might get supplies from Lynchburg, by way of Farmville, on the Southside Railroad.

But speed could not come from an army that was starving. There had not been much food in the lines at Petersburg. There was none along the roads of southside Virginia over which he had to march. Speed could not come from horses that were too weak to struggle, nor from men who were so weak and tired that many of them dropped helplessly along the wayside.

But Lee, the soldier, hoping to regain the day that had been lost at Amelia, pushed on. He put his sagging troops on the road that night of April 5, directing them due west 12 miles or so toward Rice after which they would head for Farmville, where other supplies should be waiting. It was a slow stumble over crowded roads, where confusion ruled and panic easily was spread. And where human beings, weakened by lack of food and lack of rest, were subject to error.

In the van marched Lee's workhorse, one of his most trusted officers, Gen. James Longstreet. Next came General Anderson and then Gen. Richard Stoddord Ewell. In between them were wagons, long lines of them, awkward carriers slowing the men on foot, and sometimes needing their shoulders to escape from mudholes that had become too much for the weakened horses. The rearguard was under command of Gen. John B. Gordon, another officer as veteran as any of those in front of him.

Lee had nothing to cheer him, save the association of those valiant warriors, and there was certainly no cheer in the note that was found in the shoe of one of two spies captured along the roadside after passing Amelia. It was dated that day at Jetersville by General Grant, and it directed Union General Ord to move at 8 o'clock next morning and to take position from which he could watch the roads between Burkeville and Farmville. "I am strongly of the opinion," wrote Grant, "that Lee will leave Amelia tonight to go south." This message brought the first certain information Lee had that Ord's troops, from the north side of the James, the most distant Federal units, were on his heels.

The note was brought to Lee while he stood at a broken bridge over Flat Creek, just after dining at "Selma," the home of Richard Anderson, 2 miles from Amelia Springs.

Lee realized that speed remained his only tactical weapon. The army must continue throughout the night and on into the day, with only such brief rest as was imperative. But beyond Deatonsville, 5 miles west of Amelia Springs, all of his troops and all of his vehicles must use the same road. Moreover, another road ran parallel, offering a route from which the Federals could make dashes against his wagon trains.

Longstreet and Lee reached Rice in the forenoon of the 6th. Farmville was 8½ miles away by rail, 7 by the old highway. Awaiting them there was news that 600 to 700 Union cavalrymen had passed up the road toward Farmville.

This was bad news, for it indicated forces had been sent to burn the bridges over the Appomattox. Lee knew he was passing through poor ground for a retreat. The country on either side of the Appomattox, as we know, was rolling and cut by smaller streams. Particularly dangerous was the ground on the approach to Rice, over which still must pass the center and rear guard of his column—Anderson and Ewell and Gordon and the long line of wagons. Over nearly the whole of this landscape grew dark pine woods, broken by scattered plantations and a few small farms—the perfect stage for a military tragedy.

Behind him the divisions still to come up were toiling over the bad roads that led down to the two forks of Sayler's Creek. Continuously in this advance the infantry had to move out and form line of battle to repulse Union cavalry attacks. The energy of the Federals seemed exhaustless. Driven off, they soon galloped back along different roads, heckling, taunting, waiting for the kill.

Immediately behind Ewell and Anderson and ahead of Gordon and the rearguard moved a wagon train. Around eleven o'clock in the morning the attacks on this train came so frequently that Ewell and Anderson ordered their troops to the side of the road to let the wagons move farther toward the head of the column. But the division in advance of Anderson was not notified of this halt, and it kept moving, opening a gap in the line. This gave the Federals an advantage. They dashed in and blocked the road.

Anderson advanced to drive off the enemy, and Ewell went back to turn the wagons to the right along a road that lead to a less exposed lower crossing of Saylers Creek. But Ewell failed to notify Gordon of this change of routes, and Gordon followed the wagons as had been planned, leaving Ewell's rear unprotected.

Here was human failure, failure not characteristic of the Army of Northern Virginia. We must assume the answer—that it was lack of food and loss of sleep.

As soon as the action in front and the diversion of wagons caused Anderson and Ewell and Gordon to become separated, the Federals prepared for attack. It came, and the Confederates fought back. Ewell's troops, about 3,000 clerks and Richmond howitzers and other defenders of smoldering Richmond, including the naval contingent from the James River, fought bravely and madly. The Federals recoiled. At the peak of the fighting, Col. Stapleton Crutchfield, commander of the heavy artillery on hand, fell dead. His body was found lying here on the side of the creek with a bullet through the head.

But the Federals came back, and they came back in greater numbers—Sheridan, Custer, Devin, Crook, Wheaton, Seymour, Getty, Gregg, Humphreys, Wright, and others, all with strong forces. Ewell's and Anderson's commands, with the exception of Wise's brigade and Bushrod Johnson's division, were captured. The command led by Custis Lee, the son of the great southern chieftain, was enveloped, and he surrendered. Ewell was trapped and taken prisoner, but Anderson managed to escape.

Prominent officers on both sides fell. Among the Confederates were Brig. Gen. James Dearing, Col. Reuben B. Boston, and Maj. James W. Thomson. The Federals lost Brig. Gen. Theodore Read, leader of the infantry, and Col. Francis Washburn, commander of the cavalry.

The fighting was so fierce that Anderson quickly lost 1,500 in killed, wounded, and captured. As one Confederate reported, "Everywhere you looked there was a Yankee standing with gun raised and shouting, 'Surrender.' "

After knocking out Anderson and Ewell, the Federals concentrated on Gordon. About 6 o'clock in the evening they struck him heavily in front and on both flanks.

"They struck my command," Gordon reported, "while we were endeavoring to push the ponderous wagon trains through the bog, out of which the starved teams were unable to drag them. Many of the wagons, loaded with ammunition, mired so deep in the mud that they had to be abandoned. It was necessary to charge and force back the Union lines in order to rescue my men."

Gordon's exhausted soldiers broke, got across the creek as best they could and formed again, after a fashion, in the darkness on the west bank.

The total Confederate losses for the day were between 7,000 and 8,000 men, leaving Lee only 15,000 to fight off an army of 80,000 well-fed and well-armed Federals. Percentagewise it was the greatest loss of any battle in the war.

Off on a hill west of the scene of the fighting around Saylers Creek, Lee sat on his horse and looked down on a disaster that was in full view. Teamsters hurried past with their teams and dangling traces—no wagons. Troops retreated without guns, many without hats, a harmless mob. Pressing against them were the massive columns of the enemy.

The immortal Lee straightened in his saddle and exclaimed as if talking to himself: "My God, has the army dissolved?"

Lee still hoped to outmarch the enemy, to cross the Appomattox and burn the bridges behind him, after which his troops would be allowed some much needed rest. When he had reached Rice that morning and learned that several hundred Federals were moving toward Farmville and the bridges across the Appomattox, he sent General Rosser's cavalry to head them off. Near High Bridge, the two forces met, and in the ensuing fighting the Union troops were driven back and nearly 800 of them captured.

Night brought no relief. Scattered commands were gathered in the darkness, and the march was continued. The weather was chilly—snow fell the next day at Burkeville—and this added to the suffering of men who could scarcely drag one leg past the other.

The Confederates got across the Appomattox and set the bridges afire behind them. But the Federals were too close in pursuit. They extinguished the flames before the bridges were badly damaged and dashed across on the heels of Lee's men.

The first of the Southerners to reach Farmville found rations awaiting them in cars standing on the tracks. But before these could be widely distributed, the enemy was pushing in, and the trains were hurriedly sent off in the direction of Lynchburg, in the hope that they might be stopped again at some convenient point on the track that paralleled the road along which the army must renew its retreat.

For the first few miles past Farmville, the road ran northward. Lee's men pushed on. One of their artillerists described the scene:

"Horses and mules dead or dying in the mud. * * * The constant marching and fighting without sleep or food are rapidly thinning the ranks of this grand old army. Men who have stood by their flags since the beginning of the war fall out of their ranks and are captured, simply because it is beyond their power of physical endurance to go any farther."

But some of the men preserved their sense of humor. A famished, ragged North Carolinian was surrounded by Union cavalrymen "Surrender, surrender," they shouted "We've got you."

"Yes," said the North Carolinian, dropping his gun, "you got me, and a hell of git you got."

There is a burning meaning in this soldier's cynical answer. For the man, clothing, and remnants of sinew meant nothing to the point of despisement. He was in the lines—still in the lines responding to some powerful imperatives. Nothing was left of him but the spirit. There is no application of the word "defeat" to such a spirit. The nameless man and the thousands of Confederates about him were precisely as the Greeks at Thermopylae, where the simple inscription says, "Stranger, go tell it in Sparta that we lie here in obedience to her commands."

The meaning shouts down the years and through all the havoc of battle to all men today. People, the lesson tells us, may be killed in the flash and their causes trampled but, paradoxically and wondrously, a triumph is unloosed. It is the triumph of the human spirit which builds from episode to episode, for the elevation of man in his slow and troubled evolution.

The national destiny had run its course. The fates had shown favoritism to the side with the most battalions. But no magic in command of the fates can put iron in the hearts of men, nor drive them willingly beyond endurance and far beyond all bounds of hope to defeat which to them was not defeat at all because their spirits never died.

Lee's army marched on. In a matter of hours the end would come for one of the greatest armies in history, the Army of Northern Virginia, led by a general who even in retreat could show a defiance that kept off an enemy more than five times as numerous as his own army. It had fought its last battle, the last battle fought in Virginia—the battle of Sayler's Creek.

For the southerners who comprised this army's ranks at Appomattox, their dreadful journey's end was at hand. It is engaging, if agonizing, to reflect on what the average Confederate soldier thought of it all in the last few days. But one thing seems certain: He could foresee no possibility of reward and no acclaim at all for what he had endured because a hard fact of life is that no one loves a loser—certainly not in the hour of his losing.

But in the long still grasp of history we know that bravery, fidelity and obedience to the commands of conscience and principle are indestructible. Such examples pile up and down the course of human experience, and fix the standards for human behavior. There, indeed stands the foundation upon which the greatness of our country is based. Few may behave like the Greeks at Thermopylae, or like the tired, muddy men who marched over this spot 97 years ago. But the ideal is left, and there is their own eternal reward. It brings us to the great and arresting soul cry that comes down to us through the ages from the lips of the great Apostle Paul: "I have fought the good fight. I have finished the course. I have kept the faith."

The muddy men who passed over Sayler's Creek moved with no swagger or pose or sense of destiny. And they did not seem to think that they were brave at all; they seemed merely to reason that they were doing what was right and so went about it with no self-consciousness.

Those men who got away from here had no time for soul searching. They crossed the Appomattox River like men stumbling backward. A strange shadow shape of an army it was, the greatness of heart enduring and pounding in the last agonies of life, but with the stare of death in its eyes.

With the lowering of the battle flags at Appomattox went many of the rights, not only of the South, but of the North as well. The sovereignty of the States trembled, at the last cannon blast here and 3 days later at Appomattox, but the principle still lives and patriotic men everywhere, North and South, East and West, are still proclaiming the doctrine of States rights and demanding a resumption of the powers expressly reserved by and guaranteed to the States by our Federal Constitution. Millions of men and women everywhere are beginning to see that an all-powerful Federal Government—destructive of the States and the localities—means nothing but unprecedented regimentation. They realize that unless this centralization of power in Washington is stopped, that our State and local governments will be destroyed and become nothing more than the hollow shells of a lost liberty. These millions of people are ready and willing to struggle today against the forces of totalitarianism. They recognize it is not a sectional fight between the North and South, but a fight for the preservation of the liberties and the freedoms and the principles of government established on the soil of Virginia and enshrined in our Virginia bill of rights.

We realize that we must fight today by peaceful methods just as valiantly as our forefathers fought in the Revolution and our grandfathers fought in the cause of the Confederacy. The fate of the entire free world rests on the outcome of our struggle.

The Federal encroachments upon the rights and the powers of the States and the localities have become startling and alarming. For a while the movement was so stealthy and creeping that it was intangible and invisible to the average citizen, but today these encroachments are open and bold and brazen and are moving at a fantastic pace.

Here in this land of the free and home of the brave, the representatives chosen by the people are being bypassed and thwarted not only by Executive and administrative edicts, but by orders and decrees of the Federal courts as well. Departments and agencies of the Federal Government are writing much of the legislation by making rules and regulations having the force and the effect of law. The Federal Government, principally through the Department of Justice, the very agency charged with the responsibility for enforcing the Federal laws, is usurping the police powers of the State and local governments and is hindering and thwarting the local governments in their efforts to suppress public mischief and to promote peace and harmony as is illustrated by actions in Albany, Ga., and in other southern localities. The people are subjected to propaganda by the ever-growing agencies of the Federal Government, payment for same being made from money extracted from the pained pockets of the taxpayers, to glorify the welfare state and to brainwash the very people upon whom these burdens of government rest.

The American citizen is being subjected to a barrage of false and spurious doctrine. The people are being led into a socialistic pit of no return by promises of a utopian life of ease guaranteed by the Federal Government. We are called upon and commanded to support a Federal horde of national and international spenders.

They have little or no respect for the rights of American citizens and are nothing more than wastrels and squanderers of the peoples' money and are by such means undertaking to undermine the moral fiber and character of American citizenship. We must resist with all our might the one-worlders, the deluded do-gooders, the conformists and the national and international brainwashers and spenders.

But we can find encouragement from the fact that there is evidence of a real awakening of the spirit of patriotism and independence in this country.

Virginia and the Southland leads the Nation in defense of constitutional government. We are on the verge and the threshold of a great awakening in the South, and I believe in the Nation, to the dangers of the various isms which threaten to envelop us. In scores of southern communities, thousands of citizens led by our junior chambers of commerce, our Farm Bureau organizations, and other patriotic groups are busy educating themselves regarding the flagitious forces operating within our shores. They are engaged in programs and seminars designed to give them factual information regarding the activities of the extreme leftists in the United States. This is a remarkable enterprise that has no precedent in the history of the country. For the first time entire communities, not simply a handful of individuals, are gaining sophisticated understanding of the methods of operation employed by these destroyers of our Government and American way of life. It is an imperious task of the conservatives in every community of this country to keep vital patriotic issues alive. Every alert citizen holds an obligation to his community and his country to be zealous and to stress the crises America faces and the need for building up the fires of righteous indignation against any program that is destined to damage our country, or constitutes a sell-out of this great Republic. Informed and determined citizens will emphasize the dangers which we face and take steps to repulse those who would enslave us by destruction of the principles of government which have guided the destiny of this Nation through its long and glorious history.

As we stand here today in the presence of so many resolute and unwaivering citizens of Prince Edward, we can discern echoes of counsel and encouragement from that valiant and sturdy citizenship. God bless old Prince Edward. She is populated by people of stamina who are willing to sacrifice and endure hardship in order to preserve their liberties and the right to educate and train their own children.

I commend and I applaud the people of Prince Edward for the leadership which they have established and which has guided them with courage, calmness, and dignity through the trials and tribulations of the last 10 years. Prince Edward is dealing with a force with which there is no compromise short of complete surrender and submission to the destruction of everything we hold dear. Virginians will never consent to the reformation of our State and local governments to conform to the horrible mess which we daily witness in Washington.

As long as this dear old picturesque southside Virginia county is guided by the patriotic and intelligent leadership which has guided them for at least the past 10 years, I pledge to them my full and complete cooperation and support in every appropriate manner to promote the peace, the tranquillity, and the happiness and rights of her people.

The So-Called Trade Expansion Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the following statement by Robert L. L. McCormick, well-known expert in foreign trade and governmental research, sets forth serious questions regarding the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962, H.R. 11970. I feel that it is of importance that these facts be presented to all of our colleagues in both bodies. Within the next few days, I hope to present more of this material for your information:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. L. MCCORMICK, PRESIDENT, MCCORMICK ASSOCIATES, INC., ON H.R. 11970, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, AUGUST 2, 1962

My name is Robert McCormick, president, McCormick Associates, Washington, D.C. I reside on Old Georgetown Pike, McLean, Va.

Presently, and in the past, I have had numerous clients on foreign trade matters. But today I speak as a private citizen, not representing any client specifically.

My statement is divided into three parts: First, no case has been established for the urgency of this measure; second, the so-called adjustment assistance in title III contains a most dangerous precedent; and third, the detrimental effects of H.R. 11970 on the public revenue.

I. NO CASE HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED FOR THE URGENCY OF THIS MEASURE

Federal officials have stressed the urgency for the passage of H.R. 11970, the administration's tariff reduction bill. This stress on urgency is not new. Congressional history shows urgent Executive demands for the trade agreements law of 1934, and for 11 requested extensions.

The 1934 law was urgently demanded to increase our exports and help end the depression. The depression remained. Later Congress was asked to pass urgent extensions to assist our allies; help win the war; reconvert our economy from the war; help our allies do the same.

More recently, we heard the urgent cry, "trade not aid," and Congress was thus asked to remedy the world dollar shortage.

Now we hear the 12th such request for a tariff cut—with a new name and said to be urgent because of our dwindling dollar supplies. This is the exact opposite of the last previous official crisis—and also a new one, to meet the threat of the Common Market.

On the latest urgency, Acting Secretary Ball testified to the House: "But if American producers are to have a fair chance * * * we cannot afford to delay. We must be able to assure them of access to that market as soon as possible.

"Prompt action is imperative.

"First, the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act at this session can have a major effect on developments within the Common Market itself.

"By enacting the Trade Expansion Act we will make a strong declaration not only of our intention but our ability to work toward a world of expanding trade."

Must Congress immediately grant the President sweeping authority in order to permit him to deal with the EEC? Before we accept this argument, let us look at the facts:

First, are the European Economic Community internal arrangements finalized? Arguments over federalism versus union still split EEC members. Are we dealing with a Zollverein, a new state, or something in between; or are the Europeans? On this, the French Foreign Minister stated: "If the Common Market had a function and objectives that were purely economic, then we would be guided solely by a preoccupation with efficiency and any larger (free trade) system would be desirable, if it were better than a purely European system.

"However, that is not the case, for our objective is first and essential political. We are trying to build a political union.

"The customs union and the economic union are means to obtain this end, and that is what has become clear the moment when both movements began to enter into reality."

As of July 30, the EEC had reached a partial, complicated internal agricultural trade agreement phased over 7½ years to free agricultural shipments among the six members. Admittedly, no one knows if it will work at all. Many details such as pricing policy are still not even agreed. (See Wall Street Journal, Aug. 1, 1962, p. 10.) And remember self-sufficiency by 1964 in nontropical agricultural products is a key policy of the present EEC.

Second, we do not know what nations will be in the EEC. The accession of the United Kingdom and other members in the European free trade area (EFTA) to the EEC is definitely in doubt.

The U.K. has announced that, in no event, will it accede prior to 1964. The current Brussels Conference appears deadlocked. Under bitter parliamentary attack from all sides, the matter is to be debated in London this week, sponsored by a conservative government which has slipped in 12 consecutive by-elections by an average of 20 percent electoral loss. Unless this morning's newspapers come up with something sensational, no one knows if the United Kingdom will ever enter the EEC.

The meeting with the Commonwealth nations in September may well have fallen through—according to Lord Home and Mr. Heath. Even the first timid step taken at Brussels this spring, providing for a 1970 deadline for the end of Empire preference on manufactures from Commonwealth nations, met violent Commonwealth attack. So far, the Commonwealth nations also object violently and with demonstrable strength on agricultural exports. And we must not forget that the Commonwealth nations hold strong cards as the principal purchasers of Britain's manufactures. If their agriculture is out, what happens to the United Kingdom's customers? If their agriculture is in, what happens to ours?

Third, why legislate into a hypothetical vacuum? A much-touted key, if most hypothetical, provision of H.R. 11970 would permit free trade where 80 percent of world trade originates in the United States and the EEC. But no one knows who will compose the EEC.

Would not legislating into such a vacuum be irresponsible? Yet, the President's foreign trade message of January 25, 1962, states as his second key point or priority the need for the 80-percent authority (his first priority item is the overall 50-percent tariff reduction authority.)

Here the Executive is asking for authority to bargain into a complete vacuum. If Britain joins the Common Market, a very large number of products would come under the 80-percent authority. If Britain does not do so, virtually nothing would come in under the 80-percent authority: The New York Journal of Commerce recently listed oleomargarine and a few other products as being the only ones.

The Washington Post of June 10 also points this out as follows:

"What will happen to the President's trade program if the United Kingdom does not join the Common Market? That question has gained in relevance during recent weeks, as the odds on Britain's entry have fluctuated. Two principal consequences are discernible. First, the power to bargain to zero tariffs on prducts in which the United States and the Common Market account for 80 percent of world trade would mean very little. Without the United Kingdom in the Common Market, there are not many such trade categories. This provision clearly is based on the assumption that the British will join."

If Britain, Sweden, and Switzerland join the Common Market, the 80 percent would apply to practicaly all forms of manufactured goods. With them out, it would apply to practically no manufactured goods. Will they all enter? We don't know.

Again, one might reasonably ask: "What are we talking about? Eighty percent of what?" This key 80 percent cannot be computed. Yet the Congress is being asked to delegate away its constitutional authority to a formula upon which the basic computation is 80 percent of X. Is not such a provision unconstitutional, irresponsible, or absurd?

Where do Japan, Canada and other industrialized nations fit into the 80-percent formula—again conjecture?

Nor does the 80-percent formula under H.R. 11970 permit change. For example, if Japan's trade soars on optics or textiles, and thus destroys the EEC/U.S. 80-percent-of-world-trade formula, would the original tariff reduction hold or not? The bill contains no flexibility provision; yet world markets are flexible, often volatile.

As of this writing, the 80-percent provision makes no sense at all.

II. THE SO-CALLED ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE IN TITLE III CONTAINS A MOST DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

The mere existence of title III, as well as statements by official proponents of H.R. 11970, indicate clearly that the tariff reductions it contemplates will cause injury to businesses and to workers. Recently Mr. Ball stated abroad that the title III, so-called adjustment assistance, would be used as a preferred method of the escape clause. Is this not unwise and dangerous?

A. Subsidies for business—a dangerous precedent—another RFC?

H.R. 11970 provides that, when a firm has been grievously injured by imports, the Federal Government may subsidize its conversion to another business through loans, technical advice, and tax advantages; and presumably decide into which business it wishes the injured industry to convert. This is both unsound in principle, proved faulty in many RFC cases, and is highly arbitrary in nature.

When a producer's sales have been destroyed by imports, the Government may decide that he should convert into the electronics on motel business. He may decide he doesn't want to. Who makes the decision? Obviously, the hand which dispenses the money.

And, further, such subsidy is discriminatory against the taxpaying businesses which the Federal Government wants the import-injured businessman to enter. Why should an electronics manufacturer's or a motel owner's taxes be used to finance someone else to come into his own business and thus give him new competition—buttressed by special Federal aids and tax advantages?

And, besides, if the other business is worth converting into, presumably people are already operating reasonably successfully in it.

Is the Federal Government going to invent new businesses for the import-injured firms? Are we to return to the RFC days—loans for snake and alligator farms?

To underscore the absurdities of this RFC-type proposal in H.R. 11970, let us cite a few examples of businesses where RFC-type convertibility will not prove easy:

1. Cherry and other fruit orchards.
2. Plate glass factories, with their massive special machines—as well as steel mills or blast furnaces.
3. Heavy steel or aluminum forges.
4. Spring clothespin works, or, for that matter, straight pin factories.
5. Lead, zinc, or coal mines; or oil wells.
6. Cattle or sheep ranches.
7. Vineyards. Are champagne bottling equipment, wine vats, and wine tuns suitable for beer—an already overcrowded industry?
8. Pecan, olive, and almond trees.
9. Hardwood plywood mills.
10. Fishing industries: their only past conversions into other forms of endeavor were successfully accomplished—in 1776, 1812, and 1861.

Of course, Government defense or stockpiling contracts can help sometimes. It will, however, take a rather skilled bureaucrat to apply these remedies to glass, tuna, shrimp, cherries, apples, wine, or nuts.

The 4,233 pages of hearings on H.R. 9900 (over 2 million words) contain not a single example of where or how an import-injured industry can be converted into some other line of business.

The theory of Federal officials does not necessarily create facts.

Are we setting here an RFC precedent which will proliferate every time our economy gyrates—subsidies when a plant loses a defense contract, moneys to combat new technologies, subsidies when a form of transportation is bested by another form of transportation?

Are we to have such subsidies when public taste changes: when marble soda fountains or trolley cars disappear?

B. Subsidies for workers—another questionable precedent? Another WPA?

In this bill is another fact crucial to the well-being of our citizens: workers will lose their jobs. Do we want another WPA, again probably to proliferate?

On this, Mr. WILBUR MILLS, as quoted in the New Republic said: "On the issue of 'adjustment assistance' to labor, wise words were spoken, 2 days before the President's message, by Representative WILBUR D. MILLS. He said: 'Why should a worker who is out of a job due to import competition be placed in a more favorable light (if that is to be done) than any worker who is unemployed due to cancellation of defense contracts, closing of defense installations, or technological advances? Does the fact that increased trade is a matter of national policy justify singling out this area for special treatment? Why are we more concerned with causation than with the realities of people out of work?'

"It testifies to the maturity of his audience that Congressman MILLS said the above (together with much more in equally good sense) before a meeting of the AFL-CIO, and was warmly applauded."

The Government will then pay these unfortunate fellow citizens 65 percent of approximately what they have been earning (or an estimated $61 a week) for a period, sometimes as much as 78 weeks.

And, as a prerequisite to obtaining any compensation, the Federal Government will force the workers to train for some other job—presumably a job of the Government's choosing. Otherwise, the worker will receive no help—again, Government by decree.

This unemployment compensation amount greatly exceeds the present unemployment compensation provisions. It is discriminatory against unfortunate fellow citizens who lose employment through causes other than imports.

We all cannot but sympathize deeply with a man who loses his job because of imports—especially when he did not need to lose this job in the first place.

Is this fact sufficient reason for favoring him over any other citizen, unfortunately jobless, through forces beyond his own control?

In addition, will title III prove the lever whereby the taxpayer will eventually be asked to increase Federal unemployment benefits to equivalent amounts for all unemployed workers in order to eliminate the discrimination in H.R. 11970?

Will H.R. 11970 be the death knell of the State-administered unemployment compensation systems?

Do we need the escape clause and peril point as guard rules on the cliff-side; or title III as a federally subsidized hospital? No previous administration has favored this.

H.R. 11970 and the Public Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, few witnesses before either the House Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee have fully discussed the detrimental effects of the Trade Expansion Act on the public revenue. The following statement, from the testimony of Robert L. L. McCormick before the Senate Finance Committee, brings out several important facts in this field:

THE DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS OF H.R. 11970 ON THE PUBLIC REVENUE

By the time it takes full effect, H.R. 11970 will cost the American taxpayers at least $659 million a year—and probably much more—perhaps in the neighborhood of $800 million to $1 billion a year. This includes money paid out for subsidies plus the revenue losses to be sustained.

This important aspect of this measure, overlooked so far, is its main fiscal consequence.

A. Revenue outgo

The first administration bill asked for $100 million. The official Federal witnesses also mentioned 90,000 persons to be paid for being unemployed, staged over a 5-year period.

Ninety thousand unemployed, staged over a 5-year period, would be 18,000 workers unemployed each year through imports—and domestic industry believes this estimate low—very, very low, indeed.

If these 18,000 workers were to receive $61 a week, on the average, for a year—and H.R. 11970 sometimes permits payments up to 78 weeks—each would receive $3,172 for 52 weeks (not the whole 78 weeks). Totaled for 1 year, we come out with $57,096,000 a year as a modest estimate of the annual unemployment compensation cost of this program—without subsidies to business—without the technical assistance; without the retraining of labor; without swelling the Federal payroll; without technicians, research and travel; without the other possible 26 weeks of unemployment payments. Five years times $57,096,000 is $285,480,000 which is the cost of the unemployment benefits alone.

Congress has long experience in initial estimates of Federal subsidies, inevitably on the low side—$300 million, $500 million, or $1.0 billion might be a more realistic 5-year estimate of this program's revenue outgo over 5 years.

B. Revenue losses

But this inevitably large cost to the Treasury would not be all. An even more substantial annual Federal revenue loss would occur—the virtual destruction of tariffs for revenue.

Three reductions in Federal revenue are implicit in H.R. 11970: (1) The tariff cuts of 50 percent would apply to a very great many imports; (2) assuming United Kingdom accession to the EEC, free trade on products where 80 percent of world trade originates here and in the EEC combined would bring a further drastic reduction to zero; (3) lastly, elimination of all duties of 5 percent or less would further reduce the revenue—low duties, mainly giving revenue and usually lacking in protective effects.

The following table is in our opinion a reasonable study of the eventual effect upon the public revenue of the customs revenue losses which H.R. 11970 would entail. Based on 1960 customs figures, it is indicated as over $600 million per annum (and we have tried to be conservative in our estimates; revenue loss projections based upon the higher 1962 customs revenues would be higher). Our estimates based on 1960 projected are as follows:

TABLE I.—*Estimated effects of H.R. 11970 on U.S. dutiable imports for consumption based upon 1960 imports*

[In millions]

Commodity group	Imports	Calculated duty[1]	Estimated duty after H.R. 11970, as now written, would take effect
Animals and products:			
Edible	$573	$49	$25
Inedible	196	27	14
Vegetable food products and beverages	1,226	144	72
Vegetable products, inedible	350	48	24
Textile fibers and manufactures	998	230	200
Wood and paper	568	41	21
Nonmetallic minerals	1,667	117	59
Metals and manufactures	1,382	130	20
Machinery and vehicles	1,245	139	10
Chemicals and related products	196	35	5
Miscellaneous (includes photographic goods, toys, scientific instruments, clocks, and watches)	471	117	25
Total	8,872	1,077	475

[1] Department of Commerce states that calculated duty is the "amount of customs duties (including import excise tax), estimated by the Bureau of International Programs from basic data of the Bureau of the Census."

NOTE.—The total shown for calculated duty approximates the customs receipts collected in 1960 which amounted to $1,086,089,164.

Looking at such a revenue loss over a 10-year period—and again we are far on the low side—we are speaking conservatively of an eventual $6 billion which would have to be picked up from other revenue sources or obtained by increasing the national debt in comparable proportions.

At a time of deficit financing—and this holds for the foreseeable future—it would be a serious question of judgment to precommit an annual revenue curtailment of some $602 million at a minimum, or $6 billion in toto over 10 years.

To summarize, if H.R. 11970 is enacted into law, we will, in effect: First, throw away 173 years' precedent of using customs duties as an important source of revenue; and, second, almost entirely destroy tariffs as a source of protection.

As Congressman Bow has pointed out (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 11,076 of June 27, 1962), we will thus be destroying a principle developed, fostered, and pressed by our first six Presidents; and, in effect, espoused by our whole Federal Government from 1789 to 1962.

Urgency and the Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much talk on urgency to the effect that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 must be passed this year in order to offset the great trade power of the European Common Market. The following statement, part of Robert L. L. McCormick's testimony to the Senate Finance Committee, questions whether this is myth or just unproved theory:

MORE ON THE LACK OF URGENCY IN MEETING THE COMMON MARKET PROBLEM

"BRUSSELS, July 28.—The betting odds on Britain's entry into the European Common Market were reduced to 50–50 this weekend as London's negotiations with the six European member nations neared climax."—GASTON COBLENTZ, Herald Tribune News Service.

The idea that somehow the United States had to race into the Common Market is now rather definitely being proven wrong. In this connection, I would like to cite excerpts from an article by William S. White, in the Washington Evening Star, of June 4, 1962:

"The long-common assumption here that Britain's entry into the low-tariff European Common Market was practically foreordained always was dangerously premature.

"Now it looks as though the British not only are a long way off in time from going in, but actually may not be able to go in at all without intolerable cost to their ancient ties with British Commonwealth nations like Australia and Canada.

"There have been great and avoidable political miscalculations on both sides of the ocean. Six months ago the British tended—when in this country, at least—to suggest that the real question was not whether Britain could make a reasonable deal with the European Common Market countries, headed by France and West Germany."

U.S. TARIFF FACTOR

"The real question, they intimated, was whether the U.S. Congress would ever approve the broad tariff-cutting authority required if the United States itself is to be able to bargain usefully with the Common Market.

"The history of this tariff bill in the House Ways and Means Committee shows how very wrong was this idea. The committee's chairman WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, has done just about what those who knew him always thought he would. He has brought the bill forward with a quiet mixture of power and persuasion, to the point where there is not much reason to fear that the House will reject any of its principal features. The British want the United States to have that legislation; and the United States wants Britain in the Common Market.

"British estimates of the alleged unreadiness of Congress to act were wrong because Britons asked the wrong people. Representative MILLS is outwardly, but only outwardly, a country boy. The British got their information mostly from young city slickers who made the fairly common mistake of Ivy League State Department types of supposing they knew more about MILLS' committee than MILLS did.

"On the American side, the error was in assuming that because British entry into the Common Market was sensible economically, it was also inevitable. This notion underestimated the latent opposition in England within the ruling Conservative Party, not to mention the Labor Party. And it missed the apparently implacable resolve of Charles de Gaulle of France not to let Britain into the Common Market on terms preserving British self-respect and Britain's old position as the politically dominant power in Europe.

"The misunderstanding was not helped by British officials visiting here. Instead of dealing candidly and in tune with the realities of British politics at home, they often left the impression here that Conservative opposition was largely confined to a handful of ultraconservative Colonel Blimps grumbling in London's clubs."

OUTLOOK CLOUDY

"So the position now is that British negotiations with the Common Market—and notably with France, which clearly expects to be head boss of it all—are in no way promising."

At home, the conservative National Farmers Union in Britain, important in some 75 to 100 Conservative seats, lies near the base root of the political strength of the incumbent government, and has expressed strong opposition. (Incidentally, the Conservatives may not even be in office too long if the present by-election trend continues as members of Parliament resign or die.) While the Labor Party's constituency element may favor joining the EEC, a more numerous voting Labor group, the British trade unions, are not favorable to it. While some might not consider Commonwealth or United Kingdom politics pertinent here, facts cannot be overlooked.

A BRITISH VIEW ON THE LACK OF URGENCY IN ADHERING TO THE EEC

Speaking to the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., during their 90th annual meeting June 9, 1962, at the Greenbrier in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., Mr. Lincoln Steel, British national chairman of the International Chamber of Commerce pointed out the long and difficult path which lies ahead before we know whether Britain will ever join the EEC—before we will ever know if the provision permitting elimination of U.S. duties where the United States and EEC world trade equals 80 percent of the total will ever become effective. Speaking as a private British citizen, Mr. Steel said:

BRITAIN AND THE COMMON MARKET

"The Treaty of Rome, establishing the European Economic Community, that is to say France, Germany, Italy, the three countries of Benelux, Holland, Belgium and Luxemburg, was signed just over 5 years ago, and the Community (the Common Market of the six) has been in existence for nearly 4½ years.

"It was in August last year that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom announced in the House of Commons that the British Government wished to enter into negotiations with the Community with a view to membership under article 237 of the treaty. I think it is perhaps worth giving the exact wording of this article as it appears in the unofficial English translation.

'Any European state may apply to become a member of the Community. It shall address its application to the Council which, after obtaining the opinion of the Commission, shall act by means of a unanimous vote.

'The conditions of admission and the amendments to this treaty necessitated thereby shall be the subject of an agreement between the member states and the applicant state. Such agreement shall be submitted to all the contracting states for ratification in accordance with their respective constitutional rules.'

"There is just one point to which I think it is worth drawing attention and that is that the word 'amendments' appears in the English version as quoted by the Prime Minister at the time, whereas the French version uses the word 'adaptations'. It is perhaps not surprising that the French were quick to point out after the Prime Minister's statement that the intention of the wording in the treaty was to cover only the inevitable adaptations such as voting rights that would have to be made if a new member joined the club and that in their view there was no question of substantial amendment to the main clauses of the treaty.

"In October last year Mr. Heath, the Lord Privy Seal, made a lengthy statement to the member Governments of the Community in Brussels and this, in effect, was the formal opening of the negotiations for British entry. Since that date an immense amount of examination on the technical side relating to the problems of entry has been undertaken, but there has been very little progress to date insofar as agreement between the British and the six is concerned. The crux of the negotiations is still to come. The problem is immensely complicated and on an occasion like this it is difficult to know where to start, and perhaps even more difficult to know when and how to stop. But tonight I am proposing, at the risk of substantial oversimplification, to make just a very brief reference to what might be called the political aspects of the treaty, then to discuss some two or three of the technical problems, to give some indication of the likely progress of negotiations and a purely personal assessment of the chances of their success.

"Some 3 or 4 years ago, I was talking to one of the leading architects of the Treaty of Rome, and one of those who took part in the work of the Spaak committee which led up to it. In the course of conversation he carried my mind back to the time when the French had refused to ratify the treaty establishing the European Defense Community, and prospects of any European political cohesion looked pretty bleak. My informant told me at that time that he and a number of his friends had decided that further progress on political lines toward political unity was hopeless, but that if they could get a substantial degree of economic unity between the Six, this would be a hopeful step forward, and that if they could form a customs union, then increasing economic unity would lead inevitably to some form of effective political association.

"It was in the background of thoughts like these that the Treaty of Rome was drafted, and it has become abundantly clear that with the continued progress toward economic unity on the part of the Six, the original political overtones are now becoming much more significant. They are bound to affect both the thoughts of the existing members of the club and the desires and intentions of the outside world, whether they are potential candidates for membership or are likely to remain completely outside.

"Now in forming this Economic Community the real cornerstone was the decision to proceed to a customs union, that is to say a group of countries presenting a uniform tariff to the whole of the outside world, with complete freedom from tariffs on any transaction between the members of the community. It was in fact a reproduction on a far greater scale of the original German "Zollerein" which was the foundation of the present German State. It is, however, this very reliance on the customs union which at one and the same time is an attraction to a potential new member who does or expects to do a lot of trade with the other members of the club, but also in the case of Great Britain raises a series of immensely difficult and complicated problems in relation to its present trading pattern with the Commonwealth. I am going to give just two instances, butter and bananas.

"If the United Kingdom were to join the Community and adopt completely the external tariff of the Six without any exceptions or derogations in favor of the Commonwealth, it would have a profound and possibly disastrous effect on the economies of a large number of other countries, some it is true exceedingly small, but whose existence cannot either in equity or in good sense be ignored.

"I know that any form of preference, and perhaps in particular Commonwealth preference, is an evocative and emotive word in the United States, but I think perhaps it is insufficiently realized that that particular piece of Commonwealth preference which would be gravely affected by British membership of a customs union is simply and solely free entry into the United Kingdom.

"For many years now virtually everything imported into England from the Commonwealth overseas, whether it happens to be from the developed countries enjoying high standards, such as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, or countries such as those in the West Indies which are in a much earlier stage of development, are, with virtually no exception, admitted completely free of any duty or quantitative restriction. There are, for example, no less than 12 British territories in the Caribbean, the so-called Little Eight (Barbados, the Windward, and Leeward Islands), Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana, and British Honduras. Most of them are largely dependent for their export earnings on bananas sold free of duty in the United Kingdom. Their economies would be gravely shaken if in the future they had to pay a duty of 20 percent, while bananas from the Cameroons, which at present enjoy a form of associate membership of the Six, were allowed to go in duty-free; and it is not only with bananas, but with sugar and spices and a range of tropical products and fruits that problems would arise. To sign the Treaty of Rome blind, without any arrangement being negotiated for these territories and others in a similar position scattered around the world, would, I think, be an act of political folly. To leave them out on a limb with a complete disregard for their economies might mean 12 new Cubas in the Caribbean and on the mainland of Central America.

"Now let us take the case of New Zealand and butter. New Zealand, favored with soil and climate which is ideal for growing high-quality grass virtually throughout the year, is probably the cheapest, as well as one of the most efficient producers of milk and dairy products in the whole world. What would happen in New Zealand if the United Kingdom made no provision for the problem of New Zealand farm products? The common tariff on butter in the Six is also about 20 percent. To sign the Treaty of Rome on the dotted line would mean that New Zealand butter would pay this tariff on entry into the United Kingdom, whereas Dutch and Danish butter, if Denmark also joins the club, would be allowed in free. When we think that similar circumstances would apply to New Zealand mutton, lamb, and cheese, and when we realize that far and away the largest part of New Zealand's exports consists of agricultural products, with two-thirds going to the United Kingdom, it is not surprising that the New Zealand Government could never willingly accept the British membership of the Community unless some substantial safeguards had been obtained to cover New Zealand's problems.

"Time does not permit even to relate a series of other special difficulties that have to be taken care of, the sisal from Tanganyika, the cloves from Zanzibar, nutmegs from Grenada and a host of other items, perhaps trivial in themselves in terms of the total quantum of world trade, but all vitally important to the tiny territories concerned. Nor have I dealt with the problem of manufactured goods, both from the developed and developing territories. This is equally complicated, and failure to obtain a solution would have the most important long-term political effects. India, Pakistan, and Hong Kong, for example, are rapidly industrializing. The Western World is giving or lending immense sums to help them. Their economies, however, can never be fully sustaining unless they export manufactured goods in addition to the traditional primary products. If the United Kingdom, instead of admitting everything free from the Commonwealth, puts up trade barriers, it could only mean that either these countries will suffer substantially, or that we and the rest of the Western World may feel compelled to grant them even more direct aid in the form of gifts of money or of the softest of soft loans.

"How are we to solve these problems? Mr. Heath, in his statement of October last, said it would be a tragedy if British entry into the Community forced other members of the Commonwealth to change their whole pattern of trade and, consequently perhaps, their political orientation. He pointed out, however, that the problems of Commonwealth trade had analogies, particularly in the problem of the French when they negotiated the Treaty of Rome, and that special provision was made either in the Treaty or in its accompanying protocols, to cover these difficulties. Thus, for example, the oversea dependent territories of the Six were given a special form of associated membership of the Community. This was, of course, of the greatest importance to France in Africa. Mr. Heath hinted that the problem of a number of British associated territories might be solved in the same way. At the same time, he suggested that as far as some products were concerned, notably agricultural products from temperate climates (which is just another way of saying 'butter from New Zealand'), might be solved if the Community could in effect guarantee them comparable outlets, so that if they lost in exports to the United Kingdom as such, they would gain in exports to the rest of the Community. You will see, however, that solutions of this kind may not appeal overmuch to the Six. It is doubtful, for example, if France would be anxious to see comparable outlets on the Continent for New Zealand butter, or Australian wheat.

"So we come back to the fact that, although the negotiations between the European Economic Community and the United Kingdom have been in hand since October, there appears on the face of it to have been very little progress as far as agreed terms of admission are concerned. What has happened is that there has been a fuller knowledge and appreciation of the complexity of the problem by all the experts who are engaged in preparing proofs for the negotiators. It is true that a few days ago it was announced that the United Kingdom was prepared, as part of the package deal, to end the preference on manufactured goods from the developed Commonwealth over a period of years. The amount of trade involved was not very large, and it may have come as a surprise to the British negotiators when the reaction from Australia and New Zealand in particular was so fierce. I imagine that the real problem here is that, whereas such an arrangement for a death in three cuts extending over 7 years might tolerable for the relatively small quantity of trade done, they are desperately afraid lest it should be taken as a precedent for similar action in trades of immensely greater importance.

"Well, there it is, the British Government has gone an immense way to meet the Six by agreeing in principle to accept all the main underlying objectives of the Treaty of Rome. It is now, as I see it, for the Six to show willing and to recognize in a practical and helpful manner the grave problems which the British Government, the Commonwealth, and in fact for that matter the rest of the world, have to face. If the attitude of the Six, not as individuals but as a group, is tough and obstructive, then the British Government will be faced with the appalling dilemma of either initialing an agreement which might well be rejected by Parliament, split the Conservative Party and put the Socialists in power, or of pulling out entirely from the negotiations and starting again from square one. No man can forecast with any certainty what is likely to happen over the next few months and for that matter the dice may already have been thrown at the recent meeting between the Prime Minister and President de Gaulle.

"As far as my own personal opinion is concerned, I find it difficult to imagine that any satisfactory outline agreement will be arrived at quickly. There is still much hard bargaining ahead. On the other hand if the French and the Germans make the decision that they would really like to have the United Kingdom as a full and loyal member of the Community then they have only to instruct their negotiators on what is admittedly a more complicated position and put the same sort of concessions to the British view that were conceded to the French at the time when the Treaty of Rome was negotiated."

The latest quotation from Britain, from the New York Herald Tribune by a staff correspondent from London, is as follows:

"TWO BRITISH PARTY GROUPS OPPOSE MARKET ENTRY

"Conservative and Labor Party backbench groups moved last night to fight against the Government's last major drive to join the Common Market.

"The Conservatives, politically the more important because they represent a growing section of opinion in the majority party, presented a motion asking the Government not to renege on its promises to protect the Commonwealth; British agriculture and its fellow members of the European Free Trade Association.

"It had 40 Tory signatures, and, by their example, the sponsors are hoping to gather at least another 20 adherents in their call to stand firm.

"Meanwhile, the Labor Committee of Britain and the Common Market circulated to every opposition Member a lengthy statement sharply criticizing the way Lord Privy Seal Edward Heath has conducted the negotiations in Brussels.

"The statement contained a message from Lord Attlee, the former Labor Prime Minister, stating 'I do not think it would be wise for Britain to enter the Common Market on the terms which seem to be contemplated by Mr. Health and the present Government.'"

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understood clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JUNE 23, 1962.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am in favor of House Resolution 211 creating a Captive Nations Committee. I have participated in the observance of Captive Nations Week in Chicago.

We must do all in our power to liberate the nations that are subjugated by communism. This is an effective way to do so. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

______ ______.

GOUVERNEUR, N.Y., *August 1, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

OUR DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Thank you for your tireless efforts on behalf of the captive nations. You are making a great contribution to the cause of freedom. Please continue to do all you can to expedite the establishment of the Committee of Captive Nations in the House of Representatives (H. Res. 211).

We wish more of our country's lawmakers, like you, would evaluate the importance of the leadership of the United States in the free world.

Year after year the sphere of communism becomes larger. This should be stopped immediately. People all over the world are suffering under this form of government and many nations of the world are succumbing to it because the people in these nations cannot comprehend its unjustness.

Very truly yours,

A. VALIUSKIS.
K. VALIUSKIS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I believe your proposal in House Resolution 211 to be the best and most appropriate one at the present time in the battle against imperialist Moscow.

Sincerely yours,

ANATOL MENCK.

CLARINDA, IOWA, *July 19, 1962.*

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please send me imformation on House Resolution 211 and its present status in the Congress.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. HAROLD WITTHOFT.

JULY 23, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I read in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about your vigorous campaign in behalf of the Captive Nations Committee. May I wish you a complete success in this worthwhile undertaking?

I am also very glad that you fully recovered from your recent illness. The captive peoples again have a fighter for their cause.

With best regards.

DR. ALBERT N. TARULIS.

"Visit U.S.A." Bungling Hurts Tourist Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an extremely enlightening article on the work of the U.S. Travel Agency, the subject of much comment during our consideration of the Commerce Department appropriation bill. The article appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 18 and reads as follows:

"VISIT U.S.A." BUNGLING HURTS TOURIST TRADE

(By Norbert Muhlen)

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, August 18.—The Kennedy administration's "Visit U.S.A." program is meeting only weak response abroad. For a reason: the customer is being duped.

The U.S. Travel Service, a Government agency administering the program, was launched with great fanfare on June 29, 1961. Yet the agency only managed to boost tourist trade by 16 percent in the first year of its existence, and this figure includes visitors attracted by the Seattle World's Fair.

Posing as a German eager to tour America, this reporter recently went to the USTS office here, which is in charge of all of West Germany, Austria, Italy, and most of Switzerland. To find this bureau took some doing, however, as nobody in the local offices of the American Express Co. or the German airlines could tell me its location.

A phone call to the U.S. Information Agency elicited the information that the USTS was in the U.S. consulate general building, but on arrival there it turned out to be in a different part of town miles away.

AS PER INSTRUCTIONS

A would-be tourist would have spent almost an hour, and over $4 on this search.

In the tourist office, a family of three Germans was just discussing American vacation plans with the only USTS employee available. In line with her instructions from the Washington head office, she assured the would-be visitors that they could tour this country on $8 a day per person. She did not know that according to the American Automobile Association, costs for traveling in a car are almost exactly twice that high.

The prospective tourists were told that they could find a room anywhere in this country for $6 a night—which "almost always includes," as an official USTS ad placed throughout Europe explains, "air conditioning and television, and like as not, a swimming pool outside your door."

Voit Gilmore, President Kennedy's appointee as USTS director, who owns three North Carolina motor lodges and restaurants, might remind his staff and himself that a motel or hotel room of this kind "like as not" will set a tourist back more than he had been led to budget for the whole day including meals, tips, and sightseeing.

FOOD: $3 A DAY

Yet, the innocent from abroad were informed by USTS that they could eat well on $2 to $3 a day; as the official ad proclaims, "the most tempting dishes on the menu are often the less expensive ones—because they are local specialties like the New England lobsters * * *" How a lobster dinner would leave the low-budget tourist with a penny to spend on breakfast and lunch seems a mystery which USTS failed to reveal. And feasting on drug store sandwiches for several vacation weeks in order to survive on his budget is bound to leave a very bitter aftertaste in the foreign guest's mouth—and mind.

Some European tourists went broke after their first vacation week in America, and rushed home. Others roughed it as involuntary penny-pinchers. In either case, they blamed it all on misleading promises, and returned with deplorable, but understandable resentments against this country.

A Swiss businessman who regularly visits America, asked me: "Why don't your travel authorities admit that a trip to the United States is expensive, the way even the Russians advertise travel to their realm? Most Europeans today want to visit America, and with the new prosperity in Europe, many can well afford it. But for Pete's sake, stop selling it as the poor man's vacation paradise."

The image of America in foreign eyes will considerably improve if as many guests from abroad as possible can come and see its realities, but the exact opposite is likely to be achieved when they feel they are lured to its shores, and then treated like customers in a gyp joint.

Norfolk, Conn., Weatherman To Receive Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Edward C. Childs, of Norfolk, Conn., has been selected to receive the Weather Bureau's Thomas Jefferson Award with a citation signed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges commending Mr. Childs "for over 30 years of outstanding public service taking observations and disseminating weather information at Norfolk, Conn."

I take pride in calling the attention of my colleagues to this award which has been won by Mr. Childs by virtue of dedicated service through which he has provided information of inestimable value to the Nation. The Weather Bureau has more than 12,000 cooperative observers throughout the United States who make and record daily observations, and Mr. Childs is among the most capable and reliable in this service.

The Thomas Jefferson Award, which was presented yesterday to Mr. Childs, was created by the Weather Bureau in 1959 to honor voluntary observers for unusual and outstanding accomplishment in the field of meteorological observations. A presentation luncheon was arranged in honor of Mr. Childs, at the Hartford Club by Col. John R. Reitemeyer, publisher of the Hartford (Conn.) Courant.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include at this point an article written by Joseph O'Brien, which succinctly presents the facts of Mr. Childs' experiences as a weather watcher. The article was published in the August 16 issue of the Hartford Courant:

WEATHER WATCHER BEGAN AVOCATION AS YOUNGSTER

(By Joseph O'Brien)

NORFOLK.—More than 30 years of observing the weather of northwestern Connecticut has been "an interesting avocation," said Edward C. Childs Wednesday night.

Childs, operator of the cooperative weather station here, has been selected by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to receive the Department of Commerce Weather Bureau's Thomas Jefferson award.

Childs has been cited by Hodges "for more than 30 years of outstanding public service." He began operation of the weather station in Norfolk, "the ice box" of Connecticut, on January 1, 1932.

BACK TO 1915

But Child's weather watching began long before that. "I got into weather observing as a youngster," he said Wednesday night. "I have maps going back to 1915."

Child's weather station is located at his home on Windrow Road, about 2 miles southwest of Norfolk Village. A temperature recording station is located about a mile away in a hayfield of Norfolk Valley. It is this station, Childs said "which gives the frequently surprising low temperature readings." Childs said the low readings come in the field on nights that are clear and still with low humidity. "It will be chilly there tomorrow morning," he said.

UP TO 100 ONCE

The lowest temperature recorded at the field was in February of 1943 when the mercury dipped to 37 below zero. But although Norfolk has the title of Connecticut's ice box, Childs said temperatures only go below zero here an average of 12 to 13 days a year. The highest temperature recorded in his 31 years of observing here was 101 in June of 1933, Childs said. "But that's the only day its ever been to 100 in 31 years." Childs said that during that period there were only 2 days or less per year when the temperature got above 90. "So the climate here is not severe," he said.

Childs said the most significant thing about Norfolk weather is the precipitation. "It is heavy for the region of the State and latitude," he said with an average of about 52 inches a year. This is significant, Childs said, because of the many streams that start in high wooded hills of the area. Childs said in future, more weather observing stations will have to be located in higher wooded elevations because they are the areas where streams start. This is important to observe, he said "because water is one of our most important resources with the increasing population."

Childs is assisted at the weather station by Norfolk Selectman Norman E. Smith who has been observing since shortly after the station opened in 1932.

Childs said his most interesting experience as a weather observer came "back in the days before I knew any better." Working for a firm in Reading, Pa., in 1938, Childs predicted 3 days in advance a hurricane would hit Providence. He was right, but said Wednesday night "knowing more about hurricanes today, I wouldn't be so rash as to predict anything. They can take some pretty irregular courses and can fool you."

Death Ends Noble Career of Mr. James W. Mark, of Du Bois, Pa., Prominent in Labor Circles in Pennsylvania, Where for Over 64 Years He Was Affiliated With the Bituminous Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, labor circles were saddened on August 16, 1962, when Mr. James W. Mark, of Du Bois, Pa., well-known labor leader in Pennsylvania since the turn of the century was summoned to his eternal reward after 83 years of fruitful living.

Mr. Mark, who was affectionately known as "Jim" Mark by thousands of bituminous coal miners and operators in central Pennsylvania, completed over 64 years of activity in the bituminous coal industry in the Keystone State, when he retired in November 1952.

The following tributes to Jim Mark, which appeared in the August 17 and August 18 editions of the Du Bois Courier-Express, reflect the deep esteem in which the deceased was held by people in all walks of life. Among the tributes is the telegram from John L. Lewis, president emeritus and other officers of the United Mine Workers of America:

[From the Du Bois (Pa.) Courier-Express, Aug. 17, 1962]

CONFIDANT OF UNION FOUNDERS—JAMES MARK, DU BOIS LABOR GREAT, IS DEAD

A famous Du Bois man—James W. Mark, of 13 Maloney Road—who was a living chapter in the American labor movement—is dead at the age of 85.

The ironfisted leader of coal miners in the Du Bois area during the tumultuous era of union organization succumbed in the Maple Avenue Hospital at 8:35 o'clock last night after a lingering illness.

During his 64 years in the coal business—a majority of them as an official of District 2, United Mine Workers of America—he was a confidant of the great personalities in the labor movement. He was sought out by Phil Murray, of the Steelworkers who later founded the CIO (Committee of Industrial Organization); John L. Lewis, the fiery leader of the miners; and of Samuel Gompers, who founded the American Federation of Labor.

James Mark was "Mr. Union" in the Du Bois coal-field after the turn of the century and remained so until he retired as district 2 president. He was intimately known by the thousands of miners who once worked in the pits in Clearfield, Jefferson, Elk and Cambria counties.

Soft-spoken but always carrying a big stick, Mr. Mark was well known in the coal towns in the Du Bois area that are no more—Eriton, Stanley, Big Soldier, the Shafts at Shaffer Siding and West Sandy—and in the towns that once prospered with their deep mines—Helvetia, Stump Creek, Rathmel.

He was a "field man" for the United Mine Workers; and his grit and mettle went far in organizing miners in this area. It was his efforts, and others like him in the Kentucky and Illinois coal fields, that tipped the scales of power in the coal fields from the companies to the unions. It was the miners' treasury that financed the first phase of industrial unionization in America during the thirties leading to the rise of the labor titans of today.

Friends will be received at the Moore funeral chapel here tonight, 7 to 9, Saturday from 2 to 4, 7 to 9, and Sunday 2 to 4, 7 to 9, and until service time Monday at 2 p.m. Sang Hyun Lee, assistant to Rev. Harold H. Byers, Jr., of the United Presbyterian Church of Du Bois, will officiate.

His wife, the former Phoebe Ayre Lucas, died July 9, 1962, after 63 years of wedded life. They were married in Brockway on December 25, 1898.

He leaves the following children: Mrs. Janet Benyon, Mrs. Donald (Ruth) Erickson, Mrs. Paul (Jessie) Nelson, and Allen Mark, of Du Bois; James Mark, of Alexandria, Va., Mrs. Frank (Agnes) Grebe, of Falls Church, Va., Mrs. Carl (Margaret) Nelson, Lancaster, Pa., William Mark, of Camp Hill; and Mrs. Edward (Phoebe) Gallager, of Butler.

He also leaves 18 grandchildren and 14 great-grandchildren. A daughter, Rachel, preceded him in death as did four brothers and two sisters.

James Mark was born April 29, 1877, in Scotland, the native country of another great labor leader, the late Philip Murray.

His parents brought him to the United States when he was a year and a half. They settled at Burnice, in Sullivan County. His father, Allan Mark, went to work in the mines and his mother, the former Agnes Steele, became a typical miner's wife.

At age 11, young Jim Mark was in the mines in Jefferson County. And he spent the next 20 years mining in Jefferson, Cambria, Elk, and Clearfield counties. During this time he held various posts in local unions.

District 2, the UMW organization of which he later became president, was organized at Tyrone in 1898. Mr. Mark joined the UMW staff as a national organizer in district 2 in 1908 under Thomas Lewis. After a union election, which went the wrong way, Mr. Mark went back to work in the pits.

In 1913, Mr. Mark ran for the office of executive board member from subdistrict 5 of district 2 and was elected by 31 votes. He took office on April 1, the day Woodrow Wilson was sworn in as President of the United States for his first term.

At the time, the late Charles O'Neill, who later won fame as top negotiator for the northern coal operators, was vice president of district 2. When he joined the operators' side in 1917, Mr. Mark was appointed vice president in his place.

He held this job for 10 years, until 1927, when he was elected president. He served 25 years and 6 months. For 28 years he was chairman of the union's national scale committee.

In 1929, when it came time to have another election, there was a great depression. The district was in such bad shape that the International Miners' Union took over, and Mr. Mark has had his job by appointment of UMW President John L. Lewis ever since.

After 64 years in the coal business, and president of district 2 since 1927, Mr. Mark retired in November 1952 and spent his winter years quietly with his wife in West Sandy Township.

A devoted family and union man, Mr. Mark was a man without hobbies. "All my life I always worked," he once said.

But he was an avid reader, and like other labor leaders of his era, that is how he gained his education in economics and the social sciences.

But for a nasty slump in the coal business, James Mark might never have come to America and become an American.

His father was working in Sullivan County. It was the custom when a depression came, the single men would be idled first. His father was caught in such a layoff. He returned to Scotland for a short visit. There he met Agnes Lucas and married. Remaining in his native land for a few years, he then returned to the United States.

With him came his infant son, James.

This son will be buried Monday afternoon in Morningside Cemetery, a stone's throw from the location of Berwind shaft that once graced the skyline of Shaffer Siding a half century ago, a onetime great mine in the Du Bois area.

[From the Du Bois (Pa.) Courier-Express, Aug. 18, 1962]

JOHN L. LEWIS WIRES SYMPATHY TO MARK FAMILY

Many top-ranking united mine union officials are expected to be in Du Bois Monday to attend the funeral of James Mark, of 13 Maloney Road, who died Thursday evening. He was the retired president of district 2, one of the largest districts in the UMW.

A telegram was received by the Mark family yesterday from John L. Lewis, the president emeritus of the international union. It read:

"We were profoundly saddened by the passing of your distinguished father and know that our sorrow is shared by his many friends and associates over the years, as well as the countless members of our union to whom he devoted a lifetime of faithful and valued service throughout our early struggles and in the years that followed. His memory will ever be revered in the minds and hearts of all who were privileged to know him, and in the annals of the mineworkers history, as a pioneer officer of our union, possessed of indomitable courage and great capabilities, who was at all times steadfast in his loyalty to the principles and ideals of the United Mine Workers of America.

To you and the other members of your bereaved family, in this hour of your intense grief, we extend our deepest sympathy, with the hope that you will take comfort in the memory of your father's untold contributions to the welfare and progress of his union, the fullness of his life, and the depth of affection in which he was held by one and all."

JOHN L. LEWIS,
President Emeritus.
THOMAS KENNEDY,
President.
W. A. BOYLE,
Vice President.
JOHN OWENS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Henry English

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Henry English, as a former student at East Texas State Teachers College, where Mr. English went to college, I take pleasure in including an editorial written by Hon. Carl Estes about Henry English. Also I include a letter written by Hon. Al E. Cudlipp, Jr.:

[From the Longview Sunday News-Journal, Aug. 12, 1962]

HE CAME THROUGH

(By Carl L. Estes)

If one were to take a poll of business and industrial leaders of the Southwest to ascertain who in their opinion best personified the American way of life and the free enterprise system, we are firm in the conviction that a vast majority of the votes would go to a native east Texan who, in true Horatio Alger style, has risen through the ranks to become one of the Nation's foremost executives.

As a young man, Henry E. English, president and board chairman of Red Ball Motor Freight, Inc., aimed high. Motivated by a burning ambition to achieve and spurred by an insatiable desire to be of service to his fellow man, this great man's career began to take shape early, although he was not conscious of it at the time. It was through work and vision that the pattern for a full and useful life and a successful business was cut.

As a boy, he and his father loaded stock into cattle cars marked with big "red ball" stickers. This meant that the shipments would get preferential handling. In his own words, "That stuck with me for years, the idea of speeding right on through on a clear track."

And that is how his famed company acquired its name—while at the same time it gives a keen insight into his philosophy of life.

The basic principles taught him by his parents were the guidelines upon which his personal life and his business were based. Every young man would find it very worthwhile to follow these principles: (1) "The man who sits and waits for things to happen usually finds he not only missed his chance in life for success, but also missed a lot of fun. (2) Striving for a goal is almost spiritual in nature. Working to obtain a worthwhile objective means self-reliance, self-sacrifice and self-discipline."

As an 18-year-old youth, Henry English took the $150 he had saved and $100 in borrowed money and started a busline between Dallas and Grennville with one used car. He repaid the loan within 10 days and in 1927—8 years later—sold his interest for $65,000. In 1928 he established a freight line in Lufkin that now has become one of the largest transportation systems owned and operated by an individual in the Nation.

By any yardstick, this remarkable east Texan is a big man—in stature, heart, mind, character, and ability. A rugged individual, personable, purposeful and imaginative, he has always possessed a keen business acumen and the will to work.

Those of us who know him best can testify that these few words aptly describe this man: Iron hand in silken glove; rule with firmness, but rule with love.

Henry English is a man of courage, confidence, and decision and these are some of the attributes that have taken him to the pinnacle of success. Yet he is a quiet, unassuming individual with a penchant for handling administrative matters. Through the warmth of his personality and his consideration for others, plus his innate ability, this "King of the Gear Jammers" has carved for himself an enviable place in Texas industry.

A civic soldier, he has given generously and indefatigably of himself over the last 30 years to the continued upbuilding of Dallas, where he lives and directs the farflung operations of his mammoth enterprise. He has served as an officer or director in virtually every civic or charity organization during these three decades while at the same time building a transportation empire of more than 10,000 miles of certified routes, annual payrolls approaching $10 million, 75 terminals in 9 States, 1,700 pieces of equipment and 1,400 employees.

Big, strong, robust, and hearty, this "man's man" is dedicated to his business and his city, and is devoted to his family and friends. He is the personification of loyalty.

Search the world over and you will find only one Henry English.

As the painted red ball on freight cars symbolized "speeding right on through on a clear track," the widely known Dallas industrial and civic leader set his course early in life and did not wander or deviate from it. With a keen sense of direction he made his way from the ownership of two trucks to the presidency in 1950 of the American Trucking Associations, the first Texan ever to hold that post.

Yes, Henry English has seen his dream come true. He came through * * * and is still going strong. As an example of his recognition as a national personality, the New York Times recently published a front-page feature story about him.

To our very dear friend of many years, we extend our heartiest congratulations and sincerest best wishes. May good health and happiness be his for many, many more years!

RED BALL MOTOR FREIGHT, INC.,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR FRIEND: Last week the New York Times featured a personality sketch of Henry E. English. Without Mr. English's knowledge, several copies of this article were mailed to friends and business associates. We have been most gratified by the very kind response to this article, both in personal letters and comments in the press and trade magazines.

Of particular interest and importance was a page one editorial by Carl L. Estes, publisher of the Longview Sunday News-Journal, complete with the "Red Ball" symbol. The editorial ran two columns' length on the left-hand side of the Sunday, August 12, issue of Mr. Estes' fine newspaper. A reprint in full of the New York Times story was carried on page 3 of the same issue.

This was such a fine tribute to Mr. English that I thought you might like a copy and I am attaching a reproduction of this editorial clipped from the Longview Sunday News-Journal.

Please, let me know if I can be of assistance to you at any time.

Yours very truly,
AL. E. CUDLIPP, Jr.,
Vice President, Public Relations.

A Statement to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, following is a statement released by me today to my constituents in the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia:

It had not been my intention, nor do I propose to do so now, to inject myself into the primary election of September 12 in which a candidate will be elected to succeed me as the Representative to the United States Congress from the Eighth District of Georgia.

However, a situation of which I have just become aware has arisen, and I feel it imperative that I make it known to the people of the Eighth District. To fail to do so would be contrary to the straightforwardness with which I have always conducted the affairs of our district.

I have felt, and I have so stated many times, that the people should be free to make their choice for Representative without my interference in anyway. I also made this crystal clear to the members of my staff and all of them abided by my instructions except one. This person asked for leave of absence so that he could actively campaign for a certain candidate in order to insure himself of a job. I refused his request, stating that I did not blame him for wanting to try to get a job, but to be completely fair to the other candidates and most especially to the taxpayers, it would be necessary for him to resign.

After several months he did resign and I accepted his resignation. A few days after he resigned copies of correspondence with the candidate he is helping came into my possession. I was shocked to learn that he had been using his knowledge of my friendships with many people and also knowledge of my office to the political benefit of the candidate he had chosen to work for while he was still employed by me. This in spite of the fact that he had gone out of his way to assure me that he had done absolutely nothing except to discuss with the candidate the fact that he would get a job if he decided to help him.

I require many things of the people who work for me but, above all else, I require loyalty. And I give loyalty in return. Needless to say, I am shocked and grieved to learn that this employee has betrayed my trust. I am doubly hurt by the fact that the taxpayers have also been betrayed for it is they who have paid his salary.

I still do not attempt to tell the people how to vote for a Representative in Congress but because of the above-stated circumstances, I feel that I must tell you that nobody speaks for me, just as no one has ever spoken for me since you entrusted me with the highest office it is in your power as a group to give. I consider your trust in me to be sacred, and I deeply regret that even one member of my staff could betray you.

Anniversary Messages: U.S. Naval Dental Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, congratulatory messages was the order of the day when the U.S. Navy Dental Corps marked its 50th anniversary on August 22.

From the corpsmen on up to Rear Adm. C. W. Schantz, the officers and men of the Dental Corps richly deserve these tributes.

Even the President took time out of his grueling schedule to wire his greetings to the Corps. In the Medical News Letter, several of these glowing accolades were published, along with an interesting and detailed history of the Corps and the accomplishments of its dedicated personnel.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert the newsletter so that all America may read of the outstanding work of this medical division:

ANNIVERSARY MESSAGES—U.S. NAVAL DENTAL CORPS

THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1962.

Rear Adm. C. W. SCHANTZ, U.S. Navy,
Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery (Dentistry), and Chief, Dental Division, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.:

I am happy to extend my greetings and congratulations to Admiral Schantz and the officers and men of the Dental Division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery on the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Naval Dental Corps.

The corps performs an important function in maintaining the health of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps, and I am glad to have this opportunity to send the U.S. Naval Dental Corps my warm congratulations and best wishes for the tasks which still lie ahead of you.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington.

To: The U.S. Naval Dental Corps, 1962.

Hearty congratulations on your 50th anniversary. Your half century of service has been a record of professional competence, praiseworthy accomplishments, and devotion to duty. Your corps has made remarkable progress in the field of dentistry.

We are proud to have your corps as an important member of the team that helps to maintain the overall health of Armed Forces of the United States. My best wishes for your continued success.

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington.

It is a sincere pleasure for me to extend warmest greetings to the U.S. Naval Dental Corps on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Your mission is vital to the maintenance of the overall health of the Navy and Marine Corps. The complexities of the modern defense machine demand a physical fitness unknown during the founding period of your fine corps. Yours is a direct contribution to this effort.

In addition, you exert a lasting influence upon the health of millions of our young men and women who serve their country in the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps. This influence carries over into the civil populace as these individuals return to their homes and families, thus adding to the overall health potential of our Nation.

May the U.S. Naval Dental Corps, through pursuit of its vigorous programs of education and research, continue in its prominent position of leadership in the dental profession throughout the civilized world.

FRED KARTH.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS.

It is a sincere pleasure to extend warm and hearty congratulations to the U.S. Naval Dental Corps on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of its founding. Your contributions to the overall health of officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps are without question a vital factor in the successful completion of our many and varied duties.

The many requirements placed upon these who man our ships, aircraft, shore stations, and Marine units make it necessary that all personnel concerned attain the highest possible degree of physical fitness. Your outstanding efficiency, technical achievements, and superb leadership today are a major part of our program of keeping people fit and will be of even greater value in the days to come.

GEORGE W. ANDERSON,
Admiral, U.S. Navy.

HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MARINE CORPS,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDANT,
Washington, D.C.

Rear Adm. CURTIS W. SCHANTZ, D.C.,
Assistant Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Chief, Dental Division, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHANTZ: It is a genuine pleasure to extend heartiest congratulations and best wishes from the U.S. Marine Corps to you, and to all the members of the Navy Dental Corps, on the 50th anniversary of your splendid organization.

Since its founding on August 22, 1912, the Navay Dental Corps has established a fine record of devotion to duty and high professional competence. We Marines hold all of you in high esteem.

Warmest personal regards and every good wish for the continued success of the Navy Dental Corps.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. SHOUP,
General, U.S. Marine Corps, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

THE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE NAVY.

It is my pleasure to extend sincere congratulations to the Navy Dental Corps on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Throughout these years dental care for Navy and Marine Corps personnel has kept pace with the tremendous advances in dental techniques and materials. Significant contributions by Navy dental officers have been made in the broad areas of dental caries, oral pathology, and high-speed techniques. Both residency training and postgraduate level education have been vigorously conducted to improve and increase clinical capability. Dental officers have increased their proficiency in general anesthesia prior to assignment to sea duty and thereby give invaluable support to the medical officer during surgical procedures.

As spokesman for the other corps of the medical department I am privileged to publicly acclaim your importance as a component of the medical team. Working together we can truly accomplish our mission of protecting the health and physical fitness of the serviceman.

E. C. KENNEY,
Rear Admiral, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY,
Washington, D.C.

To: Members of the U.S. Naval Dental Corps and Reserve components.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Naval Dental Corps, I offer a warm and cordial greeting to all those whose unceasing efforts have been directed toward the building of the professional reputation enjoyed by us today.

It is a time for us to reflect upon our past achievements; it is also a time for us to plan for even greater accomplishments ahead. Progress is never static. Many of those who have gone before us set their sights on goals that were often beyond the horizon; they, however, possessed the fortitude to chart a forthright course, often through stormy seas, to secure the fulfillment of their vision. It is this spirit that has been the driving force behind the leadership of the U.S. Naval Dental Corps.

Our heritage, therefore, demands that we, the members of the Dental Corps of 1962, accomplish our everyday tasks and surmount our everyday problems in a manner that will be a source of pride to those who will celebrate our centennial, 50 years hence. This will often demand personal sacrifices, not without some misgivings, but our deeds pervade our future. I, therefore, proudly extend to all members of the U.S. Naval Dental Corps, past and present, Regular and Reserve and to all those who work with us, a well done and sincere anniversary wishes.

C. W. SCHANTZ,
Rear Admiral, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery (Dentistry), and Chief, Dental Division.

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill.

Rear Adm. CURTISS W. SCHANTZ,
Assistant Chief for Dentistry, and Chief, Dental Division. Department of the Navy, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHANTZ: It is my pleasure to extend to all officers of the Navy Dental Corps, Active, Reserve, and retired, the heartfelt congratulations of the members of the American Dental Association on the occasion of the corps' golden anniversary.

The officers of the Navy Dental Corps, through their extraordinary devotion to the improvement of the dental health of Navy personnel and their intimate concern for the stability of the corps as an essential and autonomous arm of the Navy health team, have earned the unstinting admiration of the entire dental profession.

On behalf of the more than 98,000 members of the American Dental Association, I am privileged to extend all good wishes for continued success and good sailing to all members of the Navy Dental Corps.

Cordially,

JOHN R. ABEL, D.D.S.,
President.

THE U.S. NAVAL DENTAL CORPS

(Rear Adm. C. W. Schantz, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, Assistant Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery (Dentistry), and Chief, Dental Division)

Fifty years have passed since President Taft, on August 22, 1912, signed a bill passed by Congress authorizing the appointment of "not more than 30 acting assistant dental surgeons to be a part of the Medical Department of the U.S. Navy." Although the event marked the establishment of the U.S. Naval Dental Corps, its roots may be traced backward for well over 100 years. For it was in 1844 that Dr. Edward Maynard, a dentist in Washington, D.C., first advocated a Dental Corps for the U.S. Army and for the U.S. Navy. Numerous letters substantiate his efforts. During the years that intervened, many additional attempts were made to provide regular dental care in the U.S. Navy.

There were, however, dentists and dental apprentices in the U.S. Navy before the establishment of a Dental Corps. Thomas O. Walton, D.D.S., graduate of the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery in 1856, was the first graduate dentist to serve as an officer in the Navy. Appointed as an Acting Assistant Surgeon, he served in the Medical Department of the U.S. Naval Academy from April 22, 1873 to June 30, 1879. The following year he was appointed as a civilian contract dentist and in that capacity provided dental care for the midshipmen until 1899. In November of 1899, Dr. Richard Grady succeeded Dr. Walton at the Naval Academy as a contract dentist. Dr. Grady was later commissioned in the U.S. Naval Dental Corps following its establishment.

Elsewhere, when available, dental care was accomplished by limited numbers of hospital stewards, with varying amounts of training in dentistry, who were enlisted in the Navy. In 1903, Navy Surg. Gen. P. M. Rixey stated that "this arrangement * * * is not satisfactory to the Bureau and is neither just to the men nor pleasing to the dental profession." In 1904, Edward E. Harris, D.D.S., became the first graduate dentist to enlist in the Navy as a hospital steward performing dental treatment exclusively. Remaining in the service, he was commissioned in the Dental Corps after its establishment. Others followed Dr. Harris in a similar capacity.

Granted the authority by Congress to establish a Dental Corps, the Secretary of the Navy appointed Emory A. Bryant, D.D.S., and William N. Cogan, D.D.S., to form the corps. Dr. Bryant was a practicing dentist in Washington, D.C.; Dr. Cogan resigned as dean of Georgetown University Dental School to accept his appointment. The first examining board for the selection of dental officers to serve in the U.S. Navy met in November-December 1912 in Washington, D.C. It was comprised of the following members: Lt. Cmdr. Richmond C. Holcomb, Marine Corps, U.S. Navy, president; Acting Assistant Dental Surgeon Emory A. Bryant; Acting Assistant Dental Surgeon William N. Cogan; William F. Murdy, hospital steward, clerk.

William F. Murdy was graduated later from dental school and entered the Dental Corps in 1918. The following candidates who were successful before the first examining board were appointed in January 1913: Dr. Harry E. Harvey, Dr. James L. Brown, Dr. Eugene H. Tennent, and Dr. Joseph A. Mahoney. In April of 1913, the first officers were appointed to the Naval Dental Reserve Corps as follows: Dr. Williams Donnally, Washington, D.C., Dr. Vines Edmunds Turner, Raleigh, N.C., and Dr. George C. Kusel, Swarthmore, Pa. The foregoing appointees also constituted the first board for the selection of officers of the Navy Dental Reserve Corps.

On March 5, 1913, Acting Assistant Dental Surgeon H. E. Harvey reported to the U.S.S. *Solace* as the first dental officer ordered to a ship. On April 27, 1913, Acting Assistant Dental Surgeon James L. Brown was ordered to the U.S. Naval Station, Guam, as the first dental officer to serve at an oversea base. On August 4, 1913, Acting Assistant Dental Surgeon Lucian C. Williams, the first dental officer ordered to Marine Corps duty reported to Parris Island, S.C. Thus, were the beginnings of recognized dental care in the U.S. Navy.

It should be noted that dental officers appointed under the act of 1912 were not commissioned, although the act made provision for commissioning "at the end of 3 years." The early appointees held the relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) and wore the insignia of such rank. The Reorganization Act of August 29, 1916, granted dental surgeons the rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenants (junior grade). It provided further for advancement to the ranks of lieutenant and lieutenant commander.

A young and inexperienced organization, the Dental Corps faced the specter of war in less than 5 years after its establishment. Records indicate that 35 officers were on active duty April 6, 1917, the date marking the entrance of the United States into World War I; a peak of 500 officers was reached before the war ended. In spite of its youth, the Dental Corps, nevertheless, had its heroes in World War I. Two of its members were decorated with the Nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor: Lt. (jg.) Weeden E. Osborne, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, the first naval officer to meet death in the land fighting overseas, "in helping to carry the wounded to a place of safety" and Lt. (jg.) Alexander G. Lyle, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, "for extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty."

Following World War II, the Dental Corps entered a period of consolidation. Although dental officers had served previously in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, it was in 1922 that a Dental Division was established to "care for the technical needs of the corps." In 1923, a dental school was created as a Division of the U.S. Naval Medical School. The latter event marked the embarkation upon a course that has greatly influenced the professional excellence of the corps through the years. Notwithstanding the fact that dental officers were granted the pay and allowances of the ranks of commander and captain in 1918, it was not until 1926 that the ranks were authorized. Although 14 officers were selected for the rank of commander the same year, it was not until 1937 that dental officers were promoted to the rank of captain. In 1942 the rank of rear admiral was authorized, Capt. Alexander G. Lyle, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, being the first dental officer to be so honored.

The economic crisis that faced the United States in the thirties was reflected in the U.S. Naval Dental Corps. In 1932, the Naval Dental School was closed when budgetary limitations caused retrenchments. Further, six officers who held temporary appointments were assigned temporary duty with the U.S. Army in 1933 for service with the Civilian Conservation Corps. In 1936, the U.S. Naval Dental School was reopened, this time as a part of the Naval Medical Center, Washington, D.C. Significantly, Comdr. John V. McAlpin, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, was ordered as dental officer in command, the first dental officer to be so titled.

In the early 1940's, for the second time since the establishment of the Dental Corps, war clouds loomed on the horizon. The corps expanded to the extent that 759 officers were on active duty at 347 dental facilities on December 7, 1941—the morning of the attack on Pearl Harbor. The peak of World War II saw 7,026 dental officers on duty at 1,545 installations, the largest of which was Great Lakes, Ill., with 459 officers. Of significance during World War II, the U.S. Naval Dental School was commissioned as a part of the National Naval Medical Center in 1942; the first woman dentist in the Armed Forces, Lt. Sara G. Krout, Dental Corps, W-V (S) U.S. Naval Reserve, reported to Great Lakes in 1944; and an effort gained momentum for increased self-administration for the Dental Corps. The latter was climaxed in December 1945 with the approval of the bill, Public Law 284, "To provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the U.S. Navy."

But there was another side to the Dental Corps in World War II. At all operations, dental officers and dental technicians carried out regular duties, assisted in the sick bays and operating rooms, administered supportive therapy, gave anesthetics, and aided in identifying the dead. In that major conflict it may be said that few engagements took place without the active participation of the dental officer serving with his unit. Proportionately, each contributed his share in all the heroic efforts of each campaign. The following list of awards is some measure of their accomplishments:

Silver Star Medal	12
Legion of Merit	3
Navy and Marine Corps Medal	3
Bronze Star Medal	27
Commendation Ribbon	48

The following officers made the supreme sacrifice for their country in that conflict:

KILLED IN ACTION

Lt. Comdr. Hugh R. Alexander, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, December 7, 1941, U.S.S. *Oklahoma*, Pearl Harbor.

Lt. Edward A. Baumbach, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, November 13, 1942, U.S.S. *Juneau*, Guadalcanal.

Lt. Thomas P. Capps, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, November 24, 1943, U.S.S. *Liscombe Bay*, Tarawa.

Lt. James S. Gate, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, July 25, 1944, 4th Marine Division, Tinian.

Lt. Comdr. Thomas E. Crowley, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, December 7, 1941, U.S.S. *Arizona*, Pearl Harbor.

Lt. Stanley E. Ekstrom, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, October 24, 1944, U.S.S. *Birmingham*, Philippine Islands.

Lt. Gilbert F. Gorsuch, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, November 12, 1942, U.S.S. *Erie*, Atlantic.

Lt. Comdr. Earl O. Henry, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, July 30, 1945, U.S.S. *Indianapolis*, Philippine Islands.

Lt. Charles W. Holly, Jr., Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, March 1, 1942, U.S.S. *Langley*, Indian Ocean.

Lt Comdr. Farrell W. Keith, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, March 1, 1942, U.S.S. *Houston*, Java Sea.

Lt. (jg.) Stephen M. Lehman, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, July 4, 1944, 4th Marine Division, Saipan.

Lt. (jg.) Thomas R. McIntyre, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, October 30, 1944, U.S.S. *Franklin*, Okinawa.

Lt. Edward J. O'Reilly, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, August 24, 1942, U.S.S. *Astoria*, Solomons.

Lt. (jg.) Carol W. Peterman, Jr., Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, July 8, 1944, LST–384, France.

Lt. Robert W. Seegar, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, May 1, 1945, U.S.S. *Terror*, Okinawa.

Lt. Comdr. Laurice A. Tatum, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, September 15, 1942, U.S.S. *Wasp*, Guadalcanal.

Comdr. Wadsworth C. Trojakowski, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, May 8, 1942, U.S.S. *Lexington*, Coral Sea.

Lt. Miller C. Wonn, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, February 21, 1945, U.S.S. *Bismarck Sea*, Iwo Jima.

DIED AS PRISONERS OF WAR

Lt. Comdr. James A. Connell, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, May 6, 1942, Navy Yard, Cavite, Philippine Islands.

Lt. (jg.) Robert G. Herthneck, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, May 6, 1942, Navy Yard, Cavite, Philippine Islands.

Lt. Henry C. Knight, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, May 6, 1942, 4th Marine Regiment, Philippine Islands.

Lt. Alfred F. White, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, May 6, 1942, U.S.S. *Canopus*, Philippine Islands.

Following demobilization, the dental corps faced its problems—the implementation of Public Law 284, officer retainment and career attractiveness, a broadening educational program, opportunities for dental research, assignment of dentists trained in the Navy V–12 program to the Army and Air Force, and others. In 1946, the U.S. Naval Dental Clinic, Brooklyn, N.Y., was established as the first of 11 such dental installations under the command of a dental officer and under the management control of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. The outbreak of the Korean incident in June of 1950 found the dental corps with 1,003 officers on duty and the need for another buildup. The latter was given impetus by passage of the doctors draft law which established priorities for service based on previous military service and training. During the peak, over 1,900 dental officers assisted by 4,700 dental technicians carried on operations at 480 facilities. Frontline dentistry with the marines in Korea was performed either in trucks converted to mobile dental units or in quonset huts.

Ever alert for progressive change, a program was originated in April 1955 that eventually would convert most dental operating units in the Navy to higher speeds. The initial conversions were to belt-driven handpieces and later to turbines. The Dental Corps is proud of its part in the high-speed revolution, inasmuch as the air turbine and ultrasonic vibration instruments developed at the U.S. Naval Dental School played important roles in the radical changes in dental instrumentation during this period. Pioneer models of both instruments are on display at the Smithsonian Institution, U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.

As the U.S. Navy entered the nuclear and space age, the Dental Corps was challenged with new problems. The complexities of the new Navy made it imperative that the health of its men be brought to higher levels of perfection to eliminate "every possible cause for impairment of the sense of coordination." Accordingly, new Navy dental research programs were directed toward closed environment and cold weather studies. The former were to better prepare Navy men for trips into outer space, and trips of prolonged periods beneath the seas in nuclear powered submarines. The cold weather studies were in support of the various Navy programs in the Polar regions. A sequel to the latter was the founding of the Antarctic Dental Society by four members of the U.S. Naval Dental Corps in December 1956. In the same year, the Dependents Medical Care (Medicare) Act became effective. It was of major import in that it made 130,000 dependents at oversea bases and remote areas eligible for routine dental care without authority for compensatory increases in dental personnel. The Dental Corps, however, accepted it in stride.

During the fifties, significant developments in broadening the Dental Corps' education program included: production of a casualty care training manikin, "Mr. Disaster"; publication of a "Color Atlas of Oral Pathology;" and creation of an extension training program covering dental clinic administration, in addition to a series of professional subjects. Another major highlight in the history of the U.S. Naval Dental Corps was marked with the commissioning of the nuclear powered U.S.S. *Long Beach* in September 1961, and in November of the same year, the U.S.S. *Enterprise*. In this manner, dental treatment in the U.S. Navy under nuclear power was initiated as a routine procedure.

Thus, after 50 years of steady progress, the U.S. Naval Dental Corps as an integral component of the Medical Department of the U.S. Navy reflects with due humility upon its previous accomplishments, and passes its heritage as a challenge to the future to maintain its worldwide leadership in the profession of dentistry.

President Hoover Defines Conservative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, former President Herbert Hoover gives an excellent definition of a conservative in the following editorial from the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C.:

CONSERVATIVE DEFINED

The following definition of a conservative is from the observations of former President Herbert Hoover:

"There is a lot of fiction and fog around the words conservative and liberal. My idea of a conservative is one who desires to retain the wisdom and experience of the past, and who is prepared to apply the best of that wisdom and experience to meet the changes which are inevitable in every generation."

The ultraliberal won't subscribe to that definition. To him the wisdom and experience of the past are not to be taken as guidelines to the future. He has other ideas and it doesn't matter how many times in the past these ideas have proved to be nebulous and untrustworthy.

The Net Debt of the Federal Government Has Not Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there is a tendency in some quarters today to cast a critical and suspicious eye at the national debt and to cry inflation at every turn of the calendar. Some of us, however, manage to keep a level head—and a level eye—on what is really happening. The following letter, addressed to the president of the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York, lays low these doubts about the soundness of the dollar and I commend it to the attention to our colleagues:

AUGUST 5, 1962.

Mr. DAVID ROCKEFELLER,
President, the Chase Manhattan Bank,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ROCKEFELLER: The July 27 Life magazine, on its letters page, had a comment from me on the letter you wrote the President, appearing in the July 6 issue. To me there seemed in it an "overconcentration on one problem to the neglect of others that are not waiting in a single file to be solved but must all be solved together."

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William M. Martin, said to the House Banking and Currency Committee, on July 17, that there has been too much of a tendency to "compartmentalize." "Today we will work on the unemployment problem. Tomorrow we will work on growth, and then on Friday we will work on the balance of payments." I felt your letter to the President illustrated this tendency. Also, it gave the impression of near panic in the "business community" about the soundness of the U.S. dollar.

This is most strange in light of the report in the bimonthly "Business in Brief" (No. 45, July–August 1962), prepared by the Economic Research Department of the Chase Manhattan Bank, which says there has been no inflation in the United States for the last 4 years. You said: "Inflation in the past 4 years has continued in another guise—in the form of rising costs," but your economic research department reports "the increase in costs, too, has slowed markedly though unit costs have not altogether stopped rising." Prices, on the average, have been stable since 1958, and the money supply has expanded more slowly than the growth in the volume of output since 1946, according to the economic research department of your bank, yet you persist in the use of the explosive term "inflation" to describe our economic situation.

Dr. Max Ikle, head of the banking and currency division of the Swiss National Bank, says the consensus of the world's competent monetary authorities is that the American dollar is sound, and the U.S. economy the soundest known in the world. Mr. Martin, Federal Reserve Board Chairman, tells the House Banking and Currency Committee, on July 17, that he agrees with this judgment. But you write the President that "bankers here and abroad * * * look with concern on recent fiscal policy in our country and * * * worry actively about the future of the dollar."

You say the business community's "background of experience and intuition" and "long memories" justify worry over Government deficits. Fiscal irresponsibility is unjustly attributed to the Government. The fact is that the Federal debt was declining after World War II until the Korean war and other unprecedented Government tasks were forced upon us."

Page 268 of the President's Economic Report shows the net public and private debt, 1929–61. The various economic sectors, State and local governments, corporate, farms, nonfarm individual and noncorporate and Federal Government figures for net debt are shown here. In every economic sector, except one, the net debt kept increasing every single year since World War II. The one exception is the Federal Government. (I cannot take advantage of the literal fact that the net debt of the Federal Government was actually less at the end of 1961 than at the end of 1945 for my case, because of the overborrowing at the end of World War II. This would be an unfair argument; nevertheless, equally unfair arguments are used for the purpose of undermining the credit of the U.S. Government.) Apparently the politicians were financially more "conservative" than businessmen and bankers, but no one gives them credit for it. A sound credit policy means giving credit where credit is due.

According to Prof. William Ernest Hocking "the total mental power of business in the United States today exceeds the total mental power, in terms of mastery of world affairs, of the nonbusiness political nation * * *. Our future as a nation depends largely on the moral orientation of business." ("Strength of Men and Nations," Harper & Bros. New York, 1959, p. 63.) You imply the "business community" has a right to question the competence of the Government upon whom spending is forced by nonbusiness pressures and compulsions. Then you have the obligation to earn the confidence of the ordinary citizen in your competence at least not to give way to panic.

I hope you will not find this uninvited letter amiss. But I felt your letter to the President had to be reconciled with the factual record, as shown by the economic research department of your bank and by official statistics.

Yours sincerely,

SIDNEY KORETZ.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Another Look at USDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, since one of the favorite pastimes of many editorial page writers in election years is harpooning government agencies, it is refreshing to see an editorial looking at the positive side. An editorial in the Ames (Iowa) Tribune of August 24 brings forth some noteworthy facts, and I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so more people will have an opportunity to read it. It is as follows:

ANOTHER LOOK AT USDA

Of all agencies of the Government, the Department of Agriculture probably comes under the heaviest fire.

Chief reason for this, of course, is that the bill for subsidizing crops, paying farmers for nongrowing of crops, and storing of excess crops keeps getting bigger. This is a problem neither party has been able to solve.

Agriculture Department expenditures ($9.9 billion in fiscal 1962) rank second only to those for defense and are felt by many to be about as worthwhile as the billions eaten up by paying the interest on the national debt.

Scandals like the Billie Sol Estes case and the yearly hassles between Congress and the President over farm legislation have also served to give the public the impression that the whole situation is just one big boondoggle.

Thus a look at some of the Department's positive accomplishments may help put a better perspective on its operations. Rather than trying to kill off the small, independent farmer, as some critics charge, the Department has actually done much to insure the prosperity of farms and farm communities.

Since it is technology that has brought the farmer to his present pass by enabling him to raise far more on far less land than his father, it is only fitting that technology be utilized to provide new outlets for his abundance.

For instance, a few years ago cotton was seriously threatened by synthetic fabrics. Thanks to the Agriculture Research Service, new markets were developed for cotton by making it flame and water resistant and by aiding the development of wash-and-wear fabrics. The latter use alone consumes a billion bales of cotton a year.

In 1945, Florida was close to overproduction of oranges with no new markets in sight. ARS helped develop a frozen orange juice concentrate. Today, more oranges go into cans alone than were grown in 1945.

As a result of new potato products ARS has devised, 12 potato dehydrating plants are now in operation in potato-growing areas around the country. Their yearly consumption of $6.3 million worth of potatoes has reversed the downward trend in per capita use of this staple.

Research into improved frozen poultry has helped bring about a 2.5 billion-pound increase in the consumption of turkeys and chickens in the past 5 years. Even waste feathers that once cost processors money to get rid of are now made into fertilizers, feeds and plastics.

The list of such examples could be extended. Unfortunately, the good men do oft lies interred with the bones of other issues.

Labor Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, Charles R. Sligh, Jr., executive vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, last week called for a thorough investigation of the economic effects of union monopoly power by an appropriate committee of Congress.

Earlier this week, it was announced that President Kennedy's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy had abandoned plans for a study of monopoly power in labor and business. The reason given was that such a study would generate much conflict among the six labor executives, six business executives, and six public members who constitute the committee and possibly disrupt the group.

According to the press, the decision to shelve the study was taken at the suggestion of George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, who urged that the committee seek areas of possible agreement and avoid areas where agreement would be virtually impossible.

In calling for a congressional committee to take up the investigation, Mr. Sligh said:

> Union monopoly power is now having a seriously adverse effect on our economy and on the strength of the Nation. If the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy is unable to deal with a hard-core issue such as this, Congress has a responsibility to get at the facts. This problem will not be resolved by simply ignoring it.
>
> Monopoly in business is under constant inquiry, not only by the Justice Department in its enforcement of the antitrust laws, but by one congressional investigation after another and by the various administrative agencies. It is high time the Government looked for monopoly where it really abounds—in our labor unions. This matter has been avoided by those in positions of public responsibility far too long. Unless they face up to the facts, our economy is in for continuing trouble.

Susquehanna River in Pittston Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, a historian of my congressional district, has written an interesting and highly informative series of articles on the early history of the Susquehanna River, particularly in the Pittston region. This series has been appearing in the Pittston Sunday Dispatch, and as part of my remarks today I include the two latest installments of August 19 and August 26, 1962.

The two articles follow:

[From the Pittston (Pa.) Sunday Dispatch, Aug. 19, 1962]

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN PITTSTON REGION—LISTINGS OF MANY FERRIES IN USE FOR RIVER CROSSINGS

(By Charles A. McCarthy)

Richard Gardner established a ferry at Ransom in 1778, using a scow for transportation.

When the British, Tories, and Indians swooped down on some of the defenseless settlers, on June 30, 1778, Richard Gardner was one of those taken prisoner at Harding. He was tortured by the Indians who later burned him at the stake.

His son, Richard Gardner 2d, was operating this ferry in 1788. It extended across the Susquehanna River from Ransom to a point on the west side, near Coray's (Sutton's) Creek. He also used a scow to cross the river.

The ferry was maintained for some time by Richard Gardner 2d's son, Samuel Gardner, and later by Samuel's son.

In 1866 the ferry came into the possession of Mrs. Mary Ives. She deeded it on November 3, 1895, to Henry M. Ives. Her son, Francis Ives, became owner on November 1, 1910.

William Ives who operated this ferry at one period, died at Ransom on May 19, 1897.

The Ransom Ferry was out of service on May 6, 1901, when high water washed it away. Again on January 24, 1910, it was swept from from its moorings and proceeded unguided down the river. The front end of the ferry struck the third pier on the east side of the Ferry Bridge (Fort Jenkins) but the craft swung around undamaged and continued its journey downstream.

On April 28, 1910, the ferry broke from its cable, and lunged downstream. On board was a loaded wagon and team of F. A. Snyder of Sutton's Creek. One horse was drowned. The ferry became moored on the eastern shore at Weldon, the upper telegraph station of Coxton Yards.

With a load of passengers aboard the ferry broke loose from its cable on July 4, 1917, and drifted downstream one-half mile where the passenegrs landed safely.

A bridge leading to the west side dock was damaged during the July 1935 flood. While repairs were underway, the March 17, 1936, St. Patrick's Day flood washed out the bridge causing a cessation of operations.

KILLED IN FALL

Soon after this, in preparing the ferry for service, Frank Ives, then 84 years old, climbed a tree on the eastern shore of the river to adjust one of the guide ropes of the ferry. He lost his balance and fell a distance of 30 feet. His skull was fractured and he died almost instantly.

In his early boyhood Frank Ives attempted to join the Union Army in the Civil War. He was compelled to return home by his father having been only about 10 years of age at that time.

After Frank Ives' death no attempt was made to revive the ferry service.

Keeler's Ferry, named for Paul Keeler, of Eaton, the father of Asa Keeler was located a few miles south Osterhort in 1788.

Early in the 19th century stage and mail coaches en route to northern points along the river traveled through the narrows on the east side of the river to Wyoanna, at Keeler's Creek, 2 miles above Ransom, and utilized this ferry to reach the west bank, near Swartwood Bend, east of the top of Brown's (Kocher's, Swartwood's) Hill.

OWNERSHIP CHANGES

In 1799, 1801, and 1802, Paul Keeler, of Eaton, was assessed as half-owner of Keeler's ferry. The other half was owned by Hezekiah Smith of Exeter Township. According to the tax lists of 1806, Paul Keeler sold his lands to Hezekiah Smith and left the township.

Aaron Brown, a feed mill operator and postmaster at Falls, organized Brown's Rope Ferry in 1875.

Brown's Rope Ferry extended across the Susquehanna River from a point north of the Lehigh Valley railroad station at Falls on the east side of the river to what later became known as Reigel's Riverside Hotel, on Joseph Street, in West Falls.

Passengers arriving via the Lehigh Valley Railroad, who wished to use the ferry to cross the river, walked north from the station about 100 yards where an underpass was utilized to walk under the track to reach the ferry dock.

ORAL AGREEMENTS

When Clarence Brown succeeded to his father's business enterprises in 1889, the ferryboat was leased to John Fetterman who maintained it until his death in 1899. It is interesting to note that all agreements between Brown and the operators of the ferry were oral; an important section being that all teams hauling grist to Brown's mill, to be sold or ground, traveled free on the ferry.

William Sickler, who rented boats, sold bait, and at a later time operated a naptha launch to Forest Glen, a small settlement north of West Falls, took charge of the ferry in 1899. His daughter, Mary (Mrs. Story), assisted as ferryman.

When William Sickler died in 1917, his widow hired Frank Corwin as ferryman, at a daily wage of $2. When her health failed in 1920, Corwin took over the operation and maintained it until the Falls Bridge was opened in 1922.

ENDS SERVICE

The Sickler ferry discontinued service for the season on December 7, 1910. On June 21, 1916, it was not in operation due to high water.

In June, 1922, when the ferry made its last trip, the ferryboat was sold to Antonio Mozzione of Exeter, who used it to transport vehicles on and off of Scovill's Island.

Gibb Bowman ferry, located ¼ mile north of Brown's ferry, ceased operations in 1890. The ferry culvert on the east side of the river had a wooden floor.

From at least 1900 until 1918, Stephen Jones who resided with the Knowles family at 65 Cliff Street in Pittston, operated a freight ferry between Falls and West Falls, in the Falls Bridge area.

Jones' cargo consisted mainly of merchandise and animals. In addition, he held the contract for the transportation of mail across the river at this site.

[From the Pittston (Pa.) Sunday Dispatch, Aug. 26, 1962]

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN PITTSTON REGION—WHITE'S FERRY WAS BUSY OPERATION—LASTED UNTIL YEAR 1938

(By Charles A. McCarthy)

Between 1890 and 1900, Hadder Smith maintained a rope ferry service between Forest Glen, on the west side of the river north of Falls, to "Granny" Smith's on the east bank, whose home was occupied in 1954 by Joseph Begrant.

The area of Forest Glen, previously mentioned in this story, was originally owned by Abijah "Bigar" Baird. Walter S. Barritt, a Pittston wallpaper and paint dealer, bought a lot here on September 26, 1904, and built the first cottage, "Wanda," in the area. By April, 1908, a total of 17 cottages was erected in the immediate region.

In addition to the ferry, Tracy A. Smith, whose nickname was "Commodere," also operated a launch to Canfield Island, 1 mile north of Forest Glen, from the Falls station of the Lehigh Valley Railroad. He also towed fishermen.

The only occupant of Canfield's Island was its owner, Frank H. Canfield, whose cabin was known as "The Wigwam." This island was washed away in the 1920 flood.

John "Doc" Hughes, the tolltaker at Pittston's Ferry Bridge, operated a naphtha launch from Forest Glen.

On August 14, 1906, he placed an additional craft, a 25-passenger steamer into service. He purchased the new boat at Bloomsburg and named Capt. William Hurrey of Pittston as its commander. The steamboat met all trains and also towed fishermen upstream.

GASOLINE LAUNCH

A gasoline launch, maintained by Fred Geisinger for passenger transportation between Falls railroad station and Forest Glen, burned near Wanda cottage dock on July 5, 1909.

Isaac L. Smith purchased a ferry boat on February 1, 1910, which he operated in passenger service between Falls and West Falls.

Nelson Walker, who timbered the Keeler property at Keelersburg, a few miles above West Falls, operated a freight ferry for about 5 years until 1900 from that plot to the McKune property, on the east side of the river, where the lumber was placed on Lehigh Valley Railroad cars which reached there via a three-quarter mile rail spur.

Solomon White commenced the operation of White's Ferry in 1838. He maintained it until his death on July 23, 1890, when his son, George White, became owner. George White died on July 2, 1914, and his son, William M. White, continued ferry service at this place until late in November, 1938.

BUILT OWN CRAFT

It is interesting to note the White family maintained ferry service at this site for exactly 100 years.

The initial ferry-boat built by Solomon White, of white pine logs, cost $35. Members of the Keeler family and others contributed the funds for its construction.

The last ferry boat in use here, constructed by Mr. William M. White in 1914, of pine and white oak, cost $2,100.

Members of the White family built all ferryboats used by themselves and also constructed ferryboats for others, including those used by Frank Ives, at Ransom. Ferryboats were constructed upside down.

In high water, this ferry was operated by cable; during the summer season, when the water was low, a handrope was utilized.

FEE SMALL

During George W. White's tenure as ferry operator, the fee for a return rip per wagon was 35 cents. William M. White charged 25 cents one way per automobile.

In 1925-26, when the Falls-Tunkahannock concrete road (Route 92) was being laid, a gasoline motor was used on the ferry.

CHANGE NAME

The designation of White's Ferry by which the region on the east side of the river was known was later changed to Hoban Heights by the U.S. Post Office Department, effective August 1, 1927.

Dudley Inman Ferry, situated 1 mile north of White's Ferry, commenced operating about 1900 and continued for about 6 years. Its principal business came from logging operations. There was some passenger service. Failure to receive patronage from the Lehigh Valley Railroad, because of its distance from White's Ferry station, necessitated its abandonment.

WYOMING FERRY

Prior to June 2, 1791, James Gardner operated a ferry from Sixth Street in Wyoming to about 1750 River Road, in the Port Blanchard section of Jenkins Township.

A ferry was maintained by Jeremiah Blanchard, Jr., prior to 1796, in the general area of the present Wyoming Bridge. In 1837 Blanchard willed his right and title in this project to Jeremiah Blanchard 3d.

Miller Ferry, established prior to 1806, was operated for many years by Christopher Miller.

As early as 1842 Andrew Miller operated the Sixth Street ferry to the Port Blanchard Hotel.

He eventually sold the operation to John Sharpe, Jr. On April 8, 1856, Sharpe sold a three-quarter interest in this business to Thomas F. Atherton, James Jenkins, and Isaac C. Shoemaker. When John Sharpe died, after 1898, his son, James Sharpe, continued the operation until the Wyoming Bridge was completed in October 1915.

Timothy Rose, of Kingston, was given the liberty at a town meeting held on September 25, 1773, to keep a ferry opposite the Forty Fort. This ferry was in operation at the period of the Revolutionary War. Early in the 19th century this ferry was replaced by one whose west-side dock was situated near the present boundary line of Forty Fort Cemetery. It operated until about 1880. Thomas Reese was the last owner.

David Culver organized a ferry about 1880. Its west-side terminus was a little south of W. T. Pettebone's. Its east-side dock was in Port Bowkley. Service was maintained here until 1905.

Equal Time Regulation Is Ridiculous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article, entitled "Equal Time Regulation Is Ridiculous," which appeared in the Peoria Journal Star of August 24, 1962, in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

EQUAL TIME REGULATION IS RIDICULOUS

Chicago's educational TV station has had to cancel a scheduled discussion of Illinois politics which would have featured two unopposed legislators—John Parkhurst of Peoria and Representative Abner Mikva of Chicago—one Republican and one Democrat.

Why?

They have had legal advice that any member of the general assembly or candidate therefor could then demand "equal time."

This ridiculous regulation, promulgated with such high purposes, is still in effect in spite of the repeated evidence that it has only served to deny the public revealing exposure on bona fide candidates and a variety of useful and educational programs.

It was admitted that the regulation was silly and unworkable when the Congress of the United States set it aside, specifically, in one instance to permit a TV debate series between the candidates for the Presidency of the United States.

That moratorium was temporary and the law is back in full force and effect in spite of that public display of the benefits available without it.

The purpose of the law was sensible and good—to prevent unfair discrimination against a candidate. However, the nit-picking interpretation that exposes perfectly fair broadcasters to legal attacks from all sides has, in actual effect, outlawed TV debates by candidates.

The annual outpouring of new laws, followed by nit-picking detailed regulations, followed by pit-picking interpretations, far from the obvious and sensible purpose of the law, is "messing us up" on a dozen fronts at the same time.

We need a new basic legal philosophy. The present nonsensical technical—yes, we'll use the word yet again—"nit-picking" approach is making a mockery of our whole legal system.

It's like the rule against gross immorality by druggists—now interpreted to mean he mustn't advertise dangerous drugs—or the law against gambling which says you are gambling if you put up some valuable consideration in the hope of winning a prize. Everybody knew what that meant for years and years—and it made sense to everybody and was enforceable.

Then, one day, some "nit pickers" decided valuable consideration included even wasting your time—and giveaways involving no money at all became gambling, according to them.

So it goes, the professional business of taking sense and turning it into nonsense—a legal specialty.

None is more nonsensical than the extremes to which the "equal time" rule has been carried to turn it into a ban on the most vital of TV programing. The only remedy, apparently, is to get rid of that stupid law altogether.

A Friend To Stand By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I made certain remarks on this floor concerning the high esteem in which the Commercial Solvents Co. of Terre Haute, Ind., is held by the citizens of that city. On Sunday, August 12, 1962, the Terre Haute Tribune-Star ran a fine editorial concerning this company. Following the appearance of this editorial, the Vigo County and Sixth District Republican Chairman Mr. Buena Chaney, of Terre Haute, wrote the editor, Mr. Marsee Cox, to commend him on this fine editorial. Since this letter and the editorial further evidence the high regard in which this company is held, I include them, under unanimous consent, in the RECORD of this Congress:

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune Star, Aug. 12, 1962]

A FRIEND TO STAND BY

Just 18 months ago this city found itself pilloried in a national magazine, and amongst us there rose that very evening one good friend to say gently but firmly that this story painted a picture whose colors and balance were not accurate. He said some of the things that article said, and much that it implied, were in direct conflict with the proven experience of 42 years in Terre Haute.

That friend was Maynard Wheeler, of Commercial Solvents. Today, in the backwash of the amazing Billie Sol Estes case, he finds himself under antitrust indictment in Texas. The acts alleged against him are foreign to his nature and to everything Terre Haute knows about the man and the company he leads.

We shall not forget how, after CSC's many years of contributing vigorously to the progress of this city, and creating here a leadership in research and manufacture of life-giving products such as the crystalling penicillin of World War II, Maynard Wheeler modesty gave credit and thanks to this community. At the Terre Haute Advertising Club meeting where he spoke the evening of February 7, 1961, he said:

"The gratitude I express to you tonight is by no means limited to our progress here. It is gratitude which recognizes that Terre Haute is the cradle of accomplishment for our company in many ways. From the roots which were put down here have come much of the widespread operations of the company which reach across these United States and into many parts of the world."

Under his vigorous leadership, CSC has here an annual payroll of about $3.5 million, and now contributes to our area's economy annual purchases of goods and services amounting to approximately $5 million.

Statistics aside, among us the name of Maynard Wheeler has been synonymous with honest, progressive business and with good citizenship both personal and corporate. His given word always has been recognized here as better than any bond.

We are happy to see the solidarity of the company in the face of the current problem. It was well voiced by Jeremiah Milbank, Jr., one of the directors and the chairman of Commercial Solvents' executive committtee, when he said:

"I share Mr. Wheeler's complete confidence that the unwarranted charges against him will be refuted in the courts and that Commercial Solvents and its management will be fully cleared."

We know that his side of the case has been in no way heard yet, and it is in the nature of legal matters that such defense often must be awaited until the proper occasion and time arrives.

We know that, whatever strange involvements may yet come to light concerning others in this matter, we can safely apply to the attack on Maynard Wheeler and his company the words he spoke about that earlier attack aimed at our community:

"It is in direct conflict with the proven experience of 42 years in Terre Haute."

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, Aug. 13, 1962]

Mr. Marsee Cox,
Editor of Terre Haute Tribune,
Terre Haute, Ind.

Dear Mr. Cox: It is now my turn to invite you for a cup of coffee as you were so kind to do a few months ago in an editorial after I proposed in a public leter to the Democrat political leaders that each party stay out of the county school trustee election.

Your editorial in last Sunday's Tribune-Star concerning Maynard Wheeler and Commercial Solvents Corp. was a masterpiece of speaking for an entire community. Although I like thousands of our citizens, have never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Wheeler, through his company and his deeds, we feel him to be one of our city's great friends. It saddened us all that because he headed a large industry that had among its customers a Billy Sol Estes, that he would be victimized to the point of being accused of crime before a Texas court.

Commercial Solvents Corp. is one of our city's vital industries and its payroll has helped, and is helping, during our economic stress. Mr. Wheeler has always had the best interests of his and our hometown in mind. Now is when we all should stand behind him with our prayers, faith, and sentiment.

We thank you, Mr. Cox, for saying it so nicely for all of us in Terre Haute, Ind.

Yours truly,
Buena Chaney,
Chairman, Vigo County
Republican Central Committee.

A Tragic Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article concerning the power struggle between the Communist system and the Western concepts of social and economic organization has come to my attention. The article, by Robert Hotz, appeared as an editorial in the August 13, 1962, issue of Aviation Week and Space Technology. The article follows:

A Tragic Paradox

(By Robert Hotz)

Six years ago this summer, we stood in the garden of the Red Army Club in Moscow listening to Nikita Khrushchev twit Gen. Nathan F. Twining, then USAF Chief of Staff, on the relative merits of the Soviet Socialist system versus the American capitalistic system. The Soviet boss was still relatively new in his position at the top of the Red totem pole and had just begun to experiment with the technique of the vodka-inspired phrase as a major instrument of international diplomacy. But even then he had already run afoul of the enormous, creaking official Russian bureaucracy spawned by the Communist doctrine of state control for everything. He had already tabbed this bureaucracy as one of the major roadblocks lying squarely across the path of Russian economic progress.

"Your country is moving more in the direction of socialism," Khrushchev told General Twining with a quick side glance to make certain that Western reporters present were getting the translation of his remarks. "But we in Russia are moving more in the direction of capitalism. In 10 years it will be hard to tell the difference between your system and ours."

SOVIET INCENTIVE FAILURE

These remarks were deleted by Soviet censors in the Moscow cable office when Western correspondents tried to file them that evening. It is still official Soviet heresy to admit that the incentive of the Communist system has failed miserably to stir the Russian people into anything near the kind of effort really needed to develop their country economically. However, there has been ample evidence since Khrushchev made these remarks in the summer of 1956 that he has personally made a tremendous effort to bend the official system to establish some sort of effective individual incentives in the Russian economy. He has also conducted vigorous warfare against the centralized state planners and regional bureaucrats who are more concerned with following totally unrealistic plans blindly, even to the point of faking successful statistical results, than in operating a growing economy.

Recently, Soviet newspapers have been spotted with detailed case histories of the failures of bumbling bureaucrats who executed their portion of the state plan to the letter, even though it meant disaster for the overall economy. Soviet courts have also recently resumed handing out death sentences to managerial types who have run their particular enterprises into the ground, although the official verdict never quite puts it that bluntly.

One of the most remarkable insights into the failures of the centralized Soviet state planning bureaucrats came from the distinguished Russian aircraft designer Oleg K. Antonov. His criticism was initially published in the Moscow daily newspaper Izvestia and was reprinted in Aviation Week and Space Technology (July 23, p. 74). Designer Antonov's article was remarkable for several reasons, perhaps the most important being the fact that top Soviet leadership felt it necessary to have a Russian of Antonov's technical stature publicly attack the official Soviet system in one of its most important government-controlled publications. This is also a fair gage of just how serious this situation has become.

BUREAUCRATIC BUMBLING

It is also noteworthy that Antonov not only attacked the bumblings of the bureaucracy as it fumbled with the production system but that he also attacked failures of the educational system induced by blind adherence to centralized conformity. Even to Antonov, the response from the Russian citizenry was remarkable. He based a subsequent article on specific case histories of bureaucratic bumbling written to him by Izvestia's readers.

Western readers of the Antonov analysis will also be interested in his conclusion that the lack of supply and demand relationships and the lack of competitive aspects of the marketplace are major flaws in the Soviet economic system. These features, so typical of Western economies, are a favorite target of Communist doctrinaries, who dismiss them as "wasteful."

Since 1956, Nikita Khrushchev has taken a variety of steps to provide increased incentives for Soviet citizens that are more significant than the cheap, enamelled "hero" badges that seem to be a major production item of Soviet factories. Mr. Khrushchev's actions since 1956 have validated that portion of his prediction that the Soviet system would be moving more in the direction of capitalistic techniques. Unfortunately, the national leadership of this country has provided considerable evidence that his analysis of our drift toward the centralized planning and dulling of human incentives that characterize the Socialist system may also prove to be correct.

In no other facet of American life has this growth of a highly centralized planning dictatorship been more pronounced than in the technology and industry embraced by the national defense effort. The full blame for this trend cannot be laid on the power-hungry Government bureaucrats who have been the architects of this system. They never could have erected such a mighty bureaucratic superstructure without the acquiescence of key segments of American industry and the indifference of a majority of the American people.

It is a rather tragic paradox that in this critical stage of the power struggle between the Communist system and the Western concepts of social and economic organization, the Communists are now adopting the basic elements that gave the Western system its vitality and growth, while the great Western nations are stupidly picking up those very elements of the Socialist system that have been discarded as unworkable by the Socialists themselves.

Interfaith Understanding in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article, which appears in the September 1962 edition of the United Synagogue Review.

Mr. Leon Paul, a Catholic writer, lecturer, and teacher, describes how he has contributed to understanding between the Christian and Jewish communities of Brooklyn.

The article follows:

Through Catholic Eyes

(By Leon Paul)

"But I thought Catholics weren't allowed to go into a synagogue."

This is the surprised reaction from some Jews when I take my Catholic adult education classes to visit a synagogue. What they have heard, of course, is that Catholics are not permitted to attend a non-Catholic service. A visit to a non-Catholic house of worship is quite another matter.

As far as I know, there is no prohibition on this whatever.

Catholics visit non-Catholic houses of worship for a number of reasons: curiosity, perhaps; interest in how other people worship God; the historical background of a particular house of worship; or simply to broaden their knowledge of religion. My own reasons for taking classes of Catholics on what is formally known as a "field trip to a synagogue" are quite practical.

When I began teaching an adult education course on "The Church and Judaism" some years ago, under the auspices of the social action department of the Brooklyn diocese, I felt that this kind of class needed to do more than just hear about our Jewish heritage—they also had to see it. How, for instance, could I do justice to a topic like "Old and New Testaments: One Bible" without showing my students the ancient scrolls as they came down to us from Moses? How could I bring into the classroom some of the atmosphere of the synagogue in which Jesus taught and prayed? Moreover, wouldn't it benefit the class to spend a question-and-answer period with a rabbi?

Since I could not bring a synagogue into the class, I had to bring the class to a synagogue. But I had no idea what the reactions would be, either from the class or from the rabbis. Experimenting, I telephoned a few rabbis. Some seemed dubious and reluctant. Some were cooperative. One was rather enthusiastic, and proved to be so understanding that whenever possible I take the class to his synagogue. This young Orthodox rabbi, a graduate of Yeshiva University, invited his cantor to join us and chant excerpts from the Torah for us. He also invited some of his officers to join the class and talk with us informally, helping us to feel at home.

This was the very thing I had hoped for, had wanted to achieve: to get my fellow Catholics to feel "at home" in a synagogue, for it was in a synagogue that our faith was born. Our religion was founded on Judaism. I tell my classes our visit to a synagogue is like "going home to mother." If a Catholic doesn't feel at home in a synagogue, he doesn't understand the origins of his beliefs.

I first tried this experiment on an evening that was not a regular class night, so that the members had to give up extra time. The reactions were enthusiastic, and all the comments I heard were favorable. "A wonderful experience," one student said. Another: "Most interesting." "I got a lot out of this visit," said a third. None seemed to feel it a waste of time.

The experiment was so successful that I have made the synagogue visit a regular feature of the course. At the end of each course I ask the students what they have most benefited from. Invariably they say: "The visit to the synagogue."

The idea has spread, and I am now also giving the course for the Rockville Centre diocese. Several weeks ago my students were the guests of Rabbi Max J. Routtenberg on a visit to his synagogue, B'nai Sholom, in Rockville Centre. Wrote one woman after her visit:

"The visit to Temple B'nai Sholom has been of tremendous value to me. It gave me the opportunity to appreciate the similarity of some of the Jewish rites to many of our religion. Rabbi Routtenberg's erudite and illuminating remarks gave me answers to several questions I had always hoped to clarify. I hope with all my heart that this visit will be only the beginning of closer relations between the Jewish and Catholic communities, leading to better understanding."

Another student wrote:

"The thought that struck me on my visit was that if enough people in Germany had done likewise, the Second World War couldn't possibly have come about."

There has always been a certain amount of misunderstanding on the part of Jews toward the Catholic Church, and on the part of Catholics toward Judaism and the Jews. Through my courses on "The Catholic Church and Judaism" I try to accomplish three objectives:

To bring Catholics a new awareness of the Jewish heritage.

To help Catholics have a better understanding of the Jews and appreciation of Jewish culture and ideals.

To destroy the walls of ignorance between the Catholic and Jewish worlds for our mutual good.

How far the course succeeds in doing these things is open to speculation, but comments from some of the men and women who have taken it indicate that it stimulated new and useful thinking.

Not all comments were wholly uncritical. One student, for example, suggested that the use of electric lights detracted from "the feeling that you are in a house of worship," and would have preferred candles.

Again and again students remarked on what they considered resemblances between Catholic church and Jewish synagogue. One expressed surprise at seeing so many symbols on the ark, such as the kiddush cup, that were reminiscent of Catholic ritual objects. Another student, after hearing the cantor chant Bible verses, said that "it was interesting to note where many of our chants come from." A third thought that "our chalice, wine and incense show our religion takes many of its rituals from Judism." He continued:

"I had been told that Catholic churches are more ornate than other places of worship, but felt that the lavishly adorned covering of the Torah far surpassed any ornateness in the Catholic Church."

The Torah and its importance to Jews impressed almost all the students more than any other single aspect of the synagogue. A typical comment was this, by a housewife:

"The Torah impressed me the most. They have such respect and reverence for God that they say a prayer before even writing His name in it, and if an error is made, the Torah is taken to the cemetery and buried. Perhaps if some Catholics would take heed of this they would be better Catholics for it * * * The rabbi was gracious and I enjoyed listening to him. The visit helped me to understand the Jewish faith and customs."

This note of closer understanding was struck repeatedly in the students' reports. One wrote:

"A greater understanding, close to sympathy, has developed within me. It is a great pity that out of such a common bond, there can be so much misunderstanding—all due to ignorance of facts. I would like to see a course like this given to all parochial high school students and their instructors. We were welcomed with graciousness; over all the theology and discussion was the wonderful feeling of friendliness."

Reports like these led me to feel I had achieved my purpose. One in patricular seemed to sum up rather completely:

"Like millions of other Catholics, we had often wondered about the inside of a synagogue. The Torah and other religious articles gave us an understanding of their faith. One cannot listen to the cantor chanting the Psalms without thinking that Jesus too listened to the same chants. If more Catholics were to visit synagogues, it would encourage more Jews to visit our churches. This would result in a better understanding."

In October, 1960, a delegation of 130 leaders of the United Jewish Appeal came to the Vatican for an audience with Pope John XXIII. After some conversation with them, the Pope startled them by stating: "I am Joseph, your brother." His own given name being Joseph, he was of course referring to the emotional Bible narrative of Joseph's reunion with his brothers and father in Egypt. To promote closer harmony and friendship with the Jewish people, Catholics have the example of a Pope proclaiming to a group of Jews: "I am Joseph, your brother."

Retraining the Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article which appeared in the New England Business Review for August 1962, published monthly by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston:

PART I. THE NEW ENGLAND EXPERIENCE: RETRAINING THE UNEMPLOYED

Retraining the unemployed is to be vastly increased by the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. However, the practice of retraining the unemployed is relatively new and very little actual experience has been obtained.

Two New England States have had pioneering programs in retraining the unemployed, one of which anticipated by several years the first pilot Federal program under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. New England has also participated fully in the ARA program. It is therefore possible to gain some valuable information by looking at the first experiences of retraining in New England.

Seventy-seven percent of the 638 New England trainees of the Area Redevelopment Act have been placed in jobs related to their training with another 5 percent being placed in other jobs after training. Some of the placements have been outside the redevelopment area. This program has had from the start a handicap in that a redevelopment area by definition does not have a normal demand for labor. It should be noted that 100 percent placement is not necessary for retraining to be considered a success.

The significance of the Connecticut and Massachusetts State programs initiated before ARA is that they are not confined to but include "depressed areas," and therefore provide a better test of the effectiveness of retraining than the ARA program.[1]

CONNECTICUT RETRAINING

Early in 1961, the State of Connecticut instituted the community action program training course for the unemployed. The combined efforts of the vocational, apprentice training, and research staff of the State set up a program which was first instituted in Bridgeport on May 15, 1961. Seventeen machine tool operator trainees started a course in the local high school. Since then 660 unemployed workers have been trained in skills including welding, machine tool operation, and power sewing machine operation. In each case the job openings were identified and assurances were obtained from employers who said that they could absorb any trainee graduated from the course. Comprehensive testing and interviewing was done for the selection of the trainees. A curriculum was developed and classes scheduled to be taught at the local technical high schools with no charge for tuition. The unemployed were able to continue receiving unemployment compensation during training. Almost all the trainees participating in the community action program have been placed in jobs which will give them on-the-job experience in their new skills.

---

[1] The area redevelopment program in New England was described in the April 1962 issue of the New England Business Review. Since that date 4 additional courses have been approved for 355 unemployed individuals in New England redevelopment areas.

The Connecticut program was similar to the area redevelopment program in that extensive screening of applicants was done, and only specific programs were offered to the unemployed.

MASSACHUSETTS RETRAINING

The Massachusetts program is an older, and far different type of retraining program. A series of amendments to the unemployment compensation benefit law were made starting in 1956 so that an unemployed person taking a vocational training course could be considered as "available for work" and therefore eligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits while training. In fact, an 18-week extension of the benefits was provided if this extension were necessary to complete the approved course providing potential benefits of 48 weeks.

Each course was selected by the trainee and approved by the appropriate State agency, division of vocational education or division of employment security, if it would "serve as a means of realizing employment." The student paid tuition, if any.

Although no major advertising of this program has been done, approximately 1,300 individuals have taken advantage of the program since the first active year (1958) with approximately 300 having had a year's work experience since their retraining. This latter group does represent one of the largest groups of unemployed who, (1) have had retraining; (2) have reentered the labor market; and (3) have a year's work experience since retraining.

A joint research project was undertaken by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security in order to evaluate the success of the retrainees under this program. A questionnaire was sent to the 900 who had participated in approved programs by the end of 1961, for most of 1962 applicants were still in school. More than three-fourths of all those surveyed responded. In addition, a survey of other claimants who were similar in age, sex, previous occupation, geographic region, and date of compensation was made to establish a control group, i.e., a group of people with similar backgrounds, who had not had retraining. The purpose of this control group was to establish whether the change in income and steadiness of employment was due to retraining or to some other factors such as a better business climate which would affect all such individuals.

IMPROVED ANNUAL INCOME

Initial placement is just one test of the effectiveness of retraining. A more difficult and perhaps more important question is: Does retraining improve income and job stability?

The survey of the retrainees of the Massachusetts program has yielded some impressive results as to the effectiveness of retraining. Those people in this program who: (1) were laid off; (2) took some form of vocational training; and (3) have been out working for more than 1 year, on the average increased their yearly income by almost $1,000, or 35 percent.[2] The increase in yearly income for people who were similar to the retrainees but who did not have the advantage of retraining was $250, or 10 percent in the same time period. Retraining did pay off for the typical trainee in the Massachusetts program, although more of the improvement in their annual income came from increased steadiness of employment, rather than an increase in weekly wage. The increase in weeks worked per year was 7 weeks, providing almost steady employment (48.7 weeks per year) while the $8.50 increase in weekly wage was not much greater than the control groups.

The courses taken by the retrainees were determined by individual choice, limited only by the available institutions with courses that would be approved by the respective State agencies. As it developed, the courses taken were mainly in preparation for entrance in the service or clerical field. In fact, half of the whole group was studying to be barbers and beauticians. Six percent of the group were studying to become IBM office machine operators. A substantial number of women took a course to qualify as a registered practical nurse. Other women were taking courses in stenography and typing. Technicians, mainly electrical, accounted for 9 percent.

One of the advantages of this type of training program was that there were more than 72 types of training courses offered by both public and private institutions taken by these trainees ranging from training to be hospital attendants to a 6-week course in teacher training.

Because there were so many different courses with relatively few in each course—except for the barbers and beauticians—it was posible to compare meaningfully the results of the various types of training for only a few categories. The group taking IBM machine courses did fare better than the barbers and beauticians (at least during their apprenticeships). The practical nurses increased their weekly wage by $8 to $57, and the IBM operators by $10 to $75. The barbers and beauticians actually suffered a loss in weekly wage of $10 to $65. But the latter group still managed to increase its annual income by a one-fourth increase in employment time.

If the experience of the barbers is excluded from the experience of the other retrainees, the results of the remaining trainees are even more impressive. There is a 16-percent increase in weekly wage and an increase in average annual income of 50 percent.

Perhaps the greatest testimony of the effectiveness of the program itself is from the many comments which were written on the the questionnaire by the retrainees.

There is a statement of this success from a 23-year-old male from Somerville who had taken a course in the operation and wiring of IBM machines. His testimony follows:

"The training I was able to receive made it possible for me to obtain a good position with great opportunity for advancement. I certainly feel that many good workers can be retrained and helped to find steady employment."

This particular individual had worked for 36 weeks in the previous year at $50 a week. He is now working with IBM equipment at $90 a week and working steadily. Another man who was successful in electronics had this reply to the question: Would you have taken the course without unemployment compensation benefits?

"I would have continued to try and complete my desired education, but I must not minimize that help that I received through the unemployment office. It gave me a feeling that, because I was trying to improve myself, they were willing to help me financially."

Receiving unemployment compensation while they were learning did provide strong motivation for self-improvement for other individuals as well. From a woman taking a secretarial course came this quotation:

"[It is] very satisfying to know that you can receive an income while learning. More of an incentive to improve your position."

Many of these individuals, particularly those who had quit their jobs, were highly motivated and would have taken training without the aid. However, almost 60 percent of those who were laid off would not have taken the course had it not been for the program. With the aid of the program, 90 percent of the entire group finished their course work successfully.

Many of these workers were motivated by the drive to obtain steady employment as evidenced by this quotation from a 41-year-old housewife now making $40 a week as a beautician: "Two years ago I came over here from England. It was quite easy to find a job, but not a steady one. After a few weeks there was always the inevitable layoff. That is why I took the course (beautician). Since finishing school I have had steady employment. If it had not been for help I received from the division of employment security, I doubt if I ever could have finished the course."

The attempt of the individuals to get a defense against the irregular employment opportunities in many of the industrial shops is illustrated graphically by this quotation from a 51-year-old female from Worcester: "I love taking up hairdressing. There is a good future in it. When I complete my course, I won't have to worry about layoff from the shop."

Many of the voluntary quits were people who were "underemployed," i.e., those who did not work full time either because of seasonal patterns or because they could only obtain work 2 or 3 days a week. A 30-year-old truckdriver in Springfield decided to go to barbering school and quit his union truck-driving job partially because he could only obtain work 2 or 3 days a week.

Not all courses that were taken were satisfactory, nor was employment obtained by all, although 93 percent of those who had made a concerted effort to find a job in their new skill were able to find one.[3]

A person who was dissatisfied with a business course taken in air passenger sales and ground services gave this comment: "Out of 26 people who finished school only 2 are working * * * I am now unemployed and would appreciate anything you could do for me."

Though the success of retraining was not as graphic for the old people, there were many cases of individual triumphs through training in the older worker. One was a 65-year-old lady who at the age of 62 had been retired from her $40 a week typing job. After a period of several months when she was unemployed for personal reasons she decided to take a 10-week course in typing. This lady was very happy with her new job and her $58 a week pay which she considered to be a big improvement.

---

[2] It was possible to quit a job to go to vocational school, serve the required 10-week disqualification period for quitting, and then apply for benefits. About 20 percent of the applicants were of this type. The results of the voluntary quit group were separated from the involuntary separation group for the above statistics. In general, the voluntary quit group did significantly better than the control group, but not quite as well as the involuntary separation group.

[3] Quite a few barbers and beauticians (15 percent) did not remain in their apprenticeship because of low salary prospects for at least 18 months.

Some of the individuals who took advantage of this program were referred to the employment office by the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission. One man who had suffered and was recovering from a nervous breakdown took a course in electronic mechanical drafting. This man obtained a job as a senior draftsman and has been working steadily ever since.

This program was instrumental in enabling a 38-year-old male from Worcester to finally realize an 11-year-old ambition to become a teacher. This individual was a machinist and during a period of layoff took the vocational teaching training course at one of the Massachusetts State colleges during which he was allowed unemployment benefits. After a year of training he was employed as a machinist again and took the second year of teacher training 2 nights a week. He is now qualified and has been hired to teach at a vocational school.

Even college graduates have benefited from this program when they were laid off: "Although I had a B.A. degree in economics, I had to start in all over again to gain the necessary credits to enter the teaching field. Being able to attend the intensive teacher training program offered at one of the State teaching colleges was certainly a great boon to me. This is my first year teaching and I like it very much."

Many individuals who did not receive a job directly as a result of training did not feel any regret as to their taking such training: "I did not receive a job utilizing the knowledge that I have received in school. However, the fact that I have furthered my education helped me to acquire my present job."

Some individuals took a course which would give them a higher skill in the same industry. One individual said in describing his experience: "I have been working in shoe factories for 10 to 12 years, always having my pay vary from $3,000 to $4,500 a year with seasonal layoffs. I decided to learn a good trade at shoemaking that would keep me busy all year round. That I did at the * * * shoemaking school under wonderful guidance and I now have a future to look forward to."

The man is now making $100 weekly plus overtime and working steadily.

If future retraining experience lives up to the potential shown in the New England experience, it might solve the employment problem for many individuals who have found or will find that there is little demand for their particular talents, unless further developed.

However, initial success in the first New England retraining programs does not necessarily mean that retraining will provide an answer for finding employment for a substantial number of the unemployed. As illustrated in the table, the person who elected to take advantage of the program is significantly younger and better educated than the unemployed taken as a whole. Thus it cannot be assumed that all unemployed would derive comparable benefits from retraining.

A more thorough discussion of the general application of retraining to the unemployed will be deferred to part II of this series.

Trainee characteristics

Age group	Massachusetts trainees	Massachusetts unemployed	U.S. unemployed
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Under 25	51.8	14.9	33.2
25 to 34	25.6	17.6	19.6
35 to 44	12.5	21.6	17.1
45 to 54	8.1	21.3	15.7
55 to 64	1.5	13.7	10.6
65 and over	.5	11.7	3.8
Average age	28.4	43.0	35.0

Years of school completed	Massachusetts trainees	Massachusetts unemployed
	Percent	*Percent*
8 and under	12.4	31.2
9 and 10	18.7	21.1
11 and 12	58.0	39.7
1 or 2 (college)	7.1	4.9
More than 2 (college)	3.8	3.1
Average education	10.9	10.0

Source: U.S. Department of Labor and Massachusetts Division of Employment Security.

A Statement of Position on Senate Joint Resolution 29 and H.R. 11040

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, August 27, 1962, when Senate Joint Resolution 29, "qualifications of electors" amendment to the Constitution, was brought on the floor for consideration, I was necessarily absent in my district and could not attend the House session. Mr. Speaker, if I could have possibly been here on yesterday when the vote was taken on this constitutional amendment, I would have voted "no." My vote in the negative would have been based not only upon my belief that those States who now require a poll tax as one of the qualifications to vote in a general election should retain that prerogative, but I would also have objected on the basis of approving an amendment to the Constitution of the United States under a suspension of the rules which only allows 20 minutes debate on each side of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, my great State of North Carolina has long since eliminated the poll tax requirement for citizens to exercise their vote and if I had been in the State legislature when this matter was considered, I would have voted to do away with the poll tax requirement as a qualification to vote in North Carolina. I would still desire to see the States that now have such a requirement to eliminate it on their own volition. I do not feel it is the prerogative of the Federal Government to dictate to the four or five States their constitutional right to establish voter qualifications.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this statement for the RECORD to show the position that I would have taken had it been possible for me to have been present when the vote was taken on Senate Joint Resolution 29.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with H.R. 11040, on the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, had I been present and voting my vote would have been in the affirmative in concurring in the Senate amendments and passing it.

Commencement Address, June 3, 1962, St. John Kanty Preparatory School, Erie, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 3, 1962, commencement exercises were held at the St. John Kanty Preparatory School in Erie, Pa.

This school is under the sponsorship of the Vincentian Fathers and the rector is the Reverend Dr. Wallace S. Czapla.

At the commencement exercises, Dr. Felix E. Sklagen, of Washington, D.C., was the main speaker. His address to the graduates was timely and most impressive.

I feel that in times like these it is worth while to reflect on the spiritual needs of today as an offset to the materialistic aims which seem to dominate the world today.

Dr. Sklagen's address was as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF DR. FELIX E. SKLAGEN, JUNE 3, 1962

Those of you who have long been associated with the growth of Kanty today I know must have a feeling of warmth and satisfaction to see these young men reach this first landing in their climb to what we hope will be for each of them a brilliant career.

This, for them, is their last curtain call at Kanty. And if it is true that last impressions are the best, then this day for them will be most remembered. Like a song that will end but whose melody will linger on, Kanty and the part it played in their lives will for them always be a pleasant memory.

On occasions of this kind, speakers very often talk of the new and varied experiences which young graduates will encounter. They speak of great changes in the world.

But really, the world basically has not changed so much. Its position in the universe is about the same. The geographic locations of its oceans, rivers, and continents are still substantially in the same place. The sun, the stars, and the moon which fill the skies are just as they were since the beginning of civilization.

What actually has changed, however, was progress. Down through the centuries the individual has been working his magic wand of achievement.

We thrill at the stories of how in a covered wagon he crossed this continent. How he carved this Republic of ours out of the wilderness. How he built tremendous railways and highways, great cities, factories, schools, and churches. How in the march of human progress, like a fairy godmother, he has transformed this world of ours—particularly America—into a fairyland of unbelievable realities. From a small backwoods settlement, we have truly become a giant among nations. We are the wealthiest and strongest country in the world. We today have the greatest industrial productive capacity, and above all we have the atom which is just beginning to open its limitless powers to hitherto unexplored peacetime uses.

This is the America that has been built for you—where ability, talent, and character are recognized and rewarded—where opportunity to reach the pinnacle of success is given to all—where leadership in every field is open to everyone.

This is the America beckoning now to you graduates. It has for each of you a new assignment to fulfill—a more important task to perform.

And do not for one moment think, my young graduates, that the greatness of America came about by accident. It grew great and powerful, its way of life brought freedom and progress because our forefathers—and those who followed—knew what it was to have courage, and how to make sacrifice. They had faith in God, in themselves, and in each other—the very things your teachers here at Kanty have emphasized so strongly and so frequently.

A century ago our people had never heard of the expression "Aw, what's the use. Let's give it up." They would never let discouragement get them down. They were builders. Adversity made them strong. And theirs was not a path of roses. Ours has not been such, and years hence it will be just the same. We will always have to work for things worth while.

But their life and their progress should be the example of life and progress for us—a life and a progress based on unity, on understanding, and on the willingness to join hands—to work together. Like they, we too, must be builders. We must build for us, and for those who follow an even bigger and better America.

And how are we to do it? We are to do it, by recognizing that all this accomplishment is tangible evidence of the rich qualities of soul and character of men. By benefiting from, and by utilizing the greatest asset we possess—education.

It is education that strengthens the mind, that elevates character to higher levels of spiritual growth and moral greatness—that can lead us in wisdom and foresight to the golden dawn of a truly responsible American life—the only kind that is really worth living.

And let there be no mistake about it. Character is the creative key to success. It is the indispensable part of a graduate's equipment in coping with the problems of the modern world. Without character, failure is inevitable. With it, one reaches the heights.

It is character and education that gives to a nation the tolerance and the wisdom it needs. A nation is great only when the people comprising it are intellectually and morally great.

To keep America intellectually and morally great then is education's problem. It is the endless task of teachers if we are ever to restore faith and freedom and peace to this present spiritually impoverished world.

Today the world is spiritually impoverished. Today education is at the crossroads.

The United States stands deep in conflict with the materialistic ideologies of communism. We are fighting a seepage of ideas completely foreign to our concept of American traditions. A godless philosophy seeks to undermine the reality of God's existence, and pervert the meaning of truth, beauty, and goodness—the eternally fine and indestructible things of heaven.

The materialism of Karl Marx has today become the political philosophy of many professors in our schools of higher learning.

A professor in one of our leading teachers' colleges, for instance, wrote a book some years back which he called "The Great Technology." In this book, this teacher of teachers openly tried to mold the plastic minds of his students with tenets utterly incompatible with the American way of life. In fact, he asserted the American way was a failure, and he advocated replacing it with a "new social order." His whole teaching was a deliberate attempt to falsify the concepts of Americanism, and to inculcate subversive doctrines into the minds of American students.

He taught what he said he believed. And he believed, for instance, that our institutions were dishonest, that they lacked integrity. He believed the courts defeated the will of the people. He believed that our notions of loyalty to Government had to be uprooted. He believed that our oath of allegiance, and our flag salute were mere mumblings without any meaning at all. He believed the Constitution was written only for upper classes. And most shockingly, he depicted his belief in Communist Russia as a glowing picture of "a fine civilization."

Then we had another professor who also wrote a book, "Faith, Reason, and Civilization," a book which had a wide circulation throughout this country even though in it he said that our civilization showed all the signs of complete collapse; that religion had lost its power over mankind; that the only successful faith available in our days was that of the Russian Communists; and that a worldwide communistic revolution of society was desirable.

Not so long ago, even the Congress of the United States found it necessary to look into the question of textbooks used in our American schools because they were distorting the facts, depicting false portrayal of American life and history.

Oh, how fortunate that here at Kanty, under the protective teachings of your church, you have been taught to distinguish truth from error. How fortunate that here, under the guidance of your faculty, you have at an early age learned that wisdom was a God-given spiritual actuality; that "the beginning of all knowledge was fear of God." You have come to learn that despite everything the expression of character and moral righteousness still dwells in the human soul.

I believe that most, if not all of you, will be entering college in the fall. In making your selection I cannot emphasize too strongly the danger of making a wrong choice of schools. May it preferably be a Catholic one, whose teachings have survived the test of centuries; where truth, undeterred from its course, towers in strength and power, fixed as it is, like the North Star, in the galaxy of its scintillating beauty.

Oh, we can be thankful that though the war shook things to their very foundations, things eternal were not disturbed. The essential things of life remain. That for every one teacher in the United States preferring the book of Karl Marx, we have a thousand who prefer the Sermon on the Mount, and the Ten Commandments. Teachers who still believe in the Master of them all—the Teacher of Galilee.

We can be thankful that we live in a country where we can still have places of worship—a home for God to live among us. We can be thankful that people in the world still cleave to their God, and in God they find peace and contentment.

Lift then, my dear graduates, your eyes upward to the skies where there is destiny. Where the stars can guide you as they once guided the wise men of old to the simplicity of that small manger—to the warmth and bright flame of a loving heart.

It was Emerson who once said: "Only in the dark of night, one can best see the shining stars."

Yes. When the argument of those who deny truth sometimes appears to you convincing, when at times shades of doubt seem to obscure for you the truth, the spiritual equipment given you here at Kanty will fortify and be for you a pillar of protection. All you have to do is look upward, and there in the darkness you will see the unchanging dogmatic truths of your religion—the shining stars, winking to you, at it were, almost as if saying: "We know better, don't we?"

Of course, we know better. We know that beyond the starry clockwork of the universe there is God—and eternity.

Throughout life be then never so proud, my young friends, as not to bend your knee to say: "Our Father, Who art in heaven, hallowed by Thy Name."

Be never so ungrateful to your country, my young friends, as to forget your obligations to it, or as not to say—

> "But the glory of the present
> Is to make the future free;
> We love our land for what she is,
> And what she is to be."

Oh, we may complain about our Government, and about our country. But after all, it is a democracy, and it is ours. And it is the best in the world today. Where it may need repairs, we will patch it, but we will not junk it for any or all of the other systems of government.

All we have to do is to make sure the paralyzing hand of tyranny does not engulf it. To see that communism does not destroy the heritage given us by the Founding Fathers. Freedom must not be permitted to die in the very land where freedom was given birth. And it must spread throughout the world.

Not until you have been denied the right of public worship, would you realize the meaning of freedom of religion. Not until you have been denied the right to speak your mind would you realize what is meant by freedom of speech. Not until you have been shipped to a concentration camp against your will, would you know what is meant by freedom of economic opportunity. Not until a dictator has told you how to vote would you appreciate the freedom of the ballot.

Here in America we have all these cherished blessings of freedom. We must always, however, be on the alert not to lose them.

In our generation we have seen dictators try to set themselves up as mighty gods. They have torn men and women from tradition and belief. They tried—and in some instances even succeeded—in winning over men's bodies for enslaved labor and military strength. But they never quite succeeded in controlling men's minds.

Faith in God forbids making a god out of man, however powerful he may be. The soul of man who has faith cannot be killed. The altar will never lose its place of honor in the Nation's heart.

And finally, be never so hardened, my young friends, as to forget the needs of your fellowmen, or to destroy their hope for peace.

In our quest for world peace we have led ourselves to believe that in dollars, guns, and tanks, we can attain our objectives. We say too much about the sending of food and money to all parts of the world. We say too little about the importance of carrying to the world expressions of cultural and moral purpose.

What the people of the world need most today is assurance that we mean only to reconstruct dignity and decency into human lives. That in preserving democracy, the things we want to destroy are the bad ideas—not the persons having them. That what we seek is to rebuild hope and confidence and the will to live again in a seemingly hopeless atmosphere. We must teach that the moral power capable of creating "finer things" can be made secure only in the hearts and minds of men. That only in the human mind and heart can there be peace and liberty.

So in taking to the world the ideals and principles of a true democracy, let us by all means bring people back again to the Cross, the only potent force that we have left in this maddened world; the only powerful weapon remaining to defend our civilization against atomic fears and the onslaughts of barbaric aggression.

It is better for us—as a famed educator once wisely said—"to light a little candle in someone's heart than to stand by idly cursing the darkness."

When this country of ours was first inaugurated among the nations of the world, an age of courage and a new spirit was born. Minutemen, you will recall, went into action. Not only a candle, but a mighty torch was lighted and lifted toward the skies. It was the light which made bright the path of enjoyment of the blessings of our American liberty.

Oh, the world today needs more of that light. We cannot stand idly by. It must burn ever more brightly.

And I, for one, have great faith that our youth—these and all graduates throughout the country—will keep it ever burning. They are the minutemen of our age. Through them and their accomplishments we can confidently expect our highest ideals realized.

People under the rule of despots must find their destiny in the mud beneath the heel of the tyrant. But you—my dear graduates—as free American young men—can and will lift up your eyes and seek your destiny among the stars.

In the great sea of American opportunity there is room for every childish sail and a harbor for every dream. The door of opportunity is open to everyone, rich and poor alike. On the magic carpet of ambition, some rise from rags to riches. Under our system, one may rise from a log cabin to the White House.

Yet, there are some who would try to paint for us a gloomy picture for the future. But what they would say cannot be true, for we have not started to invent as yet. We have only scratched the surface, just cleared away the briars and rubbish on the outer field of achievement.

One hundred years from now people will look back upon our time and wonder how we ever managed to get along on such primitive outmoded methods. They will wink at our so-called achievement. Colonel Glenn's capsule—*Friendship 7,* and the *Aurora*—will be antiquated museum pieces. People will be living in an age where time and space will have been completely abolished, and mankind will be served beneficially with the peacetime uses of atom's energy and the sunrays.

To you young graduates for whom today the door of acomplishment is swinging ajar, this should be real inspiration.

So as you go forth from these memorable walls, have confidence in yourselves. Be courageous. Face the future without fear or uncertainty. The training you have received here at Kanty has prepared you well for the task. Behind you is infinite power; before you is endless possibility; and around you endless opportunity. Why, then, be afraid?

As you accept this challenging world of tomorrow, remember what a poet once wrote:

"Somebody said it couldn't be done,
But he with a chuckle replied,
That maybe it couldn't, but he would be one
Who wouldn't say so till he had tried.

So he buckled right in with the trace of a grin
On his face. If he worried he hid it.
He started to sing as he tackled the thing
That couldn't be done—and he did it."

Each of you can do it, if you will only try. And do not let your age deter you. Youth is the mainspring of the world. The greatest things of all ages have been done by young men.

When Bacon was only 16 years old, he already had sketched his philosophy. At 17, Sir Walter Raleigh had gone out to find new worlds. At 14, Napoleon wrote home from the military school to his mother, "With my honor in my pocket and my sword at my side, I will fight my way to the top." At 27, he was already triumphant over Italy. Alexander, when only 32, already wept for other worlds to conquer. On his 37th birthday, Raphael lay already dead beneath his last painting. At 36, Mozart had played his last song. Patrick Henry became famous as a lawyer at the age of 27, and at 29 in the Virginia House of Burgesses made a speech in defense of the Colonies that caused George III to tremble on his throne. Daniel Webster was a Congressman at 31, Henry Clay at 34 was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives. Thomas Jefferson, at 33, wrote the Declaration of Independence. And let's not forget, that Christ at the age of 30 was ready for His ministry, and at 33, He died to redeem the world. The present President of the United States took office when he was only 43, and at 40 Colonel Glenn was soaring in orbit around the earth, pioneering the endless possibilities of the space age.

Yes, my young friends, the world calls you. Humanity needs you. Success awaits you on the mountaintop.

But the mountain is steep and rugged. Every accomplishment will mean painful and consecrated effort. Every great victory calls for sacrifice. Ah, but there at the summit is where you will see and enjoy the beautiful view stretched out below—the glorious sea of satisfaction.

It was on a mountaintop that the Ten Commandments were given. It was on a mountaintop that the beautiful Sermon on the Mount was preached. It was on a mountaintop that Calvary's Cross was raised to radiate its potent power down through the centuries.

O, my young friends, always stay within its shadow. Be at all times in communion with that Something greater than yourselves, and you will receive the blessings of peace, success, and happiness.

In this sad hour of world history, with a mantle of enslavement and darkness spread across half the world—as I conclude this message here this morning—may I appeal not only to the graduates, but to all of you to keep firm your faith in God to lead us through our dark moments and to bring to us love and better understanding of neighbors. Keep the little candles burning.

We must never permit this to be a nation that has forgotten God. For as a great statesman once said it is only under God that this Nation "will not perish from the earth."

To you graduates my congratulations. My best wishes. May God bless you.

Oveta Culp Hobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, following are the remarks which appeared in the spring 1951 issue of Dixie Business magazine. I am taking the liberty of adding to the remarks of that publication. The last two paragraphs are my own.

OVETA CULP HOBBY

Oveta Culp Hobby is America's foremost woman.

She and Gov. W. P. Hobby, who was named in 1950 to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, make up the outstanding husband and wife newspaper publishing team and the Hobbys of Texas have distinguished themselves in various fields of service even more than publishing the great Houston Post.

First woman to serve as president (1949) and chairman (1950) of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association; only woman appointed by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to the National Policy Board of the American Assembly; wartime head of the WAC's with rank of colonel of the Army; she has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and Philippine Military Merit Medal and accorded honors without number.

She was parliamentarian, Texas House of Representatives (1925–31); and on the Houston Post has been research editor (1931–32); book editor (1933–36); assistant editor (1936–38), and is now director and executive vice president.

It would take many pages to list all the organizations and movements she has been a leader in—press, cancer, community chest, education, government, safety, National Conference of Christians and Jews, American Heart, savings bonds.

She is the author of "Mr. Chairman" (parliamentary law textbook) and conducts a syndicate column by that title.

She is the only woman eligible to change the title of the "Man of the South" to "Woman of the South" in whatever years she should get the most votes.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Hobby was appointed Federal Security Administrator on January 21, 1953. This agency became the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on April 11, 1953. She was the first Administrator and the first woman to become a Cabinet officer of our Government. She resigned July 31, 1955.

Health, Education, and Welfare is a tremendously large and important Department. At the time Mrs. Hobby was Administrator, the Department had about 44,500 employees. The administration of this Department is considered, not only one of the most important but one of the most difficult positions in the entire Government. She did a magnificient job of administration. The Department has many agencies which are separate and distinct from each other—and, of course, their separateness adds to the administrative problems of the office—such as the Office of Education, Public Health Service, Social Security Administration, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Food and Drug Administration, and several hospitals and universities.

Tribute to Hon. Clarence E. Kilburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, an article from the Watertown Daily Times of August 24 tells of the honors recently paid to our good friend and colleague, CLARENCE KILBURN.

Congressman KILBURN has represented the 33d District of New York since 1938. He has done it admirably, and has won the love and respect of his constituents as he has that of all Members of the House of Representatives.

The New York State delegation is proud of Clarence Kilburn, who will be our senior Member and leader next year, when our beloved John Taber retires.

The article follows:

Honors for Mr. Kilburn

The Republican Party pays tribute tonight to Congressman Clarence E. Kilburn, who has ably represented northern New York in Washington since 1938 and who will seek reelection next November. Never has there been such a distinguished guest list at a Republican dinner here. The list includes Governor Rockefeller, Senator Javits, Senator Keating, the national Republican chairman, Congressman William E. Miller, and that is just a start.

The dinner has two purposes. The first is to give Congressman Kilburn the kind of recognition he deserves. The second purpose is to start the Republican campaign in northern New York. If other districts in the Nation receive the kind of representation that Congressman Kilburn has given residents of his five-county district, citizens and their interests would properly be reflected in the Congress of the United States. No man has shown a greater devotion to his constituency. He provides a personal type of representation in that his concern over the years has been to accomplish things in response to the many thousands of requests that come to him day in and day out.

In a sense this kind of representation is a personal and individualistic concern over the many situations which confront citizens and their relationship to big government. Probably no Congressman could please everyone in his district by his votes on the various issues that come before Congress. This would be an impossible task for the Representative from northern New York because we differ with each other on practically everything that is properly termed a congressional issue. Each of us on many occasions has differed with Congressman Kilburn on how he has voted. Never once has he misguided us, however, as to his attitude on the issues. If his opinion was contrary to the opinion, for example, of this newspaper, we knew it. He has always possessed a consistent point of view. A resident here always knows clearly where he stands.

This is a virtue. It is better to be represented by a man who honestly expresses his opinions than it is to be represented by an amorphous type of character who, like a jellyfish, floats with the currents, sometimes moving backward, sometimes forward, and, more often than not, sideways.

This newspaper on occasion has opposed the renomination of Mr. Kilburn, needless to say unsuccessfully. So in evaluating his congressional service and expressing support for reelection, we genuinely believe that we know something about the kind of Congressman that is good for northern New York. It certainly should be said that Congressman Kilburn has shown in the past and will show upon reelection an ability to provide what this district needs very much in Washington.

That the other party leaders, the Governor, the Senators, the national chairman, and the State chairman, Mr. Morhouse, are here is not only happy but proper. Their presence means that the Republican Party is widely based, ranging on the one hand from Governor Rockefeller and Senator Javits to Congressman Miller and Congressman Kilburn, himself. Congressman Kilburn is certainly on the conservative side of the party, and has stature for his point of view. The Republicans of northern New York are happy at the opportunity to be participating in the launching of a reelection program for Congressman Kilburn, for Governor Rockefeller, and Senator Javits. We can vote .for all three with enthusiasm, recognizing that the amalgam of their points of view offers the best hope for their proper State and National program. This Republican Party has tremendous talents and capacities for the kind of leadership that people need. Governor Rockefeller, Senator Javits, Senator Keating, and Congressman Kilburn are the reason.

An Industry Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, of continuing interest to the Congress and the people of the United States is the problem of fuels and the relationship of coal in the total picture of fuel demands and availability. A recent study by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, dated May 1962, is an enlightening report that should be read by every Member of Congress. This problem is of such grave concern that recently another study group, the fifth named in recent months, has been set up to decide what fuels should provide tomorrow's energy.

There is no doubt that this will create a great deal of competition, particularly amongst the lobbies representing oil, natural gas, coal, hydroelectric, and nuclear power. Whatever recommendation is accepted, it is done to create a great disturbance in the future of these industries, their customers, and the general economic picture. I therefore present this report in part in the hope that Members will take time to read it:

An Industry Survey

There are so many facets to coal that any brief treatment of the subject is bound to be inadequate. Its history began in the dim past when primitive men discovered its flammability, but there was little reason to dig for coal while wood was plentiful. Around the year 1710 someone made the discovery that started coal on its way to importance. When baked without air it yields a hard, porous carbon fuel called coke, and coke worked better than the traditional charcoal in the process of smelting ore. In the 1760's experimentation with simple steam engines used to pump water out of English coal mines led to improvements enabling steam power to operate machines of all kinds. Thus coal became the source of energy that built and operated modern, large-scale transportation and industry.

Later, chemists began to probe the rich organic content of coal. So far they have found about 350 basic derivatives, and the number of useful substances formed by selecting and combining these is said to exceed 200,000. Coal products include paving and building materials, fertilizers, insecticides, dyes, refrigerants, preservatives, artificial flavorings and other synthetic food substances, antiseptics, medicines, drugs, and synthetic rubber and many other plastics, some of which are suitable materials for textile fibers and filaments.

Science and economics

Despite coal's versatility, economic difficulties developed, largely occasioned by progress in other fields. Petroleum and natural gas, which could be extracted, transported, and utilized more cheaply and conveniently, cut into some of coal's biggest markets. Although much progress was made in extending coal's usefulness elsewhere, the thousands of tons no longer needed to run railroads and heat homes could not readily be absorbed in other uses. Most coal chemicals, for instance, must still be regarded as byproducts of coke. Without a growing demand for coke to feed blast furnaces, or until new methods are developed, few of these useful substances can be produced economically in greater volume.

Coal industry research, therefore, continues to concentrate on projects that seem most likely to have a quick and favorable impact on volume. Cost reductions obviously fall in this category. Machines were developed for this purpose and are constantly being improved. Coal processing—sorting, cleaning, crushing, and sizing, or powdering to meet the needs of particular users—has reach an advanced stage, but is still studied for the purpose of improving both service and efficiency.

Transportation costs vary considerably but have recently averaged about one-fifth of the delivered price of coal. Progress here could mean savings for consumers and increased volume for producers. Present efforts center on three main ideas. First, coal pipelines similar to one already operating successfully in Ohio may come into more general use. Such a pipeline has been franchised to move powered coal suspended in water from the northern Appalachian coal region to the huge market areas of the northeast. Many problems remain to be solved, however, before a right of way can be established and actual work begun. Second, the railroads' answer to the pipeline may be an "integral train" of specially designed coal cars moving nonstop directly from the mine to the customer. The third idea has been called "coal by wire." It involves construction of steam-powered generators at mine sites and transmission of power at much higher voltages and over longer distances than have ever been attempted before. Each of these possible answers to the challenge of transporting coal is still experimental to some degree. Which one or what combination of the three may finally meet the test of economic survival remains to be seen.

Utilization studied

The efficiency with which coal can be converted to useful energy is a matter of key importance and is constantly under examination. Recent experiments indicate, for instance, that combustion equipment can be built to handle powdered coal in water right from a pipeline without incurring the added cost of separate settling and drying. Other aspects of coal's efficient conversion to heat and power are also being subjected to extensive research and may result in totally new equipment for handling solid coal. The more revolutionary solution, however, may lie in converting the coal itself to gaseous or liquid fuels. A specific project of this type involves a gas turbine to generate electricity using fuels derived from coal. Other studies seek wider use of coal products in fertilizers, soil conditioners, and paving materials, and the recovery of aluminum and other metals and chemicals from coal mine wastes. The steel industry is gradually learning to produce more than the traditional ton of steel for each ton of coal used, but so far, in terms of coal consumed, increased steel production has more than offset greater efficiency. The aluminum industry, which uses the energy equivalent of 6.8 pounds of coal to produce a pound of metal, has found coal-generated electricity competitive with water-generated power when proximity to markets is also considered. Researchers expect to find ways of helping coal serve these important users more efficiently.

Economic trends

Coal's recent economic history is reflected in the accompanying charts. The graph of production and employment begins with the year 1920, when output was still close to the 600-million-ton levels of World War I. At that time coal employment was rising toward its alltime peak, just over 700,000, reached in 1923. World War I climaxed the long upward trend in bituminous coal production that paralleled the growth of modern industry. After 1920, production gradually declined. The depression years of the thirties hastened this process, but then the demands of World War II and subsequent temporary power shortages raised coal output to 600 million tons again. After 1947 the downtrend resumed, and output now is about the same as it was in the late 1930's. In contrast to these somewhat intermittent declines in production, employment dropped sharply and almost continuously. In less than 40 years the number of employees fell 78 percent, from 700,000 to 150,000, from 2.5 percent to a third of 1 percent of total nonfarm workers. This chart's production and employment scales are matched in such a way that points where the lines intersect represent periods when productivity was close to an annual rate of 1,000 tons per employee. Production was below this level in the early years, but has been well above it most of the time since 1940, and it approximates 2,700 tons per employee.

Coal's regional importance is roughly indicated by the production statistics for principal coal States. In West Virginia, coal currently accounts for about 11 percent of total nonagricultural employment, a substantial change from the 1930's when coal mining provided more than one-fourth of all the jobs in the Mountain State. Employment losses have been less critical in other coal States. Kentucky's coal miners now represent a little over 4 percent of total employment. Pennsylvania's less than 1 percent. Virginia ranks sixth as a coal producer but third in order of the relative importance of coal employment.

Problems pinpointed

The changes in mining methods reflect the trend toward greater use of expensive but more efficient equipment. The growing use of continuous mining machines is steadily increasing the over-all productivity of underground operations. In surface mines, the new method known as augur mining, has proven capable of more speed and efficiency than any other mining method. The mining machines have helped coal to meet its competition but unemployment was the byproduct.

Despite this greater productive efficiency, coal's status as a source of energy has continued to decline. In 1920 bituminous coal provided nearly two-thirds of all the energy consumed in the United States. Since then energy use has more than doubled and has been rising at a rate that might double it again by the year 2,000. Bituminous coal consumption, however, has dropped 25 percent since the 1920's. It now accounts for about one-fifth of total energy consumed, and until recently was declining from its wartime peak at a rate that if maintained, would have completely eliminated coal as a source of energy by the year 2,000. Research projects such as those outlined earlier make such an eventuality seem most unlikely. Furthermore, despite the general declines apparent in the graph of consumption patterns, three markets have remained strong. First, electric utilities have needed more and more coal to satisfy America's fast growing appetite for electricity. Second, although steelmakers use coke more and more efficiently, sometimes by augmenting it with natural gas, their total demand has remained fairly stable. Third, other manufacturers have been consuming fairly constant amounts of coal and constitute a market area in which researchers particularly expect to stimulate important new growth. The greater stability apparent in most coal data since 1958 is already a reflection of these new trends.

Coal's chief competitors, petroleum and natural gas, account for nearly three-quarters of all energy consumed currently in the United States. Several factors explain this. The primary one is price per unit of power delivered to the point of utilization. Natural gas has low extraction and transportation costs. "Residual oil," the petroleum product that competes most directly with coal in many uses, is, as the name implies, a residue of the refining process and is usually disposed of at whatever price supply and demand may set. This is tough competition for coal. Present quotas on residual oil imports help a good deal, and coal men hope to compete more effectively in both price and service.

Wages and profits

Coal mining has been a well-paid line of work. Average hourly earnings have been consistently higher than in steel mills and automobile plants and substantially higher than for manufacturing industries generally. Annual earnings, however, provide a somewhat different picture because of differences in hours worked. The final chart shows that until recently the average miner earned less per year than did steel and automobile workers. Miners' annual earnings, however, have consistently exceeded those of manufacturing workers generally. Value added per production worker in automobiles, steel, and all manufacturing exceeded the approximately comparable figures for bituminous coal. Therefore, the favorable comparison between miners' earnings and those of workers in other industries means that the fraction of value added going into workers' pockets was substantially larger in coal mining than in any of the other groups.

In recent decades, except during wartime, coal companies typically have been less profitable than other industrial firms. For instance, in 1934 less than one-third of the corporations engaged in coal mining reported net earnings. Other mining companies fared about the same; construction firms, considerably worse; manufacturing, a little better. In 1939 the fraction of coal corporations reporting net income was smaller still, but the others had improved, and by considerable margins in construction and manufacturing. In 1947, however, spurred by postwar fuel shortages, 75 percent of incorporated coal firms showed net profits as compared with 71 percent of similarly chartered construction companies, 66 percent of franchised manufacturing plants, and 60 percent of the mining group as a whole. By 1959 the proportion of profitable corporations had declined only slightly in manufacturing and moderately in construction but had dropped to 46 percent for coal mining firms. The latest data on profits are for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, a year complicated by both a steel strike and a recession. Coal mine earnings after taxes were 0.4 percent of sales compared to 2 percent in total mining, 1 percent in construction, and 4 percent in manufacturing. Conditions suggest that many uncertainties still exist in both the production and marketing phases of the coal business. It may be several years before the new coal trends settle into new and stable patterns of employment, production, and earnings.

EXPORT MARKETS FOR COAL

The figures shown on the outline map above represent one estimate of the continental distribution of world coal reserves. These are interesting statistics even though they are the sort that must be interpreted with reservations. These precentages are based on estimates that total something over 5 trillion tons, reflect available geological surveys, and probably indicate well enough the distribution of usable supplies of coal.

Mining more difficult overseas

The United States enjoys important natural advantages over and above a substantial share of the world's coal. American deposits are largely of high quality lying relatively near the surface in comparatively thick layers that seldom deviate more than a few degrees from horizontal. In contrast, most of the remaining English coal exists well beneath the surface in seams that are frequently narrow and sharply tilted. Workable deposits on the European Continent are generally so deep in the earth that operating costs are high, and expansion costs are almost prohibitive. Coal is plentiful in many parts of the Asiatic Continent, but developmental capital is scarce, and, in any case, Communist ownership precludes free world access to these deposits in the foreseeable future. Much of Japan's coal is of mediocre quality and occurs in twisted and segmented veins caused by volcanic activity. South America, a complex of nations eager to industralize, has relatively little coal, and the bulk of this is located in Colombia.

Mining activity in the Common Market countries has changed little since 1952. For the rest of Europe, the increases that continued through 1957 occurred for the most part behind the Iron Curtain. The principal gains in world coal production since 1957 have occurred in Asia. It was reported that China doubled output between 1957 and 1958 and added a substantial increment annually thereafter. India has mined more coal each year, although on a considerably smaller scale than that reported for China. Japan's recent annual output has ranged between 52 million and 57 million tons. It is clear that many of the principal nations with with the United States regularly trades have plenty of coal, but little of it is well suited to more rapid exploitation.

Exports irregular but rising

The wide fluctuations in U.S. coal exports since World War II tend to obscure the fact that the trend has been upward. An acute coal shortage prevailed in Europe during the first half of the period charted, and exports to Europe were largely determined by the amount of Federal aid available to finance them. As a result of the oil scare that culminated during the 1956 closing of the Suez Canal, European nations stockpiled coal, importing large amounts in 1955, 1956, and 1957. By 1958 stocks were unduly large, concern over the possibility of an oil shortage had subsided, West Germany actually embargoed coal imports, and this Nation's exports nosedived, stabilizing again only after 1959.

Recent exports to other countries primarily reflect economic rather than political events. Exports to Canada, the national coal industry's largest and steadiest external customer, have trended downward as that nation has increased its domestic output of petroleum and natural gas. Elsewhere, native sources of fuel have not been adequate to meet the needs of the growing steel and electric power industries—particularly in Japan, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile. The resulting exports to these areas have provided a bright side to the recent picture of oversea markets.

Potential growth

In most parts of the world there are important factors limiting the expansion of coal output. The United States is the conspicuous exception. Coal's competitive situation in world markets which can also be served by petroleum or natural gas is frequently a question of price with only a slight advantage needed to tip the balance one way or the other. Waterpower potential is limited in many areas by inadequate rainfall and, where feasible, requires large capital outlays. Atomic reaction and other revolutionary sources of power are still largely experimental. Superficially, at least, these facts seem to point to sizable future markets overseas for U.S. coal if present trends toward higher productivity and lower prices continue.

Some specific trends abroad can be cited to support this view. Japan's coal production has been fairly stable in recent years despite phenomenal growth in her general economy. In the 5 years between 1956 and 1961, for instance, pig iron production nearly tripled and thermal-generated electric power considerably more than tripled. During the same interval, Japan was able to increase water-generated power by only 15 percent; in Europe, West Germany increased steel production 40 percent between 1956 and 1961; France, 30 percent; Italy, 50 percent; Sweden, 50 percent; Belgium, a little over 10 percent; and Great Britain, a little less. For the same 5-year period, increases in production of electric power were about 40 percent in West Germany, France, and Italy; 50 percent in Great Britain and Sweden; and 30 percent in Belgium. In South America, steel production rose 60 percent in Argentina and 20 percent in Chile, while increases in electric power production in the principal countries ranged from 30 percent in Brazil and Chile to 50 percent in coal-rich Colombia and over 100 percent in oil-rich Venezuela.

The statistics quoted above are not exact. The purpose is to create a general impression of growth rates, in various parts of the world, in the two industries that consumed the most coal. In contrast, coal output actually declined between 1956 and 1961 in Western Europe, and recorded only moderate gains in South America and Japan. There is, of course, no way of knowing how economic forces may shift. But the present trends—lower costs in the United States, rising demands and limitations on output overseas—seem to point to a period of rising export opportunities for the United States.

The U.S. Position in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I had the privilege of addressing the 17th annual convention of the National Society of Public Accountants at the Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia, Pa. At the request of the society, the subject of my address was "The U.S. Position in World Affairs." Under leave to extend my remarks I am including the text of that address:

The U.S. Position in World Affairs

(Address by Representative James E. Van Zandt, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, before the 17th National Convention of the Public Accountants, Sheraton Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., Monday, Aug. 20, 1962, 7:30 p.m.)

The subject I have been asked to speak to you about tonight is "The U.S. Position in World Affairs."

Every American is aware of our country's great variety of activities in a thousand spots around the globe.

The newspapers, radio, and television keep us informed daily of American activities in Laos, South Vietnam, Geneva, the United Nations—revolutions in Latin America, riots in Palestine, or propaganda from Moscow.

Yes we are deeply interested in what is going on around the world—because we are deeply involved.

This involvement is partly by choice and partly by circumstance.

The circumstances of World War II left only two great powers—the United States and the Soviet Union.

Japan and Germany were defeated and occupied.

Other European powers were drained and exhausted by the long bitter years of war.

As the United States brought its boys home, the hard realities of this new two-power world soon became evident.

Unless the United States exercised strength—either militarily or economically—as in the case of the Marshall plan the Soviet Union would capture by force and subversion every free country whose affairs it could entangle.

The United States chose to take up vigorously the task that historic circumstance had thrust upon us.

We became leader of the free world in the struggle to maintain independence against the threat of Soviet Russian imperialism.

Of all the roles which our country plays in the world today—this one is the most worthy.

I could speak to you today about our position as a firm and loyal supporter of the United Nations.

I could speak to you about our position of builder of the underdeveloped areas—about our foreign aid program—and our Alliance for Progress.

I could speak to you about our evolving position as a partner in trade with the new Europe—a Europe saved from Communist chaos by its own determination and hard work—aided by the resources the American taxpayer provided by our Marshall plan.

I could speak of these and many other positions of the United States in world affairs today.

But I want to talk about one aspect of our position of leadership of the free world, the very core of strength of our leadership position—our military strength.

We know from bitter experience that Communism will not hesitate to use the force of arms in pursuit of its imperial ambitions.

We also know that freemen, armed with a knowledge of Soviet tactics as well as with the machines of war, will not lose their freedom easily.

Since the core of free world strength is the military power of the U.S. Armed Forces, and since Khrushchev has been making so many claims lately about the size and strength of the Soviet strategic forces, I would like to take this opportunity to point out the relative balance of military power between the United States and the Soviet Union.

There are two reasons for my selection of this specific subject to speak about on this occasion.

First, I have firsthand knowledge of it and, second, during the month of July Mr. Khrushchev and other Russians did some boasting that needs a straight answer.

My knowledge of the subject comes from my Navy experience in the two World Wars, and the Korean conflict.

Also from the fact that I am currently a member of the House Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I think during the course of my remarks that I will be able to show up Mr. Khrushchev's boasts for what they are.

I think I shall also be able to clear up some possible question in your minds about such things as the missile gap.

It is important in this age of the possibility of nuclear catastrophe—for every citizen to be aware of the realities of the military situation.

This is another reason I thought it important to clear up any confusion created by last month's Soviet exaggerations.

I believe it is useful to share our thinking with our staunch allies—such as our friends from Canada who are here with us at this gathering.

They share equally in the dangers of defending our freedoms.

For that reason, they ought to share equally in our evaluation of the actual military balance of power today.

Let me begin by comparing the strategic striking forces of the United States and the Soviet Union.

At present we have about 85 operational ICBM's to a reported Soviet 50–75.

In addition the United States has 128 Polaris missiles on 8 operational submarines.

We have over 600 B–52's, almost 100 B–58's, and about 1,000 B–47's with round trip refueling capabilities.

Against this the Russians have only 150 intercontinental bombers and about 400 to 800 one-way-only medium bombers.

This is all that the Russians have that poses a direct threat to the United States and Canada.

We have, however, in addition to all these missiles and bombers about 100 MRBM's in Europe.

We also have about 300 carrier-based and 1,000 land-based tactical aircraft designed and stationed so that they could carry nuclear weapons into Russia.

Thus, considering only the United States and the Soviet Union, we have an enormously overwhelming advantage in strategic nuclear striking power.

To partially offset this advantage the Soviets have their huge well-equipped land army and about 400 MRBM's stationed in Eastern Europe with which to threaten our NATO allies.

The advantage in missiles and bombers is decidedly on the side of the United States and is growing rapidly.

Furthermore, we and our NATO allies are building up our conventional forces in Europe—so that we can conduct a successful local defense without using destructive nuclear weapons to do it.

Therefore, without ignoring the dangers of the fantastically destructive weapons of today, there is no need for us to be more afraid of the Russians than they are of us.

We can be confident that our vigorous defense program is keeping us ahead of the Reds.

But what about the missile gap? Did it ever exist?

Yes it did exist on paper but fortunately it never materialized in fact.

The missile gap was a prediction, let us remember, based on intelligence estimates.

These estimates showed that the Russians were building a fleet of ICBM's.

The estimates were arrived at based on the amount of steel alloy and the number of specialists and so forth required to build one of these missiles.

In addition, the estimates were based on the total amount of steel alloy and the number of specialists that the Russians had.

Then also the experts calculated how many missiles the Russians were capable of building over the next few years.

Compared to the number of missiles that the United States had planned to build over those same years, the Russians could have had in the early 1960's a lead of as much as 3 to 2.

This was the so-called missile gap.

The main reason it never materialized was that Russia never built anywhere near the number of missiles that were estimated.

Her failure to do so was due perhaps to agricultural or other internal problems which kept her defense spending down.

At any rate, we speeded up our program, and when the new intelligence information came in that the Russians had not built all their missiles—the so-called missile gap disappeared.

In fact, the United States assumed a small but growing lead in the missile field.

The same thing had happened in the early 1950's with the bomber gap and it was resolved in the same fashion.

It was worthwhile to take these alleged gaps seriously.

You can imagine the dangerous situation which could have arisen, if we had not taken them seriously, and the Russians had built to their limit.

At the present time it is reported we have a safe lead in both these categories.

That fact is a satisfying feeling for all Americans.

Now there are two specific Russian rumors that I would like to try to counter.

On July 17, Premier Khrushchev in an interview with some American editors repeated his earlier claims that Russia had an anti-ICBM missile.

He boasted that the Soviet missile could "hit a fly in space."

Our Department of Defense and other space scientists are positive, however, that the first successful intercept of an ICBM by an antimissile missile took place 3 days later.

It was on July 20, over Kwajalein Island in the Pacific, a U.S. Army Nike-Zeus missile intercepted an Atlas ICBM.

So here is an anti-missile-missile gap that Mr. Khrushchev is trying to create in the minds of the world.

The facts do not back him up.

Another Russian boast that took place last month was in connection with the Soviet Navy day celebration held in Leningrad on July 29.

There, Russian Admiral Baikov said that the Soviet Navy now had Polaris-type submarines that could go under the pole just like the U.S. version.

Later, in the military newspaper Red Star, the Soviet Polaris-type striking force was called the "shock force" of the Red navy.

Now this may well be, but if the Russians have Polaris-type submarines that can go under the pole, they must not be able to make it up the Neva River to Leningrad.

They did not show up with all the other Red navy vessels at the navy day celebration.

And only a few weeks before the Red Star called the Polaris-type submarine fleet the "shock force" of the Red navy, reports came out that the Soviet Union had just conducted its first successful underwater missile launch.

No wonder none of these subs showed up at Leningrad.

If these submarines advanced from the experimental stage to a "shock force" stage in the matter of a few weeks, those subs must have been cruising under the pole or somewhere with no time to celebrate navy day.

What all these exaggerations show, I think, is a desperate attempt by the Soviets to keep up the false image of Russian military supremacy.

This exaggerated supremacy claimed the attention of a worried world under the influence of such things as the "bomber gap" and the missile gap.

Now that time has shown each of these gaps to be nonexistent, the world realizes that the United States is still way ahead of the Russians militarily.

For one thing, the Soviet economy cannot stand the defense expenditures needed to surpass the U.S. effort.

And for the world to know this most certainly upsets the Soviet leaders.

In the face of all this Soviet bluffing and the lack of facts in the false gap stories America faces a problem at home.

Some of our fellow citizens claim that the United States is behind in everything.

They say we have become a second-rate power.

They are alarmists and prophets of defeatism.

They talk about Russia's expanding economy—and now they throw in Germany, France, and Japan.

What they do not say or do not know is that the Russian expansion is based on the period between 1948 and 1953, when the Soviet was recovering from the effects of the German invasion.

It was a recovery from a nearly mortal blow, and not normal, healthy economic expansion.

Much the same may be said for most European countries.

We know that Russia has not expanded agricultural production.

We know she is short of automobiles and such durables as refrigerators, washing machines, and many other items.

The United States has never failed to meet production goals in either war or peace from either its farms or factories.

These achievements should be the pride and glory of every single American.

One of the great unsolved military problems facing this country is that of organizing and equipping the NATO shield forces.

We must be able to fight and to win a local resistance war without destroying the homeland of the ally, which we are defending.

This means in simple terms that if we use tactical nuclear weapons to stop a possible Russian thrust into Europe, they would use them, too, and soon there would be nothing left to defend.

That is why our policy is now directed toward increasing the strength of the conventionally armed defense forces there.

If the Communists tried to invade Western Europe and we had the number of regular divisions there that we are now building up to, a stout defense could be made without the use of highly destructive nuclear weapons.

Our policy is now directed toward keeping those weapons always on hand—always ready to use if our regular defense forces cannot hold—while at the same time increasing their capability to do so.

If the Regular Forces cannot hold—and we must use nuclear weapons to do it—the dimension of the war will be radically altered, for the initiation of the use of nuclear weapons is more than just an increase in firepower.

It is a firm and solemn demonstration to the enemy that the object which we are defending is of extremely high value to us.

And his persistence in trying to gain it has raised the risks to him to a high and dangerous level.

The problem today, however, is that the conventional forces in NATO are still in the process of building up to a high enough level.

What we want is a choice of whether or not to use nuclear weapons, not a necessity to do so.

This position of choice between alternatives is a position of strength.

But the problem of tactical nuclear weapons in NATO is more complex than this.

Basic decisions will have to be made within the next year or two about the strategy under which NATO forces will use these weapons.

And based on this strategy, additional problems will have to be solved.

Our allies are demanding a greater share in the decisions about when, where, how, or if to use nuclear weapons.

After all, if we use them, they will explode in our allies' backyard.

Therefore, they are also asking more command positions in the military branch of NATO, which will have control of these nuclear weapons.

The military problems of NATO are further complicated by the political problems which always arise when two or more independent nations work together.

I would like to leave with you now a few thoughts about perhaps the greatest and most challenging problem which will have to be overcome, if we are to realize our goal of a free and peaceful society of independent nations.

That problem is the mastery of outer space.

The advances in this field in the last 5 years stagger the imagination.

For example the successful orbiting and landing last week of the Russian cosmonauts reveal the great advances made by the Soviet Union in probing outer space.

Frankly these Russian accomplishments reveal military danger which could arise if an alien power could take and maintain control of outer space—while denying its use to the West by antisatellite missiles or other means.

Seriously ladies and gentlemen—we have a lot of work to do in the development of our space program—if we are to forge ahead or even keep abreast of the Soviets.

This is the crux of the vexing problem we face.

If the West wins this space race or at least matches Russia, we will be successful in keeping the Soviet Union from threatening the free world from an invulnerable space haven.

I am certain you will agree that in such an event—we will have taken a long step toward the kind of international society we want.

Our basic problem centers on how to win this cold war without having a thermonuclear war if possible.

For as the greatest of all Chinese military philosophers, Sun Tzu said almost 2,500 years ago 500 B.C., "To fight and conquer in all our battles is not supreme excellence—supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting."

While we are ready today to fight a thermonuclear war we have no wish to do so unless forced to it by the Russians.

The United States with its overwhelming strategic superiority would put an end to Soviet Russia but she in turn would kill many millions of our people and perhaps destroy Western Europe completely.

Such an ending to the cold war would obviously satisfy no one.

Western strategy is to remain militarily strong enough so that the U.S.S.R. will not try an armed takeover in the free parts of the world.

In addition, by economic cooperation and increased world trade, we hope to make the Atlantic alliance a strong and thriving center of well-being and freedom.

Having accomplished this objective, the Soviet alliance system would break down as the captive nations of Eastern Europe are irresistibly attracted to the Western example of free and happy prosperity.

Finally the road to this ideal solution will be neither short nor easy.

There are many problems to be met and overcome and the twists and turns in the road will be many.

Yet with the confidence that the facts of the present military balance give us, and the knowledge that history is on the side of freedom, with God's help, our cause shall prevail.

If it does not prevail, let us make certain it is not due from lack of effort on the part of any one of us.

Farm Youth Exchange Delegate Reports From Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased the other day to receive a letter from Washington State's International Farm Youth Exchange delegate to Poland. The letter, addressed to her friends at home, is both interesting and informative, and I include the letter, by Miss Mary McGreevy, at this point in the RECORD:

SZOTRY, POLAND,
July 15, 1962.

DEAR FRIENDS AT HOME: I would like to have you meet my family, Panstwo (Mr. and Mrs.) Fredrish Senger, and Barbara.

As I walked into the small but adequate kitchen and saw the white, stiffly starched curtains reflecting on the highly polished, painted, plank flooring, I knew more about my mother than 1,000 words could have told me and I wasn't wrong. My mother is in her early fifties, a wee bit shorter than I and weighs 1 kg. or 22 pounds more than I. A small gray streak above her right eye in her hair makes all the rest of the small roll that encircles her head seem that much blacker. I was later to learn that we use a fat-type product to wax and polish our floors. This not only shines but also cleans the floor as you put it on providing you rub hard enough.

My father has just enough sternness in his carriage to make it evident that he is of German descent and manager of this state farm. I have yet to hear him raise his voice but beyond anyone's doubt his wishes are law outside of the house. Oddly enough in the house my mother or matka (maht'-ka) is the boss. This pattern is a little different than most of the families I have observed to date. The family structure is usually definitely paternal.

Meals are served at 6:30 a.m., noon and somewhere around 7 p.m. At the morning and evening meal it is time to start sitting down when my father pours the tea. Breakfast and supper—śniadanie and kolacja (snah-dah-nie) (kō-lahs-ya) are usually cold meals of rye bread, butter, delcious sausage, tomatoes, a dry cheese and liver sausage. In fact I can usually tell what is for breakfast by looking at what is left on the table after supper. This method really cuts down on the dishes which is a mightly important factor when a two-quart kettle is the sum total of hot water at your disposal. Dinner or obiad (ōbaht) is the hot meal and this consists of soup, meat, potatoes (in numbers) and frequently cooked cabbage or what we called suck-a-tash at home which is peas, corn, creamed together. No tea or drink is served at this meal. My mother serves herself first at all meals, indicates the order of service and tastes the food herself first at all meals. Seldom is this pattern broken. In other homes where I have eaten the host performs these duties. I have observed when we have had guests or we have been guests that the host, or in my case my mother, keeps a small amount of food on the plate until the last person finishes eating. At breakfast and supper we eat on salad plates and take one serving at a time. When finished with this you then take another. This eliminates much waste. In fact if you added all the waste from the plates of the meals I have eaten so far I doubt if you would equal the amount we have in the United States from one meal. This custom is especially saving with children.

My house is built about like the old-style family homes in the Palouse country. Many of the houses in Poland are this style, with a kind of stucco used to cover the brick inside and out. There are at least four families and maybe more that live under this roof. This is also typical in Poland for houses are hard to get and the fact that young couples in the United States can rent a single house amazes them and to own one is almost beyond their comprehension. On the main floor of our house we have a seldom used parlor, kitchen, dining room. Upstairs we have two bedrooms and we share the basement with everyone else. Many of the doors in Poland have locks and quite surprising to me they are very careful about keeping things locked, at least here at this farm.

Here just as in America the parents hope to give their children more than they have. My parents are extremely proud of my sister, 2 years younger than I, who is a lab technician at the water sanitation plant in Srem. Their son finished electrical engineering school in Gdansk recently. Many of the young adults live with their parents. This produces the same problems as in America. However, with homes so hard to get there is hardly an alternative.

People told me before I left that the Polish love to argue and believe me it's true. They remind me of my cousin and me when 1 minute the "fur was flying" the next minute we had our heads together trying to figure out how to get away from work and go swimming.

My family, like all Poles, loves music. Most of the music is a jazz mixture. John Phillip Sousa is one of their favorites and mine too, but after waking up every morning, it seems, to his "Stars and Stripes Forever" at full volume I sometimes wonder why he ever had to compose a song. One thing is very certain—one wakes up in a hurry. Meals are always accompanied with music on the radio. Believe me it was a major catastrophe when one evening the wiring shorted out and the radio was quiet. Fixing the radio was far more important than supper. Yes, there are American songs, most of them on the order of "Bye, Bye, Baby" and "Rock, Baby, Rock" played about one beat faster than in the United States. My family always tries to get the "Voice of America" program which is transmitted from Munich in Polish, but usually they are unsuccessful.

Flowers play a very important part in the life of the people. They may not have room to live but only rarely are they so cramped for space that they don't have a flower garden at least, and in most cases a very good vegetable garden also. In the towns these gardens may be small plots adjoining the town very similar in plan to what the student in the South Fairway at Washington State University have. My family has a small garden which is my father's pride and joy. By spending a few minutes each morning, noon, and evening he has as spotless a garden as my mother has kitchen and equally as productive. His specialty is roses and while it seems everyone in Poland tries to grow them, not everyone has the gorgeous success my father has. When they gave me my birthday party, and what a joyful night that was, the first course was roses and cakes, followed by courses of sausage, rye bread, deviled eggs, a meat dish similar to spam, and tomatoes with wine toasts at intervals throughout the almost 4-hour affair. Meals at which guests are invited and usually it's only supper, do last a long time and during this time you are at the table, but it is so interesting that the time passes quickly. Basically it is only on these occasions that the people take time to really visit, and the "turn" to talk passes around the table to each one present.

My farm is very clean and organized. Each piece of equipment, cow, horse, and person it seems have their place and are there each evening and morning. The courtyard which is about three times the size of the Troy Hall parking lot at the college, is swept each week on Saturday, rain or shine, and believe me there has been lots of rain. However, the soil here is much like the Columbia Basin so it soaks in quickly.

Books command much respect and the people will save many months to buy them. Actually they are not too expensive, but they are not a necessity. They will usually be within each reach for they like to read. My family takes two daily newspapers and has accumulated many books all of which they are proud of. Bookstores and flower shops are about as frequent as taverns in the United States and seem to always be doing business.

In answer to a couple of your questions, no my family does not speak English, in fact, no one here on the farm does, but we get along all right. Even though the food is very delicious, I have not as yet gained weight.

My next letter will explain the agriculture system here on my farm. Until then may your health be good and your happiness great. I'd love to see the crops there. I understand they are supposed to be very good. I hope so.

Your grateful IFYE in Poland,
MARY MCGREEVY.

The Logical Democratic Nominee for Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted recently to read an editorial in the Whitehall Times on one of New York City's outstanding statesmen, James A. Farley.

Mr. Farley is not only a statesman from the city of New York but from the State of New York and one of the great men of our times. I am happy that the Whitehall Times sees him as a worthy candidate for Governor of New York.

The editorial follows:

THE LOGICAL DEMOCRATIC NOMINEE FOR GOVERNOR

The Democratic Party of New York State faces a serious chore in its selection of a candidate for Governor this fall. Various capable men from throughout the State have announced their candidacies for the nomination, but all are handicapped by the fact that they are not too well known outside their own area. This would provide a severe drawback in the short time schedule for this fall's gubernatorial campaign.

The situation demands a candidate who is well known throughout the State, a candidate who is a regular party member respected by all, and one who can unite the present divergent factions of the party. There seemingly is only one man so qualified; that is James A. Farley.

Mr. Farley's age may be considered a handicap by some, but his activities are those of a young man, not an old one. He not only is known throughout the State; he is a national and international figure. He is one of the greatest politicians in the history of the Democratic Party, and he has statesmanlike stature.

In our opinion, Mr. Farley is the best qualified candidate to lead the Democratic Party to victory at the polls in November.

U.S. Travel Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, last year it was my privilege to sponsor the bill which established the U.S. Travel Service. This agency has the responsibility of attracting foreign tourists to America, and although it is only a year old, it has been extremely successful. Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an article from this week's U.S. News & World Report which makes note of the progress made by this agency. The article is as follows:

FOREIGN TOURISTS "DISCOVER" AMERICA

First returns are in now on a U.S. campaign to boost foreign travel in America. So far: a modest success, some surprises, some complaints. Number of visitors is up substantially because of bargains in rates and other inducements. But final results will not be known until after October.

An increasing number of foreign tourists are discovering America this year—often at bargain prices.

Many of the visitors are coming to the United States as the result of the first official venture by this country to sell itself abroad as a vacation attraction.

For a little more than a year, the U.S. Travel Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce has been active in 33 foreign countries, promoting travel in the United States.

American hotels, transport lines, travel agencies and city and State governments have pitched in to help. Special rates for travel, lodgings, meals, and tourist attractions have been arranged for the foreign visitors.

The result has been a modest but encouraging increase in the number of tourists arriving at American seaports and air terminals.

In the first 5 months of 1962, there were 203,000 foreign visitors—excluding those from Canada and Mexico—an increase of 18 percent over the same period in 1961.

As the months from May through October are the peak time for foreign travel in the United States, the prospect is that complete figures for 1962 will show a substantial increase over last year's total of 515,000 visitors from abroad.

EUROPE'S BOOM A HELP

A prosperous and booming Europe is sending more and more travelers to the United States each year. Many of these visitors combine sight-seeing trips with long-delayed reunions with relatives here. The number of tourists from Australia and Japan also is increasing steadily.

At the urging of the U.S. Travel Service (USTS), some of the hindrances to vacations in the United States have been eliminated. Also, warmer welcomes are being given to newcomers to this country.

For instance, the application for a U.S. visa has been simplified from a 4-page document to a brief form about the size of a filecard. Visas now are issued in a matter of minutes, instead of days or weeks.

Arrivals at major international air terminals on both the east and west coasts are met by one or more port receptionists. These greeters, attractive young women proficient in at least one of four languages other than English, help to speed the visitors through the formalities of immigration and customs and to their destinations.

Britain sends the most tourists to America. Last year, 93,000 Britons visited their former colony. The number of visas issued in Britain this year is up 30 percent over 1961.

Greater numbers of French and German visitors are arriving each year. Traditionally, the French do not wander any great distance from home on vacations, but so far this year the number of visas issued in France for U.S. visits has increased by 52 percent over last year.

WHAT THEY SEE

Nearly one of every two foreign visitors sets his sights on seeing Niagara Falls. The lure of natural wonders such as the Grand Canyon, Yosemite National Park and the redwood forests of California tugs strongly at most visitors.

Among the cities, New York, Washington, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Miami are most popular.

Air travel in the United States, overseas tourists discover, is cheaper than at home. Traveling in pairs or foursomes, they find they can get around the country at reasonable cost if they plan ahead.

Cross-country bus tours are available at a rate of 99 days of travel for $99. One nationwide hotel chain offers foreigners a "$6 'n' $6" plan. For $6 a person, double occupancy, it guarantees an air-conditioned room with twin beds, private bath and television in any city where it operates a hotel. For an additional $6 a day, tips and taxes included, the visitor can get three meals.

Charter flights and special "package tours" by ship are cutting the cost of getting to the United States—biggest expense item in planning such a trip.

In August, an ocean liner brought a total of 3,200 Britons to New York on two cruises at a minimum cost of $204 per passenger for the round trip. The visitors used the *Canberra*, Britain's newest ocean liner, as their hotel and made trips to such places as Niagara Falls, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington by train at special group rates.

WHAT THEY SAY

The USTS is making an effort to find out what foreign visitors like and dislike about America. So far, their comments have varied widely.

"Costs were not higher than expected, including food, entertainment, and shopping," said a member of a jazz club from London that visited New York.

"Less educated service personnel tend to be unfriendly to foreigners in restaurants and other public places," reported a tourist from the Netherlands.

"American family life is highly moral and American youth has a sense of maturity and responsibility not found in Italian youth," said an Italian.

"We were impressed, but not surprised, by the high standard of living," reported members of another group.

A British taxi driver found New York taxis "a lot cheaper than London cabs."

One general complaint is about the high prices of food and drinks in night clubs, particularly in New York.

A MATTER OF DOLLARS

Behind the drive to attract more foreigners to the United States is the continuing problem of the flow of U.S. dollars abroad.

American tourists last year spent $2.2 billion outside the United States for travel—just twice as much as tourists from all foreign countries spent in the United States. The difference is nearly half the balance-of-payments deficit of $2.5 billion piled up by the United States in 1961.

Voit Gilmore, director of the USTS, estimates that each visitor from overseas spends an average of $540 within the United States. Any appreciable increase in the number of foreign tourists, he points out, would help to close the payments gap.

New Efforts To Achieve a Meaningful Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in still another attempt to achieve a meaningful nuclear test ban treaty the United States and Great Britain have made a significant new proposal to the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

In their joint communique President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan stated that:

> The United States and the United Kingdom cannot emphasize too strongly the urgency we attach to the problem of ending all nuclear tests once and for all. For the safety and security of all of us, this deadly competition must be halted and we, again, urge the Soviet Government to join with us in meaningful action to make this necessity a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this statement and an excellent editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Times to our colleagues for their most serious attention and consideration:

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND PRIME MINISTER MACMILLAN, AUGUST 27, 1962

A guaranteed end to all nuclear testing in all environments is a fundamental objective of the free world. We are deeply convinced that the achievement of this objective would serve our best national interests and the national interests of all the nations of the world.

In recent weeks the United States and the United Kingdom have renewed their efforts at the Geneva Disarmament Conference to reach this goal. Based on the latest scientific findings of our research program, we have put forward proposals in the strong hope of obtaining prompt agreement on this crucial issue.

As a further step in the direction of this long-sought-after goal, the United States and the United Kingdom have instructed their representatives at Geneva to present today at the 18 Nation Disarmament Committee a draft treaty containing proposals for an end to all nuclear testing in all environments as well as an alternative draft treaty providing for an end to nuclear testing in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space. We both believe the arrangements we have outlined in these documents for insuring compliance with the terms of the agreement—whether comprehensive or limited—are sound and reasonable providing, as they do, the necessary guarantees for our own security and the security of all nations which might become parties to either agreement. We wish to make clear the strong preference of the United States and the United Kingdom for prompt action on the first of them, namely, the comprehensive treaty. However, we are also prepared to conclude an early agreement on the basis of the second document, that covering a more limited field, if this represents the widest area of agreement possible at this time.

Unlike a ban on testing in all environments, including underground, a treaty banning tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space can be effectively verified without onsite inspections. Such a treaty would result in a definite downward turn in the arms race as it is represented by testing to develop weapons technology. It would make it easier to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to countries not now possessing them. It would free mankind from the dangers and fear of radioactive fallout. Furthermore, agreement on such a treaty might be a first step toward an agreement banning testing in all environments.

The United States and the United Kingdom cannot emphasize too strongly the urgency we attach to the problem of ending all nuclear testing once and for all. For the safety and security of all of us, this deadly competition must be halted and we, again, urge the Soviet Government to join with us in meaningful action to make this necessity a reality.

A LIMITED TEST BAN

With the inexorable clock of history ticking away toward the moment when the atomic arms race may get wholly beyond control, the United States and Britain are making another serious attempt to persuade Soviet Russia to join them in a nuclear test ban. To this end, they have submitted to the Geneva disarmament conference two alternative draft treaties.

The first and preferable one calls for a total test ban under international control, including on-site inspection. But since Moscow flatly rejects as espionage onsite inspections by foreigners, the British and Americans are proposing an alternate treaty which Ambassador Dean rightly calls "far-reaching and epochal." This treaty would ban all nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space—these are the ones that cause lethal fallout—and it would do so without onsite inspection or any international verification machinery.

This second draft treaty is an expansion of President Eisenhower's proposal in 1959 to ban atmospheric tests up to 30 miles altitude and the Kennedy-Macmillan proposal of last year to ban all atmosphere tests without additional controls. In that respect it goes even further than such proposals as the one recently made by Italy, which involved an international monitoring system, including onsite inspection by invitation. How far it really goes is shown by the fact that it drops the previous American demand for inspection of test preparations and it shelves misgivings that the new detection methods may still be unreliable for small atmospheric tests.

However, President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan are confident that the latest scientific findings indicate that tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space can now be effectively verified without onsite inspections. It may be assumed that they base their conclusion on the results of the armada by secret American surveillance satellites going by such names as Midas, Samos, Satellite Inspector, and Vela.

The limited test ban, even if little more than another moratorium terminable on 60 days' notice, is clearly the best hope under present circumstances. It is all the more urgent because Communist China is believed ready for tests within months. The sincerity of Russian professions against nuclear testing can be judged, for all the world to see, by the Soviet Union's reaction to these latest United States-British proposals which make a major step toward the elimination of nuclear testing with its deadly fallout. If the rest of the world gets behind the Anglo-American proposals, the U.S.S.R. may yet be persuaded to soften its hostility toward the draft treaties. The future of mankind could well be at stake.

Atlantis: Fact or Fiction—Was There a Lost Continent of Atlantis? Present Oceanographic Studies May Well Answer This Intriguing Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an article, "Atlantis: Fact or Fiction—Was There a Lost Continent of Atlantis? Present Oceanographic Studies May Well Answer This Intriguing Question," by Comdr. Wendell Phillips Dodge, FRGS, explorer-circumnavigator, who has made a lifelong study of the sciences involving and controlling the oceans of the world. The article appeared in the July–August 1962 issue of the Compass, published by the Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., New York.

In the issue of the RECORD of Thursday, August 2, 1962, under my extension of remarks I included another article written by Commander Dodge, entitled "Lost Continent of Mu—Current Oceanographic Studies Bear Out Ancient Pacific Legends," that was published in the same magazine, March–April 1962. The present insertion may be considered as a companion piece about a sister "lost continent."

The article follows:

ATLANTIS: FACT OR FICTION—WAS THERE A LOST CONTINENT OF ATLANTIS? PRESENT OCEANOGRAPHIC STUDIES MAY WELL ANSWER THIS INTRIGUING QUESTION

(By Comdr. Wendell Phillips Dodge, FRGS, explorer-circumnavigator)

It would seem that Plato, with malice aforethought, left his story of the fabled Atlantis only half told simply to give future generations something about which to dream. If this was his intent, he has been eminently successful since his writings on the subject have intrigued a whole host of writers, scientists, philosophers, and even Hollywood. But positive proof or disproof of the land's existence is still in the realm of supposition.

Plato, in his famous dialogs, has Critias tell the story: "I have before remarked in speaking of the allotments of the gods, that they distributed the whole earth into portions differing in extent, and made themselves temples. And Poseidon, receiving for his lot the island of Atlantis, begat children by a mortal woman, and settled them in a part of the island, which I will proceed to describe." This he did to perfection, even to telling how Poseidon fell in love and made "alternate zones of sea and land larger and smaller, encircling one another out of the center of the island, equidistant every way so that no man could get to the island, for ships and voyages were not as yet heard of. He himself, as he was a god, found no difficulty in making special arrangements for the center island [bringing two streams of water under the earth, which he caused to ascend as springs, one warm water and the other cold and making every variety of food to spring up abundantly in the earth]." The country was described as being very lofty with steep cliffs running down to the sea. The major part of the island, according to Plato, lay toward the south, well sheltered from the north by towering hills. "The surrounding mountains are celebrated for their number and size and beauty, in which they exceeded all that are now to be seen anywhere."

The bracketed words in the foregoing paragraph were undoubtedly Plato's pseudo-scientific or better, mythological way of explaining the origins of the Gulf Stream and the Arctic Current.

On December 30, 1955, the New York Times published an editorial headed, "Must We Give Up Atlantis?" Here is what it said in part: "We don't mind so much where the moon came from, but what we do mind is a collateral conclusion of Drs. Press (Frank) and Ewing (Maurice) that there never was any such continent as Atlantis. All we can say on this point is that Drs. Press and Ewing have not taken their Plato as seriously as they might have.

"Life in Atlantis was thus something that men in later years could only dream of. In the end, unhappily, the Atlantians fell into evil ways, and at the end of the 'Critias,' in an incomplete paragraph, Plato makes it clear that the wrath of the gods descended upon them.

"The story is too good to lose. We need Atlantis. We need the romantic dream of a golden land and age."

More recently, in the "Tropics" column on the editorial page of the New York Times of July 2, 1961, appeared five paragraphs headed "The Lost Continent," "Best of Possible Worlds," "Description of Atlantis," "The Mother Empire," and "Mysteries of the Unfathomable." A few short quotations from the second, third, and fourth paragraphs respectively reveal the Times' perennial interest in the subject: "The continued fascination of the Atlantis myth or fact (as the case may be) is, of course, a reflection of man's own search for the best of all possible worlds, whether real or imagined, leavened by the mystery and romance of the unknown. Magic names like Atlantis, Mu (a similar continent said to have sunk in the Pacific), Xanadu, Shangri-La and Utopia all ring with the misty unattainable.

"According to Plato, Atlantis was a land larger than Asia Minor including Libya, situated west of the Pillars of Hercules (the Strait of Gibraltar), in what is now called the Atlantic Ocean. Plato's description of Atlantis was that of an ideal society, where good and right triumphed and man was noble and fine. Plato's dialogs contained elaborate descriptions of Atlantis and its physical appearance, even to the temples, palaces, and race courses. The city itself was said to be circular in shape.

"Atlantis, known as a mother empire because of the notion that her culture was the initial source of many other civilizations, still makes news."

The tradition of Atlantis has become part of the world's literature. At first sight the account of Plato has all the appearance of a legendary tale. But a careful examination of its text furnishes data for a reasonable case in favor of its authenticity. Lewis Spence, distinguished British author of three separate books on the subject, and undoubtedly the world's greatest authority on Atlantis, has done much careful research, considering virtually every source from which Atlantean history may be derived. In his writings he cites evidence from geology, biology, Central American and Peruvian archeology, plus the geography and topography of the Atlantic Ocean. The numerous authoritative scientific findings he gives certainly make an excellent case in support of Plato's account.

Emerson put his finger on the matter when he penned "Science does not know its debt to imagination." Two scientists who definitely do, however, are Dr. Henry Chapin and Dr. F. G. Walton Smith, who are among the world's foremost oceanographers (Dr. Smith is both founder and director of the University of Miami's Marine Laboratory). In their fascinating account of the Gulf Stream they have a pertinent chapter on the "Atlantis Legend" (The Ocean River, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1952). They have this to say: "So when we use the word 'legend' we do not mean fable or fairy story. True racial legend is a kind of history in the making composed of old memories and inventions to fit facts and events that, as yet, have no orderly recognition in history. * * * But, oddly enough, legends often break trail in the dark uncertainty of prehistory and become accepted history in turn. Troy, we should remember, was once a name in a poem until Schleimann (Henry) pursued the legend and found the actual city as described in Homer's Iliad.

"There is a particular and persistent legend connected with our story of the ocean river—the legend of the lost Atlantis, the civilization and the island empire once presumed to have existed outside the gates of Gibraltar, about where the present mid-Atlantic ridge rears up a mile or more from the ocean floor east of the Sargasso Sea. Plato first reported on Atlantis in his Timaeus and Critias Dialogues in the third century before Christ. Today the legend will not down even under the eye of modern science, for strong data keep cropping out of oceanographic research that could use some such scheme of explanation. We have to accustom ourselves to think that mankind did not start a civilized existence with the Egyptians or the Mayas or the early Hindus. In Europe we are now aware of an artistically mature race of people, the Cro-Magnon, with larger brain areas than our own, who lived in the foothills of southern France 25,000 to 40,000 years ago. The first Egyptian dynasty was less than 6,000 years ago. And the further back in time we trace our ancestry, two important things are emphasized. Firstly there seems to have been a widespread basic common cultural exchange almost encircling the globe in the warm subtropical belt of seas that reach from east of the Mediterranean to west of the Caribbean. And secondly, this dimly observed common cultural ancestry thrived beyond history as we know it, on the other side of vast geological and climatic catastrophies known to us only as legends in our racial histories from India to Mexico." Indeed this scientific-minded approach would appear to admit to the probability of both the "lost continents" of Mu and Atlantis.

The French savant Pierre Termier, director of science of the Geological Chart of France, contributed to the subject in the annual report of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., in 1915, stating: "Geologically speaking, the Platonic history of the Atlantis is highly probable."

Sir Francis Bacon (1561–1626), "The Father of Experimental Philosophy," and the first to use the inductive method of reasoning to any extent also had something to say. About 1614 he wrote an allegorical romance, "The New Atlantis," describing an imaginary island where a philosophical commonwealth, bent on the cultivation of the natural sciences was established. That famous newspaper the Times of London, on February 6, 1909, also published a theory that Atlantis is to be credited with Crete in the Minoan period, under the title of "The Lost Continent."

In contrast to the Pacific, the Atlantic Ocean contains a relatively small number of islands. The question of the origin of the Atlantic basin, like that of the other great divisions of the hydrosphere, is still unsettled. Most geologists include the Atlantic with the other oceans in the view they adopt as to its age. However, E. Suess and M. Neumayr, while they regard the basin of the Pacific as of great antiquity, believe the Atlantic to date from the Mesozoic age. Neumayr finds evidence of the existence of a continent between Africa and South America which protruded into the central North Atlantic during Jurassic times, the age of lizards and birds.

During 1947 and 1948 the Swedish deep sea *Albatross* expedition under the leadership of Hans Pettersson brought back new and startling evidence in probing the secrets of the deep ocean floor. Using a rather recently invented instrument to study the thickness of deep water sediment layers, Pettersson calculated the layers of ooze in some parts of the Atlantic to be nearly 12,000 feet thick. Then explorations made by Dr. Maurice Ewing, Ilia A. Tolstoy and others abroad the research vessel *Atlantis* discovered that over 4,000 feet of sediment rests upon the slopes of the mid-Atlantic Ridge. Another surprising haul from the deep ocean bed between Woods Hole, Cape Cod and Bermuda showed the presence of coarse sandy material, considered typical of shallow waters near shore. The startling discovery of such material in deep offshore water suggests that we are in for a considerable revision of ideas.

Seismological stations throughout the world record the time of earthquake shocks, enabling scientists to calculate their speed of travel through the earth's crust, and by a process of deduction, some idea of the distribution of heavier and lighter rocks is obtained. A paper, "Gravity Interpretations From Standard Oceanic and Continental Crustal Sections" presented in 1955 by J. Lamar Worzel and G. Lynn Shurbet, of the Lamont Geological Observatory of Columbia University, states under "conclusions": "If the Bahamas platform is all calcareous and laid down on an oceanic crust, the thickness of the calcareous sediments is 28.5 kilometers (93,000 feet). The final 16,000 feet of sediments, sampled in the well at Andres Island, would have been laid down in water depths of less than 2,000 feet." This is particularly interesting in view of what Col. James Churchward wrote of the submergence of the "lost continent" of Atlantis appearing in the article on "The Lost Continent of Mu" in the Pacific in the March–April 1962 issue of the Compass.

Other recent findings when pieced together and carefully interpreted would seem to point to the actual existence of Atlantis. At the Second Caribbean Geological Conference held at the University of Puerto Rico in Mayagues, Puerto Rico, January 4–9, 1959, Dr. Bruce C. Heezen of the Lamont Geological Observatory presented a paper on "Some Problems of Caribbean Submarine Geology," in which he stated: "Depths of water in the Antillean seas are markedly less than depths in the great ocean basins. * * * Since the depth of the Caribbean, as well as its crustal thickness, is intermeditae between the two fundamental crustal types, it is assumed that the Antillean arcs are at an intermediate stage in the process of crustal evolution. But in what direction is this process proceeding? Are the Antillean seas, pieces of a former deep sea floor in the processes of becoming part of the continents, as proposed by Ewing, et al., 1957, or are these seas pieces of subsided continental crust well advanced in the process of becoming ocean, as suggested by Schuchert in 1935, Eardley in 1951, and others?"

Then, writing of "The Ice Ages Theory," in the Journal of the Alberta Society of Petroleum Geologists, for July 1960, Dr. Maurice Ewing stated in part: "By radiocarbon analysis it is possible to assign dates to carbonate material in the cores as far back as about 30,000 years before the present. When we found out how to select undisturbed samples, it quickly became clear that at a depth of a few feet, varying somewhat from place to place according to the local rates of sedimentation, there is an abrupt change in the kind, color, and texture of the sediment, and in the kinds of animals whose remains were in it. The upper layer always contained warm water types, and these continued right up to the floor of the ocean. Below them was a layer dominated by the cold water types. The boundary between the two layers was, in many cases, remarkably sharp. It marked a rather abrupt change from a cool, steady state to a warm one at about 11,000 years before the present. For 4 or 5 years we took more samples in various parts of the Atlantic Ocean and always found the same pattern. This evidence indicates that a marked change affected the surface waters of the entire North Atlantic about 11,000 years ago." And it generally regarded that this was the time when Atlantis disappeared below the vast rolling Atlantic.

Atlantis, is it fact, is it fiction? Such a question actually has no real answer. Its existence can neither be proved nor repudiated. Realists will fight to defend their opinion that there never was such a place. Just as strongly, the believers will pick up the gauntlet to defend their opinion concerning its existence. Which camp is right, no mortal can say. One thing is certain, some day in the future a scientific dreamer will devise a means by which every inch of the cold, dark Atlantic deep can be thoroughly searched. Then, and only then, the eternal question will be solved. Now we can only hope said future search will turn up positive proof that Atlantis was a continent, and was, as Plato implied, a land of enchantment, a utopia where nothing could possibly inconvenience man in his search for the absolute.

God and Our Public Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Vernon S. Broyles, Jr., the distinguished pastor of the North Avenue Presbyterian Church in Atlanta, Ga., has delivered an illuminating sermon on the recent U.S. Supreme Court outlawing the recitation of a simple 22-word prayer in the public schools of New York.

As Dr. Broyles said in his sermon, delivered July 8, 1962:

This decision is an attack on the very validity of your self-respect because it flows out of our relationship to God. This relationship is not just a private matter. It has to be a part of the fabric of life. It always has been.

I, myself, have spoken out on the floor of the House of Representatives against this Supreme Court decision, and I am happy to insert in the Record the sermon of Dr. Broyles. I believe it should be read and studied by every American.

The sermon follows:

God and Our Public Institutions

(By Dr. Vernon S. Broyles, Jr., Pastor, North Avenue Presbyterian Church, Atlanta, Ga.)

Our whole country has become disturbed by the recent decision of the Supreme Court concerning prayer in the public schools. If this decision were absolutely isolated and did not represent a trend in our land and did not lend so much encouragement to certain movements in our country, it might be that it would be passed by. It may be that, technically speaking, the state should not write a prayer and require it to be used. But in this area, such technical decisions give so much impetus to this trend in our land that it is, I believe, incumbent upon me to speak concerning it.

The case on which the Court ruled began in 1950 when 5 parents in the New Hyde Park, N.Y., area objected to having their 10 children recite with their classmates every day the prayer: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country." The parents included two of the Jewish faith, one ethical culturist, a Unitarian, and a nonbeliever.

This is not just an isolated decision. This kind of decision has been made in lower courts. It is made more startling by the fact that one of the six who were in the majority of the 6 to 1 decision, Judge Douglas, argued that all religiously tinged ceremonial observances, including the opening of the Supreme Court itself by prayer ought to be discarded.

"For me," he said, "the principle is the same in each of the instances, given the person praying is a public official on the public payroll, performing a religious exercise in a governmental institution."

UNACCEPTABLE VERDICT

There has been a great deal of comment on the decision, as you know, and practically every major newspaper in the country has had something to say about it. Most national figures have remarked about it. The great preponderance of those who have spoken of it and written about it, have found it to be an entirely unacceptable verdict.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover said that this interpretation of the Constitution is a disintegration of a sacred American heritage and that Congress should at once submit an amendment to the Constitution which establishes the right to religious devotion to all Government agencies, national, State, and local. Mr. Eisenhower said about the same thing. Newspapers throughout the country have commented upon it. Most of them have been critical of it. The only two major ones that I know which commended the decision are the New York Times and the Atlanta Constitution. Most of the others, seem to have been in the other direction.

NOT MEANT TO LEAVE GOD OUT

The Indianapolis News has this to say about it: "The first amendment was meant to forestall the support of one religious denomination at the expense of the other. It was never meant to separate public functions in America, the education of children in particular, from the idea of God. I believe there is nothing in our past history that could be taken to serve as a foundation for this decision." It goes on: "The Declaration of Independence which was drafted and adopted by the same men who secured the adoption of the first amendment, is more aggressively theistic than the New York prayer under discussion, containing references to the Creator, nature's God, the protection of the divine providence. What the Supreme Court has in effect done is to prevent local school authorities from either encouraging or permitting religious observance according to their own likes. It has used the Federal authority to enforce agnosticism in the local schools, irrespective of local wishes. It is hard to imagine anything more truly opposed to religious liberty than that."

This Supreme Court action has struck a sensitive chord in the American public. Whether it is deep enough to produce any real results, only time will tell. The direction in which the decision moves, not actively opposed by the majority, has deep-seated implications for us all. This trend in recent years has been practically unnoticed, but is now reaching a crucial point. It is not just an attack on a particular case, but rather, and much more ominously, it is an attack on the presence of God and the acknowledgement of Him in our public institutions.

GOD CENTRAL IN AMERICAN WAY

I should like to say in the beginning that the acknowledgement of God in our public institutions is the central fact of the American way of life. If God in our public institutions is unconstitutional, then much of what America has been doing since 1776 is unconstitutional. Men have taken for granted that God belonged at the heart of our public institutions, just as much as they have taken for granted that men eat and that men breathe and that men sleep. It has not ever been a legal matter because no one has ever really questioned it. Congress has its chaplains. It is opened with prayer. The very Supreme Court is opened—every day—with prayer, though Justice Douglas apparently thinks it is improper that it should be. Since our country began, our schools knew nothing but to center themselves in God. They emanated from the church in this country. The textbooks contained moral precepts and scriptural passages. The church and the school were partners. Nobody ever considered anything else but that God should be in the center of our schools.

Our courts have always prided themselves on being the expression of the justice of God and the oath has been administered in the name of God, throughout our history until recently. The President places his hand on the Bible and takes the Oath of Allegiance. The Armed Forces have their chaplains. Federal institutions have their chaplains. Businessmen have their conventions. They hardly know why they do it, but they invite us ministers to have a prayer for their central meetings. It is an instinctive thing within us, just revolving our life around the concept of God, around a faith in God. It is our American way of life, and any attack upon it is actually an attack upon our very existence. Perhaps, however, we do not want the American way of life. This is what we are going to have to decide in the next few years. Shall we move out into a bold new adventure into chaos, abandoning the very foundations upon which we have built, or shall we resolve to cling to our heritage which does not question the existence of God as being in the center of our life and in the center of our public institutions? America has shuddered at this ruling because it attacks the foundations from which we have built all that we have in America.

RUSSIA HAS THE GODLESS SYSTEM

It attacks, in the first place, the foundation of our Government. Every time anyone, until now, spoke on Russian communism, he called it "a great godless system"—God is not allowed in it. You cannot have God in schools in Russia. What are you going to say now? What will you say if this thing goes on as the attackers hope it will? The American Civil Liberties Union, which promoted this case in New York, has said that since this case has been decided, it will attack all over the United States the use of God in the schools, baccalaureate services, God in the pledge of allegiance—all this under the guise of the separation of church and state, a fantastic idea that we have accepted in this generation.

THE ROAD TO TYRANNY

What do we say that America has as its foundation? Where are we oriented? What is the excuse for America's existence? We have taken for granted that somewhere behind all of our secularism and selfishness, we still seek the glory of God and to do His will, as a nation. This fact usually emerges when the matter is discussed. What shall we put in if we take God out? There is nothing left but the state which then becomes the supreme arbiter of what is right and wrong, and what should be done and not done. This is the road to tyranny, the way to what has happened and is happening in Communist countries. We would be following the path of Nazi Germany. There is no other standard. There is only the choice between God and the state. With God's name removed from public expression and from our national life, there is nothing left but a vacuum into which will flow state tyranny. It has always been so.

The inclusion of God in our national institutions is the only real support we have for education. It is just a simple hoax to claim that education, in itself, produces good—it does not. It must be directed toward a purpose. If God is taken out of education, then there can be no real purpose except perhaps to raise robots who successfully grow poisonous mushrooms at the end of hydrogen explosives. There is no other excuse for education except God. God has been at the heart of American education from its very beginning. We have taken Him for granted. Perhaps this is our trouble.

MAN'S CONSCIENCE IS HIGHER COURT

Our courts of law have only one foundation upon which to stand and that is their appeal to the conscience of men under God. They have no way to enforce their decrees other than public opinion. There is a "higher court" than the Supreme Court and that court is the conscience of a man before God, the conscience of a people before God. The courts claim their right to decide right from wrong under the justice of an eternal sanction. There can be no higher authority, and just as soon as they remove God from their sanction, the courts become the tools of whatever may be popular at the moment. They may stand aloof in their marble halls but they are still tools unless God is their guide.

The accepted existence of God in the center of our courts is the only support we have for the oaths people take in court. Taking any oath in the name of God in some of our courts has already been outlawed. What other support do we have for truth other than the fact that a man stands before God? If we take this out, a liar has as much standing as anyone in court. What other foundation is there?

Oh, yes, men say, "You can still pray at home." Our President has commented that it just means that we will have to pray more at home and in the churches. (One of the editorial writers said that only a President could get away with a remark like that.)

You can do that in Russia, too. You can pray at home and in the churches. This presents no problem at all.

This presence of God in public life provides the only standard of morality we have. We have taken for granted that what we have considered to be right and good and beautiful is somehow inherent in nature. It is not at all. We are the inheritors of a moral standard that is based on and flows from this Bible, the Jewish-Christian tradition. It is the foundation of morality in the Western World. The church was the center of life up until the modern era and our future moral framework stems from it.

WHAT IS MORALITY?

There are different kinds of morality, whether we realize it or not. If we take God out of the center of our lives, we have removed the only foundation of morality as we now know it. What would be your reply to the Communist who says to you that our idea of right and wrong is not the proper one? If he decided that you should be liquidated because he thought it would be in the best interest of communism you would not like it, to put it mildly, and you would say with as much force as you could muster that it was wrong. He would laugh in your face, because to him it would be right. It would be right because your liquidation would further the cause of communism. Oh, but you say, I have rights as an individual. But did you ever consider where you got them? The source is the Jewish-Christian tradition. They are not just magical, for you have no rights as an individual necessarily except for our heritage of freedom which is bound in this tradition. Otherwise, there is no reason for you to believe that your personal rights should be considered. This decision is an attack on the very validity of your self-respect because it flows out of our relationship to God. This relationship is not just a private matter. It has to be a part of the fabric of life. It always has been.

GOD IS THE BASIS FOR MORALITY

Where do we get our inspiration to act decently? What does it matter whether we are decent or not, if it does not have eternal sanction? If we are not responsible to God for what we think and what we say and what we do, we will have no basis for morality. This basic concept is the only thing that holds a community together in a moral way. If we take it out of our public life, we will have more delinquency than we have now. We will have more immorality than we have now. We are rapidly approaching the time when we have no protection against the doctrine of free speech which allows people to pander to the lowest instincts of man, which is a course that history teaches is a sure road to ruin. We have left God out. We are beginning to reap some of the bitter fruits of this omission now—just a few, but if this trend continues we are probably done for. That is why all of this is so important.

MINORITIES ARE CONTROLLING

Now, what about the minorities? Minorities should have every consideration, but if several men were to take a giant crane to which was attached a great iron ball and began demolishing the foundations of our neighboring First National Bank Building, it would not be long before the proper authorities came along and tapped them on the shoulder and said, "My friends, you must not do that."

"Oh," they would say, "We are a minority. We believe in destroying the foundations of buildings. You will offend us and warp our personalities if you do not let us do it." I think you would agree that they would soon be taken to Milledgeville.

Now I think that the time has come when the majority, believing those things upon which this Nation rests, deserve some consideration. I do not believe that five people, two Jews, one ethical culturist, a Unitarian, and a nonbeliever, should be allowed to destroy, in the name of freedom, foundations upon which this land was built. There comes a time when the rights of minorities are no longer rights. I see no fairness or equity in a small five-person group being allowed to have its way over and against the overwhelming majority of people who prefer another way that they believe necessary. What about offending them? Have they no rights? No one seems to care.

HOW FAR ARE WE GOING?

In our own city of Atlanta, I am told, the New Testament cannot be read in some of our schools. Where this trend will take us, I guess nobody really knows, but many of us are becoming frightened. Somewhere along the line, maybe our people will be stirred again to care for the things that matter. We are not in this precarious position in America because of the enemies of the precepts for which we stand. Let us be sure we understand that. We are in this position because you and I and a host of people like us have been careless. We have been so busy being comfortable; we have been so busy being tolerant of the intolerant minority; we have been so busy furthering our own ends, feathering our own nests as it were, that unless we have been bothered we have not bothered about anything. I am not sure that America is still capable of caring. So long as we have been fed and clothed and allowed to live in luxury, for as long a time as someone guarantees that to us, it may be that we will accept anything that comes, and with this acceptance our liberties will be steadily drained away. But then perhaps not. Hope always springs eternal and our active concern and our humble prayers can still do much.

If this decision can serve in America to cause Christian people once again to take their privileges seriously it will not have been in vain. We have been careless in our homes. The family altar is almost dead and we have not cared. This Sunday morning there will not be in attendance in our land in the Protestant churches 25 percent of its membership. Perhaps we should not get so excited about our enemies until we have taken these matters more seriously. We will not conquer and win in the realm of faith by overcoming enemies. We will conquer and win only by becoming dead serious about the great convictions and principles which are our precious heritage, and then causing our lives to be a witness to these beliefs.

THOSE WHO BELIEVE MUST STAND UP

I commend these problems to your prayerful attention. It is difficult to know what we ought to do. Our individual consciences can lead us. Presently there are not many things we can do, except be faithful to the things that matter, and to follow wherever God leads. The time may come in this land, sooner than we think, when those who believe must stand up and say to those who govern: "Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."

The will of God is the supreme court of the human soul, more binding in its authority than any human court.

Lead us by Thy hand, our Father, through the maze that is life and grant that we shall find the true way and the true path, that finally shall lead through all the things that Thou would have us do here, into Thine eternal glory. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

American Bar Association Statement on Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the American Bar Association's section on antitrust law statement in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 159 and similar legislation, the so-called quality stabilization bills.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SECTION OF ANTITRUST LAW

RECOMMENDATION

The section of antitrust law recommends that the house of delegates adopt the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the American Bar Association disapproves of and opposes Senate Joint Resolution 159, 87th Congress, and any proposed legislation which would attempt to create a Federal right of enforcement of resale price maintenance by private persons; further

"*Resolved,* That the officers and council of the section of antitrust law are directed to urge such opposition and disapproval upon the proper committees of Congress in connection with any legislation embodying any such concept."

REPORT

1. Background

On May 18, 1959, the board of governors of the American Bar Association adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the American Bar Association disapproves of and opposes any amendment of the Federal Trade Commission Act which would further expand the philosophy of so-called fair trade acts and create a Federal right of action in the enforcement of fair trade contracts; further

"*Resolved,* That the officers and council of the section of antitrust law are directed to urge such opposition and disapproval upon the proper committees of Congress in connection with any legislation embodying any such amendment."

In February 1962 a proposal by the antitrust section to update this recommendation as a current expression of the association was considered at the midwinter meeting of the ABA's house of delegates in Chicago. At that meeting consideration of a proposal by the antitrust section to oppose legislation creating a Federal right of action in the enforcement of fair trade contracts was postponed to the August meeting of the house of delegates. (During the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses several bills had been introduced which would create in some form a Federal right of action for the enforcement of fair trade contracts entered into under State law.)

Since the February 1962 meeting attention has been directed to Senate Joint Resolution 159, the Quality Stabilization Act proposal introduced by Senators HUMPHREY, CAPEHART, and others on February 21, 1962.[1] While hearings were held on S. 1722 on July 25 and 27 and August 28, 1961, it is under-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

stood that they will not be printed in the light of the shift of interest to Senate Joint Resolution 159. Hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 159 have been held by the Senate Committee on Commerce. In the course of the hearings the heads of the two principal antitrust enforcement agencies (Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in Charge of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, and Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission) testified in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 159.

2. *Provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 159*

The resolution opens with six recitals setting forth legislative statements of objectives. A key recital refers to unfair or deceptive acts or practices "such as * * * store-traffic baiting and misrepresentation as to the size, capacity, quality, condition, model, or age" of branded goods, "all tending to destroy unfairly the value" of brands[2] to their owners, to smaller resellers, and to the public. Among the effects of these practices recited is a tendency to diminish the volume of branded products moving in commerce, thereby reducing producers' incentive to maintain the value of their goods and producing other value-diluting consequences ("substitutions of inferior labor and materials forced by the downward spiral of unrestrained predatory pricing on popular identified products, in the fields of goods, drugs and beverages, endanger public health, and in other fields, endangers (sic) public safety"). Recognition of the property right in a brand and the good will associated therewith is also recited.

The operative provisions of the resolution would amend section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C.A., sec. 45(a)), by adding eight new paragraphs, (7) to (14). The new paragraphs may be summarized as follows:

"(7) A brand owner is deemed to retain his property rights in the brand and associated good will regardless of any transfer of the goods to which the brand relates. Any person who resells branded goods in commerce may use the brand but only in effecting resale of such goods, and subject to (8).

"(8) When goods usable for the same general purpose are available to the public from sources other than the brand owner, the right of any person to use the brand in reselling may be revoked (on written notice) by the brand owner on the ground that the reseller (a) has used branded goods 'in furtherance of bait merchandising practices'; (b) has, with notice advertised, offered for sale or sold such goods at prices other than at the brand owner's currently established resale prices; or (c) with intent to deceive, has 'published misrepresentation concerning such goods.'

"(9) Nothing in (8) shall abridge the right of the reseller, in the regular course of his business and within a reasonable time after revocation, to sell the goods in his possession on the date of revocation, so long as he does not violate (8) in so selling. A procedure is established for the reseller to offer his inventory to the brand owner at the price he paid for them; if the offer is not accepted, the reseller may sell the goods without restriction as to price so long as his advertisements or offers state the fact of revocation as to goods not in his possession on the revocation date.

"(10) A reseller who sells under the brand name after revocation commits an act of unfair competition and is liable in a civil action for damages and injunctive relief by the brand owner, in any United States District Court in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy; the owner may recover the cost of suit including reasonable attorneys' fees.

"(11) Lack of due diligence in revoking as to competing resellers who are violating (8) is specifically set forth as a defense."

The other paragraphs are saving and definitional provisions, and includes antitrust exemption language and a statement that the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts, inter alia, are not modified or repealed.

3. *Objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 159*

Senator HUMPHREY's statement introducing the quality stabilization resolution emphasized the following reasons in support of the legislation:[3]

1. The resolution is merely an extension of the trademark laws enabling a brand owner to protect his property rights through channels of distribution.

2. The resolution would permit a reseller to remove the brand from the product—"thus separating the physical property, which he owns, from the goodwill, which is another's property"—and then sell at any price.

3. The legislation would be permissive and would leave decision as to enforcement in the hands of the brand owner.

4. The proposal would permit the continuance of independent retailing and provide assurance to consumers that quality tested and reliable products will continue to be available.

5. In the light of increasing numbers of bankruptcies of small business concerns, the proposed legislation is essential to competitive survival of hundreds of thousands of independent businessmen.

Several of these reasons have been equally appropriate in past consideration of fair trade legislation and have been reviewed in detail by many commentators in the past. The most compelling reason now offered in support of the quality stabilization proposal would seem to be the reference to the current plight of independent retailers, particularly in the light of the present phenomenon of widespread "discount selling." The inroads of discount operations on sales of traditional retail stores have no doubt been substantial—"Last year, according to trade sources, discounters grossed more than $4 billion in sales."[4]

The extent to which there has been a substantial causal relationship between retailing of branded goods at prices below those established or suggested by manufacturers and small business failures is of course a difficult factual issue involving many and complex considerations. Wholly apart from the question whether the proposal is the appropriate solution, reliable probative evidence of such a relationship would undoubtedly be significant in any differentiation of the present setting from that confronting Congress during its consideration of proposed Federal fair trade legislation in recent years.

4. *Relationship to other legislation*

The three practices condemned in paragraph (8) as proposed by the joint resolution deserve separate comment.[5]

(a) Bait merchandising: The scope of this term, not defined in the resolution, is somewhat vague and uncertain. Ordinarily the concept "bait merchandising" would be thought to embrace only the use of "loss leader" selling by which certain branded goods are offered for sale at less than cost in order to bait customers into a store in the mistaken belief that all goods in the store are being sold at comparably low prices. This practice may already be subject to various State unfair practices statutes, sales below cost statutes, or fair trade statutes, or to condemnation under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act or common law principles as a species of false advertising or unfair competition. As so limited, prohibition of the practice would seem to be consistent with traditional antitrust or trade regulation principles.

(b) Resale price maintenance: While the Miller-Tydings Act of 1937 and McGuire Act of 1952 created a condition permitting State fair trade laws to be effective by providing exemption from Federal antitrust legislation, fair trade is not available in a number of States where no fair trade legislation has been enacted or where fair trade legislation has been rendered ineffective by adverse holdings on constitutional issues.[6] An apparent objective of the proposed legislation would be to supplement the remaining State laws by creating a Federal right of brand owners to effect resale price maintenance on certain goods.

While the proposed legislation provides that "no exercise of any rights or remedy provided [herein] shall be construed to be a violation of any of the Antitrust Acts," it is not clear whether this language is intended to immunize arrangements between manufacturers and retailers as to prices or enforcement of rights or remedies of the brand owner. A significant aspect of this problem is that while a principal reason advanced in support of the joint resolution is the plight of small independent resellers, the rights and remedies are given only to brand owners, who will presumably be urged by resellers to enforce the statutory rights and remedies.

(c) Misrepresentation: The proposed legislation would create a limited private cause of action providing for relief against commission of acts of misrepresentation which would probably be considered to fall within the scope of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which prohibits unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce. In consideration of the effects of the proposed law, the elastic scope of section 5 as it would bear on the content of the private right to proceed against "misrepresentation concerning such goods" and the problems attendant to possible overlapping of or conflict between privately obtained injunctions and the cease and desist order authority of the Federal Trade Commission, would be significant.

5. *Observations and conclusion*

The basic principle of the quality stabilization resolution appears to be that certain desirable national objectives will be maintained by providing specific private rights against three types of activities asserted to be detrimental to maintenance of a valuable property right in a brand name.

With respect to the protection against "bait merchandising practices", a prime difficulty is the lack of precision of the term. If flagrant "loss leader" selling is all that is encompassed by the term, the natural question would be whether the practice is sufficiently prevalent and serious to warrant Federal legislation, and whether the legislation would be effective in its apparent objective to protect small retailers against the competition of discount or other operations which may sell all items at a low markup over cost. Substantively there is probably general agreement among most antitrust students that the flagrant type of loss leader selling should be actionable. But it is unclear whether the scope is to be interpreted as so limited.

With respect to misrepresentation, again a fundamental problem is that the scope of the prohibition should be sufficiently defined. Private enforcement to supplement Federal Trade Commission authority against flagrant types of misrepresentation directly injuring a producer or brand owner, such as undisclosed substitution of goods, might well be useful. But without precise delineation of the scope of the term, problems of vagueness and provocation of trivial litigation[7] similar to those presented by section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act could be expected.

Footnotes at end of speech.

With respect to resale price maintenance, the proposed legislation differs in language considerably from existing Federal and State fair trade statutes; however, the fundamental approach seems to be the same—to permit a brand owner to control prices at which resellers may sell branded goods. Since at least 1912 the subject of resale price maintenance legislation has been highly controversial; during this 50-year period retailing and distribution have adapted to a series of drastic innovations. While the fundamental question of the desirability of such legislation may be an economic issue,[8] any such legislation would have important legal ramifications as well. The belief that a general resale price maintenance system goes beyond the requirements for protection against practices such as loss leader selling and the basis antitrust reliance upon price and other competition, with exemptions enacted only in compelling circumstances, have been strong factors in the opposition to extension of Federal resale price maintenance legislation beyond the enabling principle of the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts. In fact, a majority of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws in 1955 recommended congressional repeal of the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts. The Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission have consistently opposed fair trade legislation, and recently specifically opposed the quality stabilization proposals.

Apart from the problems of the judicial administration which may be posed by transferring to the Federal courts the burden of policing resale price maintenance through litigation brought without regard to the amount in controversy, the creation of a Federal cause of action for the enforcement of resale price maintenance would appear to represent one more step in the intrusion of Federal legislative power into the area of control of the public policy of the several States. As noted above, in 24 States as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, resale price maintenance is incompatible with the State's legislative or judicially construed constitutional policy. Under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 159, the right to legislate under the McGuire Act with respect to this significant area of economic policy in the interest of its own citizens is denied the several States by the assertion of a paramount Federal policy in the exercise of the constitutional power over interstate commerce.

There can be no doubt that many small independent businesses are faced with effective "price cutting" competition by discount houses and others which may cause them significant loss of trade. Assuming that maintenance of the traditional independent business part of the retailing and distribution structure is an important national objective, alternative methods of alleviating the situation should be considered. Examples would include Federal legislation designed to prohibit retail selling, of at least specified categories of goods, at prices below defined cost, or additional financial assistance by the Government to small business; such measures might suffice to alleviate the situation depicted. But it would seem that to date the strong factual justification required to overcome traditional reluctance of Congress and the enforcement agencies to endorce Federal resale price mantenance legislation has not been shown.

Respectfully submitted.

S. Chesterfield Oppenheim,
Chairman.

Paul Rand Dixon and Lee Loevinger did not participate in the consideration or voting on this matter.

---

[1] Companion proposals and those who introduced them include H.J. Res. 636 (Harris), H.J. Res. 637 (Mack), H. Res. 639 (Tollefson), H.R. 10517 (McMillan), and H.R. 10335 (Madden). (A joint resolution is used ordinarily to effect temporary extension or suspension of existing statutes.)

[2] This report uses the term "brand" as a reference to "brand, name, or trade mark" as used in the resolution.

[3] Congressional Record, pp. 2479–2482 (Feb. 21, 1962). A list of over 50 national trade associations supporting the measure was appended to Senator Humphrey's remarks.

[4] New York Times, Jan. 30, 1962, p. 32.

[5] The legislation would apply "to all acts and transactions in or affecting commerce which Congress may lawfully regulate," in territories and in the District of Columbia.

[6] Alaska, Missouri, Nebraska, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia do not have fair trade laws. Puerto Rico's fair-trade law was repealed in 1959. The laws of at least 19 States have been held in part or generally unconstitutional at some time.

[7] See dissenting opinions of Commissioner Elman in matter of *Gimbel Brothers* (3 C.C.H. Tr. Reg. Rep. par. 15,748 (1962)); and Judge Friendly in *Exposition Press, Inc.* v. *F.T.C.* (295 F. 2d 869 (2d Cir. 1961)).

[8] Whether a producer of goods should be permitted to fix by contract, express or implied, the price at which the purchaser may resell them, and if so, under what conditions, is an economic question. To decide it wisely it is necessary to consider the relevant facts, industrial and commercial, rather than established legal principles." Brandeis, J., concurring in *Boston Store of Chicago* v. *American Graphophone Co.* (246 U.S. 8 (1918)).

Second Best in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, very often we find a newspaper editorial which is so self-explanatory that no further comment on our part in inserting it into the Record is necessary. This is the case in an editorial which I include for the Record entitled "Second Best in Space" which appeared in the Tuesday, August 14, edition of the Chicago Daily News:

Second Best in Space

We suppose we should weigh in on the side of good sportsmanship and add our "well done" to those of everybody else. But we don't feel particularly "gung-ho" about the feat of Soviet scientists in orbiting their spectacular "space duet" and pushing this country a couple of years back in the race to the moon.

We take nothing away from Major Nikolayev, Lieutenent Colonel Popovich, the Soviet scientists, Premier Khruschev, or anyone else connected with the superb feat when we suggest that the Russians may have won this one on a foul.

For the foul was committed in the United States of America.

It was just a year ago that Senator John L. McClellan, chairman of the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, summed up 5 months of testimony and fact-finding as follows:

"Wildcat strikes, work stoppages, slowdowns, featherbedding and a deliberate policy of low productivity on the part of some unions and workers may well be responsible to a substantial degree for whatever lagging behind exists in our space and missile programs. This concerns every man, woman and child in the country who loves freedom. If greed, graft, and extortion are to dominate our way of life and our economy, especially in a program vital to our survival, it is time for Americans to wake up."

There was ample documentation in the committee's records to warrant this blistering indictment.

Up to that time, 330 strikes had been waged at our test sites and ballistic missile bases, with a loss of 163,000 man-days. The record might have been worse, except that contractors—some of them insulated from loss by cost-plus contracts—knuckled under to pressure and paid ditchdiggers $287 a week, truckdrivers $324, and journeymen electricians as high as $700.

A voluntary no-strike pledge was secured in the spring of 1961. While it cut deeply into the work stoppages, it was never entirely successful, and less so as time went on. From June 1961, to February 1962, more than 10,000 man-days were lost.

Last month, unions representing 150,000 workers scheduled for July 23 a strike that would have brought the whole missile and space program grinding to a halt, and may yet do so.

Only after Labor Secretary Goldberg wired union leaders a plea to avoid a strike "which would substantially delay our vital missile and space programs," and after President Kennedy personally pleaded for a delay, did the leaders agree to hold off. The 60-day delay is scheduled to end September 21, at which time the Nation may find both its major weapons program and its space program paralyzed.

We think the word "foul" is a mild enough term to describe this continuing assault on the very foundations of our national security and prestige.

It is possible that under the best of circumstances we would still be trailing in the space race. There is no shame in being second-best when the loser has given the best that's in him. But there is shame in lying down on the job, in welshing on the debt each man owes his fellows.

McClellan said in August 1961, that it was time for Americans to wake up. It is now a year past time.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

President Kennedy Appoints Consumer Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last month President Kennedy announced the appointment of a 12-member Consumer Advisory Council. For the first time consumers are to have a voice in the White House through the newly organized Advisory Council attached to the President's Council of Economic Advisers. All of us, Mr. President, are consumers, but consumer needs and interests are all too frequently overlooked in the development of Government policies. Earlier this year the President sent a historic consumers message to Congress.

In the Presidential message of March 15, President Kennedy said:

> Consumers, by definition, include us all. They are the largest economic group in the economy, affecting and affected by almost every public and private economic decision. But they are the only important group in the economy who are not effectively organized, whose views are often not heard.
>
> The Federal Government—by nature the highest spokesman for all the people—has a special obligation to be alert to the consumer's needs and to advance the consumer's interests.

The President set forth a consumers' bill of rights. These rights include:

> 1. The right to safety: To be protected against the marketing of goods which are hazardous to health or life.
>
> 2. The right to be informed: To be protected against fraudulent, deceitful, or grossly misleading information, advertising, labeling, or other practices, and to be given the facts he needs to make an informed choice.
>
> 3. The right to choose: To be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices; and in those industries in which competition is not workable and Government regulation is substituted, an assurance of satisfactory quality and service at fair prices.
>
> 4. The right to be heard: To be assured that consumer interests will receive full and sympathetic consideration in the formulation of Government policy, and fair and expeditious treatment in its administrative tribunals.

While all sorts of special interest groups maintain organizations and representatives here in Washington, the consumer does not have those who can represent his needs and interests. The appointment of the Consumer Advisory Council will fill this gap. The challenges before the Council are immense. Appointed as Chairman of the Consumer Advisory Council is Dr. Helen G. Canoyer, dean of the School of Home Economics of Cornell University since 1953.

Mr. President, one of the distinguished members of the Consumer Advisory Council is Sylvia Porter, the well-known columnist and writer on financial matters. Recently Sylvia Porter wrote a series of articles on the newly appointed Consumer Advisory Council, pointing out the hopes and problems and the challenges which face such a program. I ask unanimous consent to have the five columns by Sylvia Porter dealing with the Consumer Advisory Council printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, as Sylvia Porter points out:

> The CAC has been born. Now it will begin to earn its right to become a permanent, respected, valuable part of the Federal Government.

The other members of the Consumer Advisory Council besides Dr. Canoyer and Sylvia Porter are:

David Angevine, of Park Forest, Ill., information director of the Cooperative League of America and former editor of Cooperative News Service.

Dr. Persia Campbell, professor and head of Economics Department, Queens College, the City University of New York.

Stephen McKenzie du Brul, Jr., of New York City, a director of the May Department Stores and a partner in Lehman Bros., specializing in retail business financing.

Mrs. John G. Lee, of Farmington, Conn., former president of the League of Women Voters, 1950–58.

Dr. Edward S. Lewis, of New York City, executive director of the Urban League of Greater New York.

Walter F. Mondale, of St. Paul, Minn., attorney general of the State and chairman of the Consumers Protection Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General.

Dr. Richard L. D. Morse, of Manhattan, Kans., head of the department of family economics since 1955 at Kansas State University and past president of the Council on Consumer Information.

Mrs. Helen E. Nelson, of Sacramento, Calif., director of the California Office of Consumer Counsel.

Dr. Caroline Ware, of Vienna, Va., chairman of the Consumer Clearinghouse, 1943–52, and a member of President Kennedy's Commission on the Status of Women.

Dr. Colston E. Warne, of Amherst, Mass., on the faculty of Amherst College and president of the Consumers Union of the U.S.A., Inc.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: CONSUMER COUNCIL IN WHITE HOUSE

(By Sylvia Porter)

For the first time, consumers are to have a voice in the White House—through the newly organized Consumers' Advisory Council attached to the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

It is a pioneering move, the fulfillment of a pledge made during the 1960 election campaign. While, as was cynically noted in one editorial entitled "A Bone for Consumers," President Kennedy waited a year and a half before naming the Council, this doesn't seem so long against the background of 186 years that the consumer has been waiting for this high level of representation.

It is a Council composed of six men and six women, a mixture of Democrats and Republicans who come from all over the country and whose backgrounds reveal a lifelong dedication to programs to inform the consumer on matters affecting his health, safety, and pocketbook, to safeguard the consumer against fraud and deceit, to advance the consumer's standard of living.

REPORT ON POSSIBILITIES

Helen G. Canoyer, dean of Cornell University's School of Home Economics, is the Council's chairman. I'm one of the members and, in this and the next four columns, I'll report on the Council, its possibilities and pitfalls, and the status of consumer legislation in the United States today.

The Council must write its own rules—ranging from whether a 12-member Council is too big or too small to what should be its relationship with the President and the various agencies of Government. But the Council has its so-called terms of reference and they're certainly broad enough. Here are the three primary functions:

1. The council is "to advise the executive branch of the Government on issues of broad economic policy.

The Council of Economic Advisers has a Business Advisory Committee, a Labor Advisory Committee, both of which it frequently consults on economic issues, and now it has a Consumers Advisory Committee. CEA Chairman Walter W. Heller, says the economic issues could include recommendations ranging from tax cuts to controls over watered hams. In my mind, the consumers' interests in this area would fall into clearly discernible patterns.

For instance, we as consumers surely would be in favor of policies: preserving the buying power of the dollar—meaning we would be against Government or private policies that would stimulate inflation. We as consumers also surely would be in favor of programs spurring economic growth and averting or cushioning recessions.

2. The council is "to advise the executive branch of the Government on governmental programs protecting consumer needs."

This one sounds simple but it could be full of pitfalls, for the fact is there is a widespread feeling that programs in the consumer's interest are automatically antibusiness. It's nonsense but it's so. If this council could help dispel this feeling, in itself this would represent major progress.

RESEARCH MATERIAL

3. The council is "to advise the executive branch of the Government on the flow of

consumer research material from the Government to the public."

The need here is great and urgent. There is an immense amount of information within the Government agencies which could be of practical help to consumers—but most people don't know what information is available and most agencies don't know how to get the information to people.

The council has organized; it has a budget, a small staff. The President has told it that he hopes it "will not be ornamental but will be functional." "The show," as Dr. Heller put it, "is on the road."

Your Money's Worth: Consumer Voices' Dismal History

(By Sylvia Porter)

The history of efforts to give consumers a voice at the highest level of Government—just as labor has a voice and business has a voice and agriculture has a voice—is "not replete with successful precedents," drily remarked Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, in his informal greeting to the 12 members of the newly organized Consumers' Advisory Council at their first meeting in the White House recently.

It certainly isn't. In fact, the history is downright dismal—and this adds significance to President Kennedy's appointment of six men and six women to advise the executive on consumer issues.

Here is a brief rundown of past experiments in giving the consumer an independent voice in Washington, put together by Persia Campbell, professor and chairman of the economics department of Queens College in New York, an expert long identified with consumer programs and a member of the new CAC.

NEW DEAL RECALLED

1. In the early 1930's, a New Deal law set up the National Recovery Administration to establish "codes of fair competition" which would help put floors under profits and wages. A Consumers Advisory Board to the NRA was created along with an Industrial Advisory Board and a Labor Advisory Board so all three viewpoints could be heard while the codes were being written. From the start, the CAB ran into trouble. It was hard even to find consumer representatives and when the CAB finally was named in 1933, it consisted mainly of professors and leaders of women's organizations. Moreover, because the consumer group was generally opposed to price-fixing arrangements, the NRA Administrator himself detested it. The CAB died when the NRA was liquidated.

2. Also in the early New Deal days, a Consumers Council was appointed to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. In the less than a decade of its life, the Consumers Council frequently fought with the administration of which it was a part, for the AAA was trying to raise farm prices and control the flow of such products as milk to the market to stabilize prices. This office was killed in World War II.

3. In 1937, a third experiment took place when a Consumers Council was appointed to the National Bituminous Coal Commission, designed to control coal production and fix prices at the mines. The conflicts of interest were overwhelming. This one was shortlived too.

4. During and for a while after World War II, consumers were represented in the wartime agencies of the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Price Stabilization. These consumer committees, says Dr. Campbell, "identified themselves as consumer representatives, at least with respect to price control and rationing." They died when the agencies were dissolved.

DISMAL RECORD

5. From 1946 to 1952, the President's Council of Economic Advisers conferred from time to time with a National Consumer Advisory Committee which it had appointed. The committee had no influence. It faded away.

Why so dismal a record?

An obvious reason is that most consumers wear two hats and the hat with which they rarely identify themselves is that of the consumer as such. You, as a wage earner, will identify yourself with your union battling for the biggest pay raise possible, or you, as a businessman, will identify yourself with your industry trying for the best price-profit setup possible—but neither of you will identify yourself primarily as a consumer who might suffer from your wage-price-profit policies.

It may be that as a result the consumer just cannot be organized or speak with a powerful voice in this country. But that only makes it more important that he be recognized and represented at the national level.

The CAC has been born against a background of repeated failures. It must, as Mr. Kennedy told the members, "establish its [own] success."

Your Money's Worth: Status of Aid for Consumers

(By Sylvia Porter)

On March 15 President Kennedy sent an omnibus consumers' protection and interest message to Congress which asked new laws as well as a major strengthening of existing programs for the safety and protection of consumers in the United States.

The message was a catchall. It included many innocuous proposals with which few could quarrel. Who, for instance, is going to be against stepping up enforcement of the mail fraud laws except someone trying to defraud via the mails?

It also included some controversial proposals. For instance, a request for a law that would empower the Federal Trade Commission "to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders against the continuation of unfair competitive practices while cases concerned with permanent relief from such practices are pending before the Commission" was interpreted by many businessmen to mean an accused corporation wouldn't even have a chance to defend itself while the FTC simultaneously acted the roles of investigator, accuser, prosecutor, and judge

NOT MUCH DONE

Not much significant legislation to safeguard the consumer has been passed by this Congress. That cease-and-desist bill is dead. So is a bill which would require firms planning to merge into a company of "substantial size" to give "reasonable advance notice" to the Justice Department. So are other bills which would greatly increase the authority of the Federal regulatory agencies. Also on the shelf for this year, at least, are the "truth in lending" and the "truth in packaging" bills—bills which need a lot more work before they're in shape for passage.

Nevertheless, a fair number of the actions the President requested in his consumers' protection message has been favorably acted on or will be soon. Here's a sampling on the plus side.

A 25 percent increase in the staff for the Food and Drug Administration, the largest single increase in the agency's history. Probable.

An increased appropriation for pesticide regulation. OK.

A higher appropriation for inspection of meat and poultry. Mr. Kennedy won't get as much money as he's asking but he'll get some more.

An improved system of safety and efficiency of air traffic. The Federal Aviation Administration has put it into effect.

A law to require manufacture of all-channel TV sets to give a wider choice of programs. Passed.

Creation of a Consumers' Advisory Council within the executive branch of Government and appointment of special assistants for consumer affairs in all appropriate Federal agencies. Done this month.

Establishment of a new Office for Highway Safety in the Commerce Department, strengthening of accident prevention work in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, increased enforcement of safety requirements by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Done or being done.

Strengthening of the insurance program of the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp. Done.

Protection of air travelers from abuses of overbooking. The Civil Aeronautics Board put out new rules in April.

SOME SUCCESS NOTED

Regulation of excessive charges for moving of household goods. The Interstate Commerce Commission issued new rules this month.

Expansion of educational television. Law signed.

Stronger enforcement against interference in radio. Done.

Intensification of action by the Federal Trade Commission against deceptive trade practices and false advertising. Intensification on.

Stronger enforcement of mail fraud statutes. Arrests for mail fraud last year were at a record, convictions were up 35 percent.

Increased staffs for all major Federal regulatory agencies. Mixed results, with some getting the increase, some not.

It's hardly a grandiose, glittering record but it represents some progress. And while the controversial measures got lost in the shuffle, there is a new awareness of consumers' interests which is all to the good.

Your Money's Worth: Pilot Program for Consumers

(By Sylvia Porter)

Early in September, the Government will start an experiment in education of the American consumer in 100 post offices across the country.

In each of these post offices, there will be a display indicating the vast variety of pamphlets which Federal Government departments and agencies have prepared on subjects of practical concern to consumers and which can be bought for a nickel to 45 cents.

Each post office also will have supplies of order blanks listing 72 of the hundreds of publications now available. Each will have supplies of Government Printing Office documentary coupons which may be purchased from postal window clerks to cover the cost of any pamphlet and each also will have supplies of envelopes preaddressed to the "Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.," in which the order blanks and coupons can be mailed.

NINETY-DAY PROGRAM

The pilot program will go on for 90 days. To gage interest in a reaction to the material available, the experiment will be handled in different ways in the various communities.

This is an experiment, long overdue. If it is pursued properly and aggressively, it could lead to major consumer education programs which could help millions of families to improve the management of their market-baskets, pocketbooks, health, and safety.

The fact is that the Federal departments and agencies are loaded—and I mean loaded—with material of practical use to everyone. In just about every department and agency, information of indisputable value to the average consumer has been collected and is available in the form of inexpensively priced pamphlets. Hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of families might benefit if they knew what material the booklets offered and the Government knew how to channel the publications to people.

Illustrative are the 72 representative pamphlets to be placed on sale in the pilot program. "Shopper's Guide to U.S. Grades for Food," 10 cents; "Infant Care," 15 cents; "Headaches, Hope Through Research," 10 cents; "Food Guide for Older Folks," 10 cents; "Removing Stains From Fabrics, Home Methods," 15 cents; "Plumbing Manual," 40 cents; "Fuel Consumption in the Home," 15 cents; "Better Lawns," 15 cents; "Detergents for Home Laundering," 5 cents; "Automotive Antifreezes," 15 cents. There are hundreds more.

JUST BEGINNING

And this is just a beginning. President Kennedy has directed the Federal agencies and departments "to place increased emphasis on preparing and making available pertinent research findings for consumers in clear and usable form." There is a vast accumulation of information on products and services within the Government departments which can be and should be put into language that can be understood by the least informed, least intelligent and least alert consumer—for this is the consumer who most needs the guidance.

There is simply no arguing with Mr. Kennedy's comment in his March 15 consumers' protection message that "The consumer typically cannot know whether drug preparations meet maximum standards of safety, quality and efficacy. He usually does not know how much he pays for consumer credit; whether one prepared food has more nutritional value than another; whether the performance of a product will in fact meet his needs; or whether the large economy size is really a bargain."

This is one area in which the new 12-member Consumers' Advisory Council can be of lasting value. Judging from the statements made by the members at the Council's first meeting, the Council is determined to give the consumer education movement in the United States a greatly needed forward push.

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: HOW CAN COUNCIL AID CONSUMERS?

(By Sylvia Porter)

The heartbreaking stories of deformed babies born to mothers who took the German-developed drug thalidomide before it was withdrawn from the market dramatizes the importance of protecting consumers from new drugs until they have been thoroughly and objectively tested.

It also underlines the kind of contribution the 12-member Consumers' Advisory Council, recently appointed by President Kennedy could make to health and safety. There is no disputing that while many of the thousands of new drugs are saving countless lives, some also present great hazards to health. Also there is no disputing the need to strengthen existing food, drug, and cosmetic laws and their enforcement. It is in the area of educating the American consumer that the new CAC could make a significant contribution to the Nation.

No doubt you know the tale of thalidomide by now and know that it would have been in wide use in the United States had not Dr. Frances O. Kelsey of the Food and Drug Administration dragged her feet for 19 months on approval of an Ohio drug manufacturer's application to market the drug for general consumption because she was not convinced it was safe. Now the world knows about the sedative's dreadful side effects and although over 1,100 U.S. physicians did distribute samples to their patients, the tragedies in this country are nowhere near the number overseas.

POSSIBILITIES OUTLINED

Besides helping to educate consumers—and lawmakers—on laws to increase the protection and safety of the public in such fields as foods and drugs, what else might the CAC achieve?

Its official functions—advising the executive branch on issues of broad economic policy and programs to protect and inform the consumer—are so broad that they could be meaningless unless translated into specific areas of action. Specifically what?

From Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, comes the plea that the CAC help to give the consumer a voice before congressional committees which must vote funds for the Federal regulatory agencies. Senator HUMPHREY says, "The only voices we usually hear are those complaining that an agency has been too harsh or unfair in enforcing the law. We need a voice speaking for enforcing the law in the interests of the consumer."

From Helen G. Canoyer, dean of Cornell University's School of Home Economics and chairman of the new CAC, comes the statement that the council can achieve much by directing "attention to consumer education, especially to consumer economics"—and this means "teaching basic economic principles, not just feeding out information on how to take care of clothes or how to read labels."

From Colston E. Warne, economics professor at Amherst College, president of Consumers Union, and another council member, comes the proposal that the CAC should lead a drive for compilation of all the methods of testing consumer goods available the world over.

SAMPLING OFFERED

From Walter F. Mondale, attorney general of Minnesota, and a council member, too, comes the recommendation that the council assist in working on legislation permitting the States "to set up a national clearinghouse of information on racketeers that prey upon consumers" so swindlers can't escape simply by moving from State to State.

It also must make it clear, I think, that whatever it does to further the legitimate interests of the consumer is simultaneously furthering the legitimate interests of business and labor. For this is fundamentally true and the misunderstanding which exists on conflicts is a hangover from an era long since dead.

The CAC has been born. Now it will begin to earn its right to become a permanent, respected, valuable part of the Federal Government.

The John Birch Society in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it takes a strong pair of eyes to be a member of the John Birch Society. Robert Welch, founder of the controversial right-wing group, is a prolific pamphleteer. In this second of six special reports, Detroit Free Press staff writer Barbara Holliday, tells where Birchers get their ammunition:

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY IN MICHIGAN

In the world of John Birch, the sun never shines. The sky is constantly overcast and black thunderheads hang ominously on the horizon.

And through the overcast rumbles the ultraconservative thunder of Robert Welch invective.

Perhaps the most sobering thing about the John Birch Society is the thought of what a year-in, year-out diet of alarmist fear-inducing propaganda can do to people who, whatever their convictions, are basically honest, dedicated, sincere Americans.

My initial taste of the Welch-flavored propaganda came at the first John Birch meeting I attended.

But this was pale compared to the purple oratory that erupted from the pages of the bulletins that came with my membership card.

These monthly bulletins are personal messages from Robert Welch to his followers. They are rambling rebuttals to personal attacks, discourses on conspiracy in the Government, subtle pleas for financial support, and the all-important projects for the month.

Welch frankly admits that his society is the only group in the country that is fighting communism with Communist weapons. He has not only mastered the techniques—he has added the plus of good old American salesmanship.

There is no way to quote Welch briefly. For a single-purposed man, he has an extraordinarily circuitous way of getting to the point.

However, this excerpt from the June bulletin is typical:

"The dominant feature of life in the United States today is confusion. There is a miasmal fog of confusion enveloping and permeating the politics, economics, education, morals, religion, scientific research, military planning, and even the everyday commonsense, of the American people. And let nobody be surprised at these conditions.

"For, at the present rate of Communist progress, the United States is now within 3 or 4 years of the visible beginnings of the enforcement and consolidation of Communist rule by police-state methods.

"The John Birch Society is an unshakeable phalanx, marching straight ahead through all of the confusion, and gathering to its banner those who seek leadership they can trust."

It is this kind of statement that has earned for Welch the charge that his chief purpose is a personal bid for power.

In addition to the monthly bulletins, all members are expected to subscribe to American Opinion, a Welch-edited magazine which appeared as "One Man's Opinion" for 5 years before the society was organized.

The magazine carries inflammatory articles by far rightists, purported to be the inside story of such organizations as SANE (Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy), "Peril in Mexico," "Behind Fluoridation," "The FPA (Foreign Policy Association) in Atlanta."

The last article concerned the "Great Decisions" program, a study and lecture course sponsored by FPA. It was attacked in Atlanta, Ga., as being "subtly loaded against America" but, according to the magazine, the "FPA achieved a neat whitewash."

"Not a line," says the article, "appeared in the New York press, where the FPA has offices, or in cities such as Detroit, where the "Great Decisions" program plays a domineering role."

MAGAZINE INDICTS U.S. GOVERNMENT

This was cited by the Birchist author as evidence of Communist domination of the press and other communication mediums in this country.

Standing features in the magazine include "On the Cold War Front," and "A Review of the News," all calculated to add up to an indictment of the U.S. Government.

There is also a section on "New Books." The "impartial" reviews take on the following character.

"Fluoridation: Its Moral and Political Aspects," by F. B. Exner, etc.

"By this time, there must be a few cities and towns in the United States that have been harassed by emissaries from the malodorous hive of parasites and subversives that American taxpayers nourish under the official title of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

One third of a page in the June issue repeated over and over again in varying sizes of type, "Send American Opinion to a friend." At the bottom of the page was a sentence in agate type, "We are trying to burn it into your brain."

If this were all that was being burned into the brains of the Birchers it would be enough.

But this is only the start.

Mandatory for all-Birchers are the books "One Dozen Candles" which come boxed from Belmont, Mass., society headquarters, for the modest sum of $10.

Their titles speak for themselves.

"I Saw Poland Betrayed," "Nine Men Against America," "The Web of Subversion," "From Major Jordan's Diaries," "America's Retreat From Victory," "While You Slept," "The Pentagon Case," 'The Peoples Pottage," "Shanghai Conspiracy," "The Tragedy of Bolivia," "The Kohler Strike," and "Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler."

In addition, Welch has recently added 200 books and 42 periodicals to the approved list.

Among these is the pamphlet, "Inform," which recently declared 20,000 fully armed and trained Chinese Communist troops had been landed in Mexico.

LURID PAMPHLETS ARE CIRCULATED

There are more:

On my desk there is a 5-month accumulation of literature growing out of Birch meetings and allied groups where Birch members distributed pamphlets.

Interestingly enough, the most lurid are not on display at society meetings. This, again, appears to be a Welch technique of keeping the outer skirts of the society as clean as possible.

Among these pamphlets are such provocative titles as "The Hangman's Noose," "Traitors in the Pulpit," "Satan Goes to School," and "Unmasking the Deceiver."

None of the above are Welch publications but they are circulated freely among Birch members.

The strongest medicine comes in the Blue Book, the bible of the society.

Every new recruit is supposed to be indoctrinated by the Blue Book before he joins. In the passion of recruiting, this is often overlooked.

The Blue Book is essentially a transcript of the 2-day marathon speech Welch made before 11 industrialists when he formed the society in Indianapolis in December 1958.

Now in its eighth printing, it has had some sections deleted by a few cautious members of the 27-man advisory council of the society.

It includes footnotes which are a sort of running progress report.

Here is a sample of the Blue Book message:

"The truth I bring you is simple, incontrovertible, and deadly. It is that, unless we can reverse forces which now seem inexorable in their movement, you have only a few more years before the country in which you live will become four separate provinces in a worldwide Communist dominion ruled by police-state methods from the Kremlin. The map for their division and administration is already drawn. We are living, in America today, in a fool's paradise.

"When you come to the extent of Communist infiltration and influences right inside our own continental borders, the subject is entirely too large for us to do more than indicate a few pointers.

"The real significance of what I have just said lies in the fact that this door of betrayal is known to be wide open, and nobody—in Congress, in the executive branch, in the Pentagon itself—nobody even dares to try to close it. That is one indication of how powerful the Communist influence has now become in almost all of our Federal agencies."

PROJECTS ASSIGNED TO MEMBERS

To fight the Communist conspiracy, Welch draws up 10 to 12 projects each month which a member is to pursue "according to his own conscience."

If a member fails consistently to produce, he will, in Welch's words, "get his money back."

Some of these are long-range goals which are moved to standing agenda, such as "The Movement To Impeach Earl Warren" and "Get Us Out of the U.N."

Others are tied into current events and get the "hard sell."

One such project in February was presented in this fashion:

"(Project) 8. State Department Booklet No. 7277:

"The full title of this document is 'Freedom From War.' The U.S. program for general and complete disarmament. We said it was available from the Government Printing Office for 15 cents a copy. As soon as our bulletin appeared the booklet was allowed to go 'out of stock.' So we have reprinted it ourselves * * * as a public service. Copies are available in any quantity at seven for $1, directly from American Opinion, Belmont 78, Mass.

"For those who can afford it we urge that you buy enough and send one copy each to a member of your patriotic but still complacent friends.

"If they are not awakened by this official effort to wipe out our Armed Forces entirely and have us policed and 'protected' by a United Nations 'peace force'—then they will be asleep when Chinese troops come knocking on their door at 2 o'clock some morning * * * in a very few more years."

In May the National Council of Churches was under fire. In June, the alert was out for civil defense rationing forms.

"This preemergency hocuc-pocus serves beautifully the liberal line," wrote Welch. "It makes a lot of people think the emergency of war is just around the corner and fits in with the better Red than dead propaganda. Keep us posted as to all moves in this direction and start opposing them at the slightest sign of such developments."

An indication that Welch is gathering momentum in his attacks on the administration occurred in the July bulletin revolving around the Billie Sol Estes case.

"It is not widely enough known," he wrote, "but it was one of our members, a physician in Washington, D.C. * * * who was able to get Mary K. Jones released from a mental hospital.

"She was, you may remember, the secretary to an honest official who was becoming too disturbed by evidence coming into his knowledge of the Billie Sol Estes fraud. And she had been railroaded to a mental institution without the slightest reason except that she also knew too much about where the fiscal manipulations had been buried.

"Facing up squarely to this sinister danger * * * members of the society * * * should take the lead when necessary in making sure that any such incarceration of a neighbor—especially one known to be engaged in patriotic activities—is not buried in some mental institution."

A Kansas editor summed it up after Welch made a personal appearance in Wichita, one of the pilot cities for a number of Birch activities:

"The man who invented the roller coaster knew something basic about human nature; people love to be scared to death. That forgotten inventor-philosopher is the ancestor of Robert Welch."

Soviet Threat in Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a David Lawrence column entitled, "Kennedy Must React Quickly to Soviet Threat in Caribbean," which appeared in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, August 27, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID LAWRENCE SAYS: KENNEDY MUST REACT QUICKLY TO SOVIET THREAT IN CARIBBEAN

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet Government has flagrantly violated the Monroe Doctrine, which declares that no European government may establish a foothold or acquire any territory in the Western Hemisphere beyond what had already been established prior to 1823. This has been a basic principle of American foreign policy under all administrations since that time. Now, however, the Soviet Union has landed military personnel and equipment in large quantities in Cuba and will maintain a base under its control just 90 miles from this country.

President Kennedy has made it clear in public statements heretofore that, while the United States may consult with the Organization of American States, this country is nevertheless free at any time to take unilateral action to deal with any violations of the Monroe Doctrine.

The facts about the latest operations in Cuba have been verified to the satisfaction of the U.S. Department of State. Here is what actually has happened:

1. Between 3,000 and 5,000 Soviet personnel arrived in Cuba in 5 Soviet passenger vessels between July 27 and July 31.

2. Eleven cargo ships of the Soviet Union arrived during the same period and unloaded large crates at the ports of Havana, Matanzas, Bahia de Nipe, Bahia Honda, and Mariel. This was accomplished during the night hours under strict security conditions.

3. Soviet personnel did all the unloading.

4. Eyewitnesses saw empty trucks lifted into the holds of the various ships, where they were loaded and covered with tarpaulins. They were then hoisted back on to the docks and driven away by Soviet personnel.

SPOTTED BY PLANES

5. Eyewitnesses reported seeing tanks, communications trucks, and large truck-trailers carrying crates about 40 feet long. All indications are that military hardware and communications equipment formed a large part of the cargo. Crews of American airplanes, flying over the ships on their way to Cuba, also observed the military nature of the equipment.

6. Only one of the five Soviet passenger ships arrived openly and it was ceremoniously welcomed by Cuban Communist officials. It carried about 400 genuine agri-

cultural experts and technicians, who were heralded as coming to assist in the agricultural development of Cuba. The other four vessels, however, arrived secretly at night, and these carried Soviet military personnel.

7. At least 15 additional ships from the Communist bloc, containing more of the same kind of cargoes and personnel, are on their way to Cuba.

President Kennedy knew all about this when he referred briefly at his Wednesday press conference to the landing in Cuba of "supplies and technicians of a rather intensive quantity in recent weeks." He said they came from the Communist-bloc countries. Asked what the significance of it was, the President answered: "We are examining it now."

TO TRAIN ARMY

Actually, the Soviet military officers will train the Cuban army just as they have done in the case of the North Vietnam army in southeast Asia.

The Monroe Doctrine—first proclaimed during the administration of President Monroe because of efforts of Russia and other countries to colonize certain portions of the Western Hemisphere—declared, in effect, that any attempt by a European power to establish a foothold in any country in this hemisphere not already colonized would be regarded as an act of aggression and as "dangerous to our peace and safety."

The countries of Latin America, by resolution, in recent years have concurred in the Monroe Doctrine as a hemispheric policy, but the question of how it should be enforced has never been defined. That's why President Kennedy made it clear in a public statement last year that the United States feels free to proceed on its own if the Latin American States do not wish to join in any cooperative action against an aggressor.

The landing of military supplies and personnel is a natural sequel to the setting up of Communist Party personnel inside the civilian as well as the military departments of the Cuban Government itself.

From the standpoint of international law, the United States has every right to land troops, take possession of Havana, and occupy the country, unless the Cuban Government answers satisfactorily the request of the U.S. Government that all Soviet military personnel be sent home and that no further shipments of military supplies be sanctioned by the Havana authorities.

There may be some connection between the Berlin crisis and the Soviet activities in Cuba. It may be that Soviet Premier Khrushchev is testing the United States. If he finds the Washington Government soft and disinclined to take any countermeasures, the same procedure of infiltration by Soviet advisers and technicians may be followed in other countries in Latin America as part of a planned takeover of those countries. For this reason, it would indeed be a surprise if President Kennedy does not take advantage of the opportunity now afforded this country under international law and the Monroe Doctrine to safeguard the interests of the United States.

The 45th Anniversary of the Founding of the 35th Infantry Division of the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 19, several Members of Congress, including the Honorables PAUL C. JONES, of Missouri; W. R. HULL, JR., of Missouri; DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri; RICHARD ICHORD, of Missouri; WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas; and ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas, and myself attended the 45th anniversary of the founding of the 35th Infantry Division of the National Guard on the Liberty Memorial Mall at Kansas City, Mo. This division is made up of National Guard units in Missouri and Kansas. The 35th Division was organized on August 25, 1917, at Camp Doniphan, Okla. At that time, 14,282 men of that new 35th Division were from Missouri and 9,781 from Kansas. All were volunteer guardsmen or militia as they have been called since the States first raised troops for the Nation back in 1775.

The principal address of this observation was by Maj. Gen. Charles H. Browne, Jr., commanding general of the 35th Infantry Division, who spoke on the south steps of the Liberty Memorial Mall in Kansas City, Mo., facing officers and soldiers of the 35th Division and their friends. The most illustrious alumnus of the 35th Division and a former officer, former President Harry S. Truman, was unable to attend because of previous commitments, but appropriate mention was made that Mr. Truman is providing space for a permanent 35th Division Memorial Room in the Truman Library at Independence, Mo. It was pointed out by the General that "Captain Harry" of Battery D, 129th Field Artillery, was present and participated in the organization of the 35th Division on August 25, 1917.

Everyone present agreed the ceremony was a very impressive observation of the founding of the division and also an interesting, pleasant, and most significant afternoon for the officers, men, and friends of the 35th Division, which is the Missouri-Kansas National Guard.

United States-Canadian Lumber Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on August 27, negotiating teams representing the United States and Canada will meet in Ottawa for preliminary discussion of problems connected with the rapid rise of lumber imports into this country. The negotiators face a difficult task because of the close economic interrelationship between lumber producers in the two countries.

I have just received a most penetrating analysis of the United States-Canada lumber situation written by Mr. Dean Sherman, editor of Forest Industries magazine. The article is scheduled for publication in the September issue of this magazine, which is widely recognized as one of the forest products' industries most responsible spokesmen. I ask unanimous consent to include a portion of the text of the article in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES-CANADIAN SITUATION

Forest Industries has talked with people in the industry on both sides of the border to dig out the facts and to learn their thinking. The situation is no bed of roses, but it is not an impossible one. What does matter is whether the industry is ready to face the facts and jointly multiply its efforts. The industry must take the lead, for there is a far greater potential ahead of it now than was ever ahead of it during the years just gone by. There are, in the United States, soothsayers, saints and sinners who play a part in the problem—and they must help solve it.

Any approach to lumber industry problems must start with the realization that we are fast approaching economic unity between the United States and Canada. We have to. We know it—so does Canada. Mutual protection, survival and economics are at stake. Many say never, but they are wrong. Three to five years could see it a fact, particularly if Britain goes into the European Common Market.

THE BIG DILEMMA

We cannot morally nor economically tie off Canada in a corner with prohibitive restrictions. She is the United States biggest customer—nearly a quarter of her total goods come from United States—and, geographically, we share many like resources under two flags.

Imports

Last year her imports from the United States were $700 million greater than her exports to us. She has lost a considerable share of her United Kingdom markets to European nations. Canada's 92-cent dollar and austerity program were thus imposed in self defense, while the United States has pumped in a billion dollars to help prop up Canada's dollar, help keep it from going lower.

The U.S. lumber and pulp and paper industries have a $1½- to $2-billion investment in Canada's wood industries. An estimated 50 percent of Canadian forest industries are partially or wholly owned by U.S. companies—a fact often obscured in the controversy concerning Canadian lumber imports.

Though there are no confirming facts, it is variously estimated that from 50 to 90 percent of British Columbia's several hundred interior mills are partially or wholly financed by U.S. eastern wholesalers.

During the past 20 years, most of the big independent lumber operations in British Columbia have been merged into larger companies, most of which are wholly or partially owned by U.S. capital.

Eastern Canada is pretty much a pulp and paper story. Of the 32 leading pulp and paper companies in Canada, 10 are Canadian controlled, 14 are controlled by U.S. companies, 3 are owned by United Kingdom interests and one by Swedish interests. The balance are companies in which U.S. capital is partially invested.

Generally, the situation has been welcomed by Canada in spite of any headlines to the contrary. U.S. investment in Canadian wood industries has expanded integrated operations, increased employment for Canadians, improved operating efficiency and created a stability that did not exist when larger companies were not affiliated with pulp and paper operations.

More than half of Canada's plywood plants, her hardboard and particle-board plants are affiliated with U.S. companies.

If the United States cannot afford to place Canada in an unfavorable position, neither can U.S. industry go beyond a safety point in allowing imports to jeopardize her own economy. Somehwere there is a give-and-take happy ground. It can be solved by working together on the basis of sound economics and not by political doubletalk. Economists of both countries point out that the same situation exists among many industries and they spotlight the fact that steps to economic unity are already well formed.

THESE ARE THE FACTS

The many-sided industry problems have been accumulating for years. The sin of indifference—some say lack of convictions—is where the finger should be pointing. We've been dumped flat on our uncushioned floor of reality, screamed foul, and now seek to soothsay our way out.

We've relegated to Government many of its powers to act for us—we've allowed unfavorable decisions to compound within Federal timber agencies and up until now the industry has not risen as one to try to correct them. We've believed in the talk about market consciousness, product development and promotion but have done too little about it. Business generally has allowed political high places to make "profit" appear as sin and business to become unhallowed. Labor has allowed self-seeking power pushers to outmaneuver economic sense. Now we look at the influx of imported produces and can see how our own industries could be drained because of our present day cost floor. We lagged when we should have led—now we are disenchanted.

A healthy sign in the lumber industry is the fact that now it is ready to move as one.

WHAT THE INDUSTRY SEEKS

1. The lumber manufacturers seek to set up an atmosphere where they may have equal opportunity to compete for our own markets with any foreign producers. This also reflects costs of raw material, labor, transportation, development and marketing. The present solution proposed by the lumber industry is either quotas on shipments of lumber from Canada or FHA loans requiring use of U.S. manufactured building materials. Neither will solve the problem and is at best a temporary crutch.

2. The industry seeks better and more equitable relations between itself and the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, who control 60 percent of the commercial forest areas in the West.

There is much justification for the industry's raising its voice in protest of many of the regulations and practices that have been carried out in the name of public interest—dozens of which were attested in recent congressional hearings. But it would be unfair to say this without realizing that the industry is not itself without sin.

The fact is, there has been need for modernizing change to meet present conditions. This has nothing to do with personalities. Rather it is a compounding of practices that have not changed to keep up.

The causes are probably lack of effective communications, with no one really listening to the protests of bad practices nor doing anything about them.

What is sought now is for both the Forest Service and the industry to rid themselves of obsolescence in order to arrive at businesslike and friendly working relations, realizing the interdependency and the fact that the industry is a customer, accounting for 90 percent of national forest income.

The industry believes the Forest Service has not been acting in the best public interests by seeking to wring the last dollar out of every sale and that it should first consider need for community stabilization.

Lumbermen would have the Forest Service put up the full allowable cut in every forest every year. This would allow industry to plan ahead and relieve the Forest Service from criticism that holding back on sales is creating a false shortage that contributes to high bid prices. It would not, however, stop natural attrition of plants, replacement in the marketplace by other products, or prevent more mills from going into business.

The industry likes to see Forest Service consult industry on major problems and and practices as partners in business. The Forest Service might find industry willing and able to help work out many of today's knotty problems through mutual cooperation, and it would like to see all forest and regional forest advisory committees include topflight industry men and have them consult on major problems, policies, and practices beyond multiple use. It would like to see regular reports made to the industry. This would not be a rubberstamp committee, but a real working group in each case.

While the average bid price is said to have declined by 30 percent during the past 3 years, this does not take into account the further cost of roads, slash disposal, marking, and the quality of the timber itself. There are many problems in this direction, including road specifications, that need revision. Industry would like sales put up in the spring when they can be worked and not have to tie up its capital over winter seasons.

These are but a few of the problems which could be mutually solved if better working communications were established and if the Forest Service realistically looks at the industry as a customer.

Changes are needed—not political changes—but constructive approaches to the constantly changing conditions.

THE JONES ACT

That paragraph of the Jones Act requiring use of American ships to carry cargo between American ports is one of those laws that has become a hindrance rather than a help. With intercoastal shipping already reduced to but a few ships, the Jones Act is a major block preventing many western lumber cargo shippers from being competitive with imports on our eastern seaboard. Its elimination would help. And there is no need for economically unsound subsidies which some in governmental high places would like to hand out as a solution.

THE CANADIAN VIEWPOINTS

The Canadian lumbermen's approach to the solution is also confused. Obviously they can do nothing about U.S. laws, regulations, or practices. Their own economy is in difficulty, though the lumber producers are doing fairly well in American markets.

They believe the lumber industries on both sides must look to themselves for ideas and initiative and that governments should cooperate and assist, not make it difficult. British Columbia operators believe their own system of timber licensing works well, precludes excessive bidding and does provide a fair degree of stability. Actually, on open timber sales, Canadian timber prices have been bid up equal to many U.S. sales. Their boom prices are essentially the same.

They are opposed to anything that would place quotas or restrictions on lumber in the U.S. markets which are so important to them. Only through wood products has British Columbia a chance to contribute her share to Canada's economy.

Canadian producers see one of the greatest cost factors as that of allowing plants to become obsolete. "Failure to keep up is almost sudden death" on either side of the line. They are replacing equipment and are modernizing to stay competitive.

They believe United States and Canadian lumbermen should stop wrangling, stop looking through knotholes and lift their sights toward world markets where great opportunities exist. Canadian men are traveling in foreign countries and joining in with trade missions. They have established offices in England. Yet, they fail to see U.S. producers actively pursuing those markets.

They would cooperate with U.S. lumbermen in seeking world markets. Their question is: "with whom would we cooperate?" Generally, most U.S. plants cut for domestic markets. They have not wanted to export. They do not cut right sizes. They point out that cutting for export markets is a full-time job, not a sideline. Mills must be dependable suppliers of quality products and export sizes. They cannot treat foreign markets as a convenience.

Many Canadian operators believe that there are world markets much greater than those in the United States and Canada combined.

They agree that the U.S. operator has his problems but do not believe (other than in the reduced dollar value) that they have contributed as much to the cause of the situation as is claimed. Until the past 2 or 3 years there was need for all the Canadian lumber imported into the United States, in addition to the total supplied by U.S. producers. They are also quick to point out that a large share of the Canadian lumber production is produced by companies owned by American operators or who share in plant ownerships.

It is the conviction of many British Columbia lumbermen that economic union between Canada and the United States is already in the making and must become a reality within the foreseeable future. They would welcome it and feel conflicting problems could be worked out.

WHAT U.S. OPERATORS THINK

There must be equal rules applying to both sides of the line with equal opportunities for both. This probably summarizes the major thinking of U.S. lumber manufacturers.

They reason further: Canada is one of our biggest customers. We have need for economic partnership for protection and welfare of both countries. International ownerships of industry is good and should be encouraged both ways. Many of the larger operators feel there should be no restrictive barriers and we must learn to adjust—to make better products, so we may compete anywhere in the world. However, they are certain that market availability must be on equal terms. Lumber economists point out that quotas are the only protection against devaluated dollars.

Lumbermen dependent upon Forest Service timber look at their problem as one of industry responsibility. "It is neighbor bidding against neighbor for Government timber—forcing the price so high that we bid the profit out at the source of raw material." It is this situation in their minds that dominates their thinking. It is a major one, needing correction. These lumbermen want timber agencies to put up full allowable cuts and be realistic about road costs and specifications so that their raw material is kept at a reasonable figure. It is largely through raw material costs where they see the only opportunity of equalizing costs and keeping them competitive.

Many say they have no fear of Canadian exports. "U.S. lumber is better and would be preferred in the markets if we can remain competitive and still make a profit."

We found all lumber operators looking for means of modernizing their plants, cutting operating costs, finding means of reducing logging costs, searching for more economical equipment that will do more jobs better and faster.

No Such Thing as Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have asked unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record and include therein appropriate comments from representative newspapers in my district.

The Council Bluffs Nonpareil has produced many of these patriotic articles, through the capable authorship of Editor A. M. Piper and his associate, C. W. McManamy.

Today I would like to insert a recent column composed by the latter, and invite the attention of the House to one especially cogent proposal, namely: Let's call all these Government disbursements by their correct name—the "taxpayers' money"—rather than by this detached umbrella phrase, "Federal funds." We don't have any Federal funds. Only a handful of programs pay for themselves, and they are Government monopolies, such as passports and the like.

So, let's adopt Mac's suggestion on this. Let each project be identified as an item being underwritten by the taxpayer himself, not by some bottomless treasury which somehow seems like somebody else's money.

The column follows:

[From Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil, Aug. 24, 1962]

NO SUCH THING AS FEDERAL FUNDS

(By C. W. McManamy)

Webster says that a cliche is a "stereotyped expression." He then defines stereotyped as "hackneyed or conventional." Finally he says that a misnomer is a "misapplied name or designation."

So it is that the old cliche "Federal funds" is a misnomer of the first water.

Unfortunately it follows, as Oliver Wendell Holmes so aptly pointed out that "A catchword long enough repeated can defy analysis for 100 years."

Through the years and through the repeated use of the term "Federal funds" people generally have come to disassoicate themselves and their money from such so-called Federal funds.

The fact of the matter is of course that there is no such thing as Federal funds. The money handled, spent, or misspent, by the Federal Government is your money and my money, the people's money, taxpayer's money.

Why can't people see this?

Hardly a day goes past that we do not read where this or that project, usually a very costly project, will be paid for with Federal funds. Would that not mean something a bit different to most of us if it read "will be paid for with taxpayers money."

Time and time again we hear the suggestion, Federal funds are available to pay, or help pay, for this or that local project. Would we feel quite as free and easy about approving such projects if we said instead some of our tax money will come back from Washington to help pay for this.

Quite frequently we hear this acceptance of so-called Federal funds justified with the excuse "if we don't take it someone else will."

This is pretty tricky reasoning. Using the same formula you could justify holding up a bank or robbing your neighbor. If you don't do it someone else is likely to get the loot sooner or later.

An even worse aspect of this "false doctrine of Federal funds" is the apathy with which most of us watch the dissipation of this money, our money remember, to the four corners of the earth under the banner of foreign aid.

How many of you contribute to the foreign missionary effort of your church, and when you do how handsomely do you contribute. I suspect the answer would be "not too many and not too much."

This isn't because you are not thoughtful or generous but rather that you have other more immediate interests that deserve your money.

With foreign aid though your money is being sent abroad in astonishing amounts. By and large you and your country reap the negative benefits when the results are poor, which all too often they have been. On the other hand such good as comes from this spending is almost always credited to the Government which has purportedly spent its money in this cause.

Soviets Land in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Soviets Land in Cuba," which appeared in the August 27, 1962, edition of the Hammond Times.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOVIETS LAND IN CUBA

In his column from Washington today, David Lawrence discloses a State Department report that the Soviet Government has landed 5,000 technicians and a large quantity of cargo that appears to be military equipment, in Cuba.

This, points out Mr. Lawrence, constitutes a clearcut violation of the Monroe Doctrine which has been a keystone of our Western Hemisphere policy since 1823.

In that year, President James Monroe notified the world that the United States felt and would thenceforth maintain that "the American continents, by the free and independent condition that they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

This of course was announcement of a determination to protect the newly formed South American Republics and the independent empire of Brazil from any attempt by European dynasties to reclaim them.

But in 1823 Secretary of State John Q. Adams also notified the Russian czar that his proclamation forbidding fishing for 100 miles off the coast of Alsaka, then nominally a Russian possession, would be contested by the United States. Some 40 years later, we bought Alaska from Russia.

The news that the Soviets have landed a large force of what can be surmised to be military technicians in Cuba to teach the Castro dictatorship's pawns the use of Soviet weapons shipped into the island, is disheartening. Mr. Lawrence believes the action is a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine and that the United States is justified, under international law, in intervening in Cuba with military force.

The occurrence would seem to give added weight to a suggestion that Senator Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana, has been making for some time. Senator Capehart has made no secret of his belief that we should intervene militarily in Cuba.

It would seem that the time is now right to act on Senator Capehart's suggestion, particularly in view of the fact that an important American naval base has been maintained by treaty on Cuba for some 60 years. Are we to wait until Castro's Soviet-reinforced army takes over Guantanamo Bay Naval Base before we act? Are we waiting for Castro to get the rockets ready, in place to fire at us, before we move against this threat to the Monroe Doctrine?

More and more, it appears that Senator Capehart is right in his suggestion that the only way to get rid of Castro and his Communist regime, before it builds up a Red fort 90 miles from our shores, is to take some U.S. forces and move in.

A Report on the Social Studies Institute Program, "Africa: Images and Realities"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call your attention to a unique and vital summer educational program of African studies for able high school students sponsored by the St. Paul public schools and the Junior League of St. Paul. Persons in government, education, and the foundations might well give careful study to this program that has served to provide a depth study of African problems, increase the level of public information about Africa, and serve the national interest on the international scene in Africa.

The unique Oxford-type study program provided motivational conditions that held student interest 4 hours per day, 5 days each week for 6 weeks from June 11 to July 20. I also wish to note that public information levels were increased during this time. This was brought about through the cooperation of several organizations and agencies. WCCO–TV presented 31 programs on Africa. KUOM broadcast several half-hour programs taped at the summer school. The St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch gave increased coverage to African subjects. The St. Paul public libraries provided a special section on Africa. The St. Paul Gallery and the Science Museum each presented special African exhibitions.

While the program served the educational needs of able students and stimulated public interest in African affairs, it also served the national interest. This is pointed up by the fact that many stories about the summer school were carried by the 33 posts of the U.S. Information Service in Africa and that Voice of America has prepared taped broadcasts originating in St. Paul that will be carried to the millions of Africa.

I note with pleasure that we in mid-America and particularly in St. Paul, Minn., lead the way in presenting a depth program of African studies that not only increases the knowledge of students but also serves the public and national interest.

Others will undoubtedly follow this example and rightly so as there is a great need for us to learn as much as possible about the newly emergent African nations and the peoples of that great continent.

The program was designed and directed by John Mather of the St. Paul public schools. Persons seeking detailed information should write to: John Mather, director, Social Studies Institute, St. Paul Public Schools, 659 City Hall, St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. Mather's report follows:

A REPORT ON THE SOCIAL STUDIES INSTITUTE PROGRAM "AFRICA: IMAGES AND REALITIES"

(By John Mather)

The multifaceted Social Studies Institute program "Africa: Images and Realities" has attracted considerable attention in the last few months and particularly during the operational phase, June 11 to July 20. Africanists, educators, representatives of the U.S. Government, representatives of African nations, students, and laymen have expressed interest in the program. This seems to be due to the fact that many special concerns have been tied together in the educational and public affairs sides of the institute.

Sources of interest were provided by the depth program of African studies for high school students, the Oxford-type independent study program, the use of the problems approach to learning, the team teaching operation, and a public information program.

The announced purpose of the institute was to provide a quality educational program that would combine training for the intensive development of intellectual skills of able students with the development of knowledge about Africa. A secondary purpose, though not announced, was that of increasing the level of general public information about Africa through the press, radio, television, public affairs programs, and special exhibitions.

An explanation of the program that goes beyond the usual newspaper account may be useful to interested persons.

THE PROGRAM

The program was in operation 4 hours a day, 5 days each week, for 6 weeks. The daily schedule was divided into five blocks of time: I, section meetings; II, lecture for 100 students; III, seminars; IV, tutorial period; V, laboratory period.

Emphasis was placed upon the development of independent study. Unhampered by the ordinary restrictions and relatively structured procedures of the secondary school, students were free to make their own choices and pursue their own study and research interests.

The only requirements placed upon students were that they attend lectures, belong to a seminar, write a research paper of recognized quality and be prepared to take whatever examinations might be assigned. During the tutorial and laboratory periods they were free to do research, meet with staff tutors, view films, listen to taped lectures, meet with African staff members, go to the St. Paul Public Library, visit the St. Paul Gallery or Science Museum, and attend small group lectures.

The subject areas covered during the 6 weeks were: "An Overview of African Problems," "African Cultures in Transition," "Needs of the Emerging African Nations," "Political Change in Africa," and "Africa in the International Setting."

High motivational conditions were created by a team of outstanding teachers, African staff members, para-professional workers, guest lecturers from colleges and universities, and lecturers from the Peace Corps, the U.S. Information Agency, and the U.S. Department of State. The members of the St. Paul Public School faculty were John Mather, Zarm Keljik, Kenneth Osvold, Katherine McKenzie, Donald Moore, and Richard Harmon. The African faculty included James Shiroya, Kenya; Mary Gichuru, Kenya; Boniface Obichere, Nigeria; Assibi Abudu, Ghana; and Mario Nzuwah, Southern Rhodesia. Para-professional workers were provided by the Junior League. Mrs. Henry Cowie and Mrs. Platt Walker organized the volunteer project. The college and university lecturers were Dr. Josef Mestenhauser, Dr. Paul Cashman, Dr. Wm. Rogers, Dr. Alan Merriam, Dr. St. Clair Drake, Dr. Roy Sieber, Dr. Gwendolen Carter, Dr. Wesley St. John. Lecturers from the African Embassies included Mr. Wm Tsitsiwu of the Embassy of Ghana, and Mr. O. Adeniji of the Embassy of Nigeria. Lecturers from the Peace Corps were Mr. Kenneth Coffey, assistant chief of the professional and technical division, and Mr. Richard Ware, Director of Programs for West Africa. The one lecturer from the U.S. Information Agency was Dr. John Noon. The lecturers from the U.S. Department of State were Mr. Richard Sanger, Deputy Director of the Office for Eastern and Southern African Affairs, Dr. Robert Baum, Deputy Director for the Office of Research and Analysis for Africa, and Mr. Wayne Fredericks, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

Several tests may be applied to the program to determine whether or not it was a success. Tests were in fact applied and the students did very well but the other results are probably better indicators. One is that students gave up their summer vacations in order to participate in a rigorous college level program. Their notes were excellent and their research papers were outstanding. Further positive residual effects can be found in what happened in the community. A high level of enthusiasm for African studies has been generated among groups that make up part of the St. Paul public.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Many adults came to hear the morning lectures and the evening programs of the institute. A large number of people have visited the exhibitions at the St. Paul Gallery and the Science Museum.

WCCO–TV presented 30 half-hour programs and one documentary on the institute, the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch increased coverage on Africa, and KUOM carried several half-hour programs. While it is difficult to assess the effect the news coverage and the programs at least it is known that a large public audience was reached by electrical and printed mediums. Some responsive enthusiastic letters have been sent by interested persons.

SERVING THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Several news stories and pictures have been carried by 33 USIS posts in Africa and Voice of America has broadcast a number of programs taped at the institute. A photographic exhibition of the pictures taken at the institute is being readied for use in Africa.

THE FUTURE

The Social Studies Institute program of African studies will continue in St. Paul for at least two more summers. The director is currently seeking ways to expand the program.

Tribute to Alonzo Stagg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President—

> I may go on forever, because statistics show that few men die after the age of 100.

With these words, Amos Alonzo Stagg, America's patriarch of sports and football's greatest teacher, reached the century mark. Born in 1862 to a cobbler, this gentleman rose to a fame and respect that few men will ever achieve.

Stagg's career is well known and there is no good for me to retell his life's history. Perhaps, however, one incident ought to be brought out which shows the dedication and humility of the former ministerial student. While coaching at Chicago his salary never exceeded $8,500 a year. Yet, with this modest salary, he turned down an offer of $350 for a single speech because it would require him to miss a day of football practice with his squad. Not many men in our materialistic world would have flatly turned down the offer as he did. This is the quality of the man which the world is honoring this year.

A campaign is currently underway to raise $1 million for a center of physical fitness in Stagg's hometown of Stockton, Calif. This worthwhile project will stand as a testimony to one of sport's greatest personalities. But he does not need any testimony to be remembered, for the thousands of players whom he coached can never forget him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD which speaks of Mr. Stagg's achievements on reaching his 100th birthday. It is "Football's Great Is 100 Today" from the New Brunswick, N.J., Daily Home News of August 16.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOTBALL'S GREAT IS 100 TODAY

As the birthplace of intercollegiate football and the site of the proposed Hall of Fame of the National Football Foundation, it is only fitting that we, in the New Brunswick area, salute today America's patriarch of sports, Amos Alonzo Stagg, as he reaches his 100th birthday.

Twelve testimonial dinners are scheduled across the country to honor this man revered as a great athlete who became even greater as a dedicated teacher of men. He was among the first to be selected for the Football Hall of Fame as player, coach, and "the game's greatest teacher."

In West Orange, where Stagg was born the son of a cobbler in 1862, a week-long celebration is being held to honor its own centennial as well as that of its famed son. It was a teacher in this little New Jersey town who saw him as a fine student and outstanding athlete and encouraged him to enter Yale. Today he is Eli's oldest alumnus.

A preministerial student, Stagg went out for football almost by mistake. With a classmate, he had intended to try rowing, but a chance meeting with other freshmen sent the group to the football field instead. He became a member of Walter Camp's first All-America team as an end in 1889.

After coaching the first two football teams at Springfield College, the president of the University of Chicago, his former teacher of Bible at Yale, offered Stagg a job as the first director of athletics at the new institution, coaching all sports. He was head football coach for 41 years until reaching the mandatory retirement age.

Five of Stagg's Chicago teams had undefeated seasons. His elevens won seven Big Ten titles. After Chicago, he became head coach at College of the Pacific until 1946. He remained active in football, as advisory coach at a west coast junior college until 2 years ago.

Stagg well knew the value of money although it never played an important part in his life. In his 41 years at Chicago, his salary never exceeded $8,500 a year, yet once he turned down an offer of $350 for a single speech because it would mean missing a day of football practice with his squad.

Although Stagg had studied for the ministry, he felt he did not have the right speaking voice and recently recalled, "I felt especially called to preach but I decided to do it on the athletic field. I also liked the roughness and excitement of practice and later the game. Football was full of vitality and was very stimulating to me."

Football has been good to Stagg, and he to it. The Amos Alonzo Stagg Foundation is currently raising $1 million for a center of physical fitness in his hometown of Stockton, Calif. What better memorial to one of the grid game's brightest figures. Maybe the word "memorial" ought not to be used because Stagg recently said:

"I may go on forever, because statistics show that few men die after the age of 100."

Matson Shows Positive, Constructive Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the unsolvable problems of the merchant marine. Matson Navigation Co., is to be commended for embarking on a major program of solving some of those difficult problems, including those of labor-management relations and fleet and service improvements. The following articles from the Honolulu Star Bulletin of August 21, 1962, report on that program and merit consideration:

Powell Says Firm Will Spend $9 Million, Ask No Rate Increase—Compulsory Arbitration Eyed by Matson

Compulsory arbitration—with the public having a "strong say in the decisions"—must be considered in settling future labor disputes in the shipping industry, Matson Navigation Co.'s president, Stanley Powell, Jr., said today.

Speaking before several hundred Matson customers, Powell vowed that the shipping line plans no request for another freight rate increase in the future.

At the same time, Powell pledged an investment of almost $9 million in a fleet improvement plan.

"I am fully aware of the historic feelings in Hawaii against arbitration of wage disputes," Powell said at the Hawaiian Village Hotel.

"And I once thought I would never see the day when compulsory arbitration might be included among possible alternative courses of action attractive to management.

"So long as Hawaii's unique dependence on ocean shipping continues to be a fundamental charactertistic of its economy, such a drastic solution must be among those considered."

He added: "A very desirable product of compulsory arbitration would be that the public would be given a strong say in the decisions which directly affect freight rates."

Powell said Matson has no intention of seeking another rate increase at this time.

"We are firm in this intention even though we took on higher costs in settling the dispute with the unlicensed offshore unions and the recent wage reopenings in longshore contracts on the west coast and in Hawaii," he said.

He said Matson is confident of its ability to absorb the first $1.5 million of added costs through increased operating efficiency.

"We are hopeful of doing likewise the following years—but there is no guarantee," he said.

The cost to Matson to take the 12½- and 10-percent rate cases to the Federal Maritime Commission was a quarter of a million dollars, Powell said.

"Obviously," he added, "we would welcome the opportunity for a mutual examination of ways for Matson and the people of Hawaii to work out a more satisfactory, and less costly, solution to this problem."

He said, "That opportunity would appear to be at hand.

"The recent decision by the FMC set forth a broad set of ground rules under which Matson will have to operate in the years ahead.

"These rules can also be guidelines for reaching a better understanding of freight rates than was possible before."

Powell said the company's books are "open books to your public officials.

"They know as much about the Matson operation as anyone on our staff."

But, he continued, "this doesn't mean there is always agreement between us.

"But we have reached the point of mutual understanding over the facts."

Powell said he does not seek Hawaii's indorsement of everything Matson will propose or decide must be done.

"But the future of Hawaii's ocean commerce will not be well served by a continuation of the unnecessary, costly contention before the FMC on every change in the level of freight rates," Powell said.

He added: "I give you Matson's pledge to work with those responsible in the State toward an equitable solution to this fundamental problem."

MORE STABILITY

Matson will continue to develop specialized equipment that will permit more stability in its operating costs, Powell said.

"We call it a fleet improvement program," he said.

"It calls for an investment by Matson of almost $9 million," Powell added.

He explained that this money will be spent to expand Matson's capacity to handle container cargo.

"When the new program is in full force," he said, "we will be able to carry in containers 65 percent of all Hawaii's cargo capable of such movement.

"This compares to our present capacity of only 40 percent achieved through an investment of some $18 million to date."

The fleet improvement program as approved, he said, will mean:

1. Four million two hundred thousand dollars which will purchase 1,045 new cargo containers, 25 percent of them reefer containers.
2. One million three hundred thousand dollars which will be invested in providing cargo container service to Hawaii, Maui and Kauai.

NEED GUARANTEE

The labor relations record of the maritime industry, Powell said, suggests strongly that voluntary methods of solving maritime labor disputes offer little guarantee to Hawaii of uninterrupted ocean commerce.

"Such a guarantee must be fundamental for Hawaii in any long-range solution," he added.

President Kennedy has appointed Professor James Healy of Harvard, who played a key role in recent maritime settlements, to make a study of the collective bargaining aspects of the maritime industry.

Powell said Healy "should be made abundantly aware of Hawaii's immense stake in remedial labor legislation that would eliminate interruptions to its basic form of transport.

"But it will be up to us—Hawaii and Matson—to see that he is."

He pointed out that "achievement of a stable, uninterruptible shipping system is perhaps the most critical problem facing the State.

"No other problem should have higher priority in relation to Hawaii's future growth."

Powell thanked shippers for the support Matson received during the hearings on States Steamship Co.'s application to increase calls to Hawaii from 26 a year to 52.

"We will continue to resist the onslaughts of subsidized carriers which view Hawaii as a desirable byproduct along their essential foreign trade routes.

" 'Cream-skimming' of cargo might be desirable for these carriers but it would be hurtful to the Hawaiian economy," he said.

If States' application is granted, Matson may have to consider seriously either to increase freight rates or a cutback in service to maintain a reasonable return on investment, he said.

Matson Plans To Use Automated Freighter

It's practical to operate a Matson C–3 freighter between the west coast and Hawaii with a crew of 15 instead of 51, Stanley Powell, Jr., said here today.

A study of the economies with automated freighters shows that this is possible, he said.

"And the principal beneficiary of the reduction of shipboard operating costs through inevitable automation will be the users of our service—the State of Hawaii," Powell said.

"We are firmly convinced it can be brought about with a minimum of impact on the current seagoing work force, and a maximum benefit to the Hawaiian economy," he said.

Asked how soon Matson plans to put such an automated freighter on the Hawaii run, Powell replied that the target date is 3 years hence.

An automated freighter can be put into service much sooner but Matson is going to work with the offshore unions and reach some understanding with them.

This negotiation will be carried out during the 3-year life of the present labor contract, he said, "hoping an agreement can be consummated" by the time the contract expires.

James M. Dooley, president of the AFL–CIO Maritime Trades Council of Honolulu, had no comment on the Matson plan.

"Any statement on future negotiations between the union and Matson must come from Morris Weisberger," Dooley said.

Weisberger is secretary of the Sailors Union of the Pacific and was the chief negotiator for the three offshore unions in recently concluded negotiations with the west coast shipping companies.

Landing of Troops in Cuba by Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Are We Neutral?" which appeared in the August 28, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Are We Neutral?

It is incredible that the U.S. Government should stand idly by while the Soviet Union lands troops in Cuba, only 90 miles from our shores.

Nevertheless, that is just what is happening. Government officials reported this weekend that some 3,000 to 5,000 Soviet troops and military technicians had landed in Cuba. The Kennedy administration, UPI reported, is "watching the situation closely."

That is precisely what the U.S. Government has been doing about Castro for 5 years and more—watching him. We have watched him undermine an anti-Communist government, build a Communist despotism and erect a menace to our security off the coast of Florida. Now we are watching him take aboard Soviet troops.

It is time to stop watching, and to start acting. The Monroe Doctrine, which declares that no European power shall be allowed to establish its influence in the Western Hemisphere, is being turned into a mockery. It is time that it was enforced.

The U.S. Government should have imposed a total blockade of Cuba long ago. It should impose one now, to stop the further landing of Soviet troops, and to cut off the influx of supplies to those already there. It should impose a total embargo against all imports to the Communist island, until Castro and his Soviet mercenaries are starved out.

It is disturbing to note that the sole action our Government has taken in the Cuban situation in recent days has not been against Castro, but against anti-Communist Cuban forces in Florida. The Justice Department has pounced on a group of Cuban exiles who engineered a shelling of the Havana waterfront Friday night; the Coast Guard has impounded the launches allegedly used in the action. This hostile move toward Castro, it is said, may have been a violation of the neutrality laws.

This is, in our opinion, nonsense. Is the United States neutral toward Castro? Is it neutral toward the fact that Soviet troops are flooding into Cuba? Are we neutral toward the possibility that missile bases can be constructed there putting Florida in danger of attack? If we are, the Monroe Doctrine is already in the ash can, and America has thrown in its chips in the struggle against communism.

The United States should not be hindering the Cuban exiles who shelled Havana. It should take all necessary official steps to help them—just as it should have helped, but did not, the ragged invaders who were cut down in the Bay of Pigs in April 1961. Our invocations of neutrality, when we are in every way that counts at war with Cuba and with world communism, are precisely the sort of ritualistic piety which has been yielding the world to communism.

It is noteworthy that, according to copious testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, our Government did not enforce the neutrality laws against Castro when his minions were operating freely out of Florida and Texas. Official concern for those statutes arose only after Castro was in power, and the people violating them were his anti-Communist opponents.

For the sake of America, the Kennedy administration should devote less attention to proving its neutrality toward communism in Cuba, and more to enforcing the Monroe Doctrine.

Secretary McNamara's Whitewash, Incorporated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Congressional Record the editorial from King Features Syndicate, 235 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y., released August 24, 1962, by Ralph de Toledano, "Secretary McNamara's Whitewash, Incorporated":

Secretary McNamara's Whitewash, Incorporated

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Whitwash, Incorporated, which presumably shutup shop after the exposure of the Truman scandals, is back in business. This week's acting president in charge of coverup is Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. He achieved this position by cutting off all procurement information from Representative Earl Wilson, a fighting Hoosier, who uncovered Pentagon practices which are costing the taxpayer millions of dollars. This information is not classified and goes as a matter of course to technical magazine, Government agencies, and other Congressmen. But Mr. McNamara doesn't want Mr. Wilson to have it.

Why? Because Mr. Wilson has an unpleasant habit of reading it, checking, and then reporting to the Congress and the people. He has shown repeatedly that by awarding defense contracts on a sole source basis, rather than by competitive bidding, the Pentagon has violated its own regulations. And he has forced a reluctant House Armed Services subcommittee to denounce these practices and to condemn them as being of "doubtful legality and irregular origins."

To make matters even worse, Representative Wilson has been attempting to alert the press to what he characterizes as a "brazen, shocking, and callous attempt" by the Pentagon to harass Robert S. Snoyer, a Santa Monica, Calif., defense contractor who had the bad taste to cooperate with the FBI in the arrest of two high-ranking civilian Signal Corps officials. They are changed with accepting $1,500 in bribes, and Mr. Snoyer will be the key witness against them.

It has been Representative Wilson's practice to scrutinize Pentagon releases on new contracts, to take them up with the watchdog General Accounting Office for irregularities, and then to inform the Congress. In cutting him off from receiving these notices, Secretary McNamara has said that the "administrative burden" was too great.

But Mr. Wilson has been receiving the releases for well over a year. The only burden involved is to stuff one more copy into an envelope and mail it to the Indiana Congressman. By cutting Mr. Wilson off, the Pentagon limits him to quarterly reports in which the information sought is buried in overall figures—and which will reach him after the wasteful sole source contracts have been consummated and are already being carried out, thereby forestalling preventive action.

Representative Wilson is not going to take this lying down, though in a Democratic-controlled House of Representatives, he can get little cooperation. He says of Secretary McNamara's arrogant order to shut him off from vital information: "We are hitting the tender spots. We are uncovering the waste, the inefficiency, and the corruption. They are trying to stifle my work."

And he adds: "If this sort of action is typical of the man who has been called the 'whiz kid' of the Defense Department, then I think it is time he went back to the Ford Motor Co.—and we got a Secretary of Defense who will cooperate with the Congress and who will work for the best interests of the American people."

The efforts of the Pentagon to retaliate against the businessman who exposed corruption are being studied by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. If he mounts the kind of investigation he is experienced in, then he will be doing the country a real service. For the sole source contract is almost an invitation to corruption. When there is no competitive bidding, a procurement officer can always work out an under-the-table deal such as in the Signal Corps case now moving toward trial. Human nature being what it is, this is not difficult to understand—which is why Congress has always insisted on the safeguards of competitive bidding.

Those who know the facts were certain that once Secretary McNamara learned of improper procurement practices, he would move decisively to end them—with a word of thanks to Mr. Wilson for uncovering them. But the Pentagon, Mr. McNamara included, has taken it as a personal affront. As a result of four columns I wrote on the subject, readers inquired of Mr. McNamara if the facts as stated were correct. Those letters were answered by Rear Adm. H. J. Goldberg who brushed aside the cases I cited and asserted that the Pentagon had been cleared of all charges.

This was Whitewash, Incorporated, at its best. Hiding the truth may serve the Pentagon's purposes today. But it encourages further improper activity, further waste of millions of dollars—and makes the day of reckoning that much worse. As a former business executive, Secretary McNamara should know better.

Charles Evans Hughes: Centennial Mission to Brazil, 1922

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my studies on U.S. relations with various countries of Latin America, I have been increasingly impressed with the stature of Secretary of State Charles

Evans Hughes, whose lucid statements on interoceanic canal policy I have repeatedly quoted in addresses to this body.

Among the little-known chapters in his statesmanlike contributions was the visit by a U.S. naval unit, consisting of the U.S.S *Maryland* and U.S.S *Nevada* under the command of Vice Adm. Hilary P. Jones and carrying a special mission to the Brazilian centennial celebration headed by Secretary Hughes.

Having heard fragmentary information about that notable event from a number of naval officers who were attached to those naval vessels at the time, I have read with special interest an informative summary of it in an August 24, 1962, U.P.I. dispatch by Harry W. Frantz, distinguished Latin American correspondent who covered it for the then United Press.

In order that Mr. Frantz' description of this chapter in our diplomatic history may be better known, I quote the entire dispatch, together with an editorial note, as part of my remarks:

Charles Evans Hughes: Centennial Mission to Brazil, 1922

(By Harry W. Frantz)

(Editor's Note.—Harry W. Frantz reported the visit of Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes to Brazil in 1922 for United Press (now U.P.I.) and in the following dispatch recounts some of his memories and impressions.)

Washington, August 24, 1962.—Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes boarded the Munson liner *Pan America* at New York 40 years ago today (Aug. 24, 1922) on a good will mission to Rio de Janeiro which still has a lasting influence on the friendship between the United States and Brazil.

He and a distinguished delegation were to represent the United States at the Brazilian centennial celebration.

The Secretary, as personal emissary of President Warren G. Harding, would reciprocate the visit of Emperor Dom Pedro II to the United States on the occasion of its Independence centenary celebration at Philadelphia in 1876.

The United States in 1962 alerady is beginning to think of a great bicentennial celebration of its independence, in 1976. Such an occasion would inevitably revive the strong traditions of friendship and cooperation which were fomented in both countries at the time of their first centennial celebrations.

At the time when Secretary Hughes embarked for Brazil he was at the height of the world fame which had been induced by his successful planning and conduct of the International Disarmament Conference in Washington.

The visit of Hughes to Brazil would have an additional historical significance because the U.S. Senate had rejected the Versailles Treaty, and the Harding government had redirected its major policy efforts to the strengthening of the Pan American movement. The Chile-Peru differences over the Tacna Arica Provinces were in the process of arbitration, and a general effort was being made to expand shipping, communications, and commerce among the American Republics.

Upon embarking at New York, Secretary Hughes gave to the United Press reporter a brief statement in which the key sentences were: "Nothing has ever marred the historic friendship between the two peoples, and we are looking forward to the happiest cooperation in the future. The present occasion is a most auspicious one for reviving memories of the past and for expressing anew our feelings of esteem and friendship for the Brazilian people."

The merchant ship *Pan America* was escorted in the final stage of its southbound cruise by the battleships *Maryland*, flagship of the fleet, and *Nevada*, and Hughes and his party transferred to the *Maryland* off Cape Frio, outside of Rio de Janeiro Harbor.

The dramatic event of the southbound cruise was the ceremony at crossing the Equator. Secretary Hughes entered into the traditional marine festivities in a spirit of great good humor, "recognized" the domain of King Neptune, and made an impressive speech on the quarterdeck.

Rio harbor was crowded with the naval craft of nine nations when the *Maryland* arrived on September 5, as Brazil had planned an international naval review as a major event of the centennial celebration. The British naval pride was represented by H.M.S. *Hood*, then considered one of the greatest craft afloat. A Japanese battleship was in the harbor.

Six Brazilian destroyers escorted the *Maryland* to its anchoring place, and the Brazilian battleships *Minas Geraes* and *Sao Paulo* boomed salutes to the Hughes party. In the year previous, the *Minas Geraes* had been reconditioned at the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

In 1922 the might of nations was measured by their naval strength, and air power was scarcely recognized as the future determinant of military strength. It might therefore be noteworthy that the first catapult used to launch an airplane from a U.S. naval vessel was on the quarterdeck of the *Maryland*. And also that Orton W. Hoover, a U.S. aviator, was flying above Rio harbor in a civilian Curtiss Oriole airplane. In 1922, the fact that a civilian air network would after a few decades blanket the Western Hemisphere was still in the dream stage.

If a Secretary of State were visting Brazil today his traveling time would be in hours instead of days.

Secretary Hughes received a magnificent welcome in Rio de Janeiro. He and Mrs. Hughes resided at the Guanabara Palace. The Secretary was almost constantly in attendance at events appropriate to an international historic occasion: military review, naval review, session of congress, meeting of the supreme court. The Secretary made five or more addresses, which had the singular merit derived from his extraordinary experience as a jurist.

At that time the future of inter-American relations was expected to develop around themes of arbitration, the codification of international law, and universal compliance with binding treaties. Forty years later, economic development and social welfare would become the dominant preoccupation of hemisphere statesmen.

In the retrospect of 40 years, one of the most memorable events of Secretary Hughes' visit in Rio de Janiero was the dedication of the site for the American Centennial Monument, on September 8, 1922. The U.S. Embassy was to be situated later in this vicinity.

No one then could have foreseen the tremendous construction of the modern city of Rio de Janeiro which would later become evident hereabouts. This reportor ran a quartermile across recently leveled fields before he could reach a telephone to report the groundbreaking ceremony.

Secretary Hughes, concluding a brilliant impromptu address, made these remarks concerning United States-Brazil relations:

"We have institutions dedicated to freedom, and we desire not simply the independence of might but the independence which rests secure in a prevailing sense of justice.

"We have different stocks and traditions but we cherish the same aspirations; the same longings for liberty under law. The differences are superficial, the resemblances fundamental.

"We derive our strength from the same spiritual forces.

"We have been colaborers and united by the memory of our historic friendship we are going forward with mutual respect to the enjoyment of our varied opportunities, knowing full well that only in brotherly helpfulness shall we find the adaptations which the democratic spirit demands and be assured of the satisfactions of rational progress."

Students Working for the U.S. Government in the Summer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to determine, if possible, the geographical distribution of the 5,000 mentioned. It has been my contention there should be a broader geographical distribution of the type of employees mentioned in the two articles. The two articles are entitled, "GOP Plans Seminar To Rival President's" which appeared in the Washington Post and "Five Thousand Youths Hear Talk by President" which appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

Also I include tables which are a part of a hearing entitled "Extending Apportionment Requirement to Temporary Summer Employment," that was held by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 29, 1962]

GOP Plans Seminar to Rival President's

(By Dorothy Butler)

Republican National Chairman William E. Miller accused the White House yesterday of "perverting into purely political operations" its seminars for college students working in Government jobs this summer.

So the Republicans will hold a seminar of their own today, Miller announced.

He said college students working in GOP congressional offices, at GOP National Committee headquarters at congressional campaign committee offices were not allowed to attend the seminars, including yesterday's finale.

Nearly 5,000 students gathered on the south lawn of the White House, where President Kennedy urged them to consider Government as a career at a time "when this country must make not only our own society work, but all those societies which are dependent upon us."

Commenting on Miller's statement, White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said he did not believe "all those thousands out on the lawn today were all Democrats unless there has been a very strong trend toward the Democratic Party."

"As I understand it," Salinger added, "all those working in the Government were invited."

Dorothy Davies, director of the seminars, had said earlier that invitations had been restricted to students working directly on Federal jobs. Those working with political parties were excluded, she said.

Miller further complained in his statement that the interns got a "one-sided picture" of Government because the seminars featured only Democratic speakers.

Today's GOP-sponsored seminar is open to anybody, Miller said, and will start at 4:30 p.m. in the Ways and Means Committee hearing room of the House Office Building.

Speakers will include Senators Barry Goldwater, Republican of Arizona, and Kenneth B. Keating, Republican of New York, and Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri.

At the White House, Kennedy asked those who had become interested in "either a politician or a civil servant or a bureaucrat" to lift their hands. A lot of hands—but not nearly all—were held up.

Then the President praised the Constitution, calling it "extraordinary," but a document that "has to be made to work today in an entirely different world from the day in which it was written."

Later in the afternoon, the young people heard Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy at Constitution Hall.

One student asked him about Monday night's television debate in Boston between his brother, Edward M. (Teddy) Kennedy, and Edward J. McCormack, opponents in the Democratic primary for U.S. Senator from Massachusetts.

"I think Teddy won," the Attorney General answered, to a round of applause and laughter.

Another asked him about Washington influence in the younger Kennedy's campaign.

"I know there have been suggestions that we were going to deport people who didn't vote the right way," Kennedy said—again to laughter—"but I can tell you that all these things are untrue."

Senator John D. McClellan, Democrat of Arkansas, also addressed the seminar yesterday.

The series wound up last night with a jazz festival at the Sylvan Theater, which featured the Dave Brubeck Quartet, Tony Bennett and Pearl Bailey.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 28, 1962]

Five Thousand Youths Hear Talk by President

President Kennedy today urged nearly 5,000 college students, working in various Government agencies as summer "interns," to consider making "an attractive career" in Government service.

He told the group, gathered on the south lawn of the White House, that a career as a politician or civil servant is "most challenging in these days when American leaders face complex problems at home and abroad."

The President said he was struck by the fact that some of the most gifted men in American history, such as Calhoun, Clay, and Webster, failed in dealing with comparatively few problems in the few decades before the Civil War. The fact that the Civil War came about despite their efforts was an indication of failure, he made clear.

America's political leaders may not be so gifted today, he added, but they have to deal with problems much more complex than those of 100 years ago. The extraordinary obligation of meeting such problems impresses all those with responsibility in the Government, he said.

Summary of temporary employment in selected Government agencies, summer 1959

States	Summary	General Accounting Office[1]	The Library of Congress[2]	Department of Agriculture[3]	Department of Commerce[4]	Department of Defense[5]	Department of the Air Force[6]	Department of the Army[7]	Department of the Navy[8]	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare[9]	Department of the Interior[10]	Department of Labor[11]	Department of State[12]	Department of the Treasury[13]	Atomic Energy Commission[14]	Civil Service Commission[15]	Federal Communications Commission[16]	Federal Power Commission[17]	Federal Trade Commission[18]	Interstate Commerce Commission[19]	National Aeronautics and Space Administration[20]	National Science Foundation[21]	Securities and Exchange Commission[22]	Veterans' Administration[23]
Alabama	3				2				1															
Arizona	5				4					1														
Arkansas	6		3	1	1	1																		
California	37	2		2	9					1	1			21										1
Colorado	37				34					2					1									
Connecticut	9		1		5					1	1													1
Delaware	3				3																			
District of Columbia	490		30	48	54	5	3	52	23	164	43	1	19	19		2	11	1		3		5		7
Florida	13	1	1		9				1															1
Georgia	4									2	1	1												
Idaho	13				1										11							1		
Illinois	33			2	13			2	6	2	3			4								1		
Indiana	14				5			2	4			1												2
Iowa	10		1		5	1			2	1														
Kansas	10		1		7				1	1														
Kentucky	9				2				2	3				1		1								
Louisiana	5								1					2							1			1
Maine	2				2																			
Maryland	628	6	16	88	80	1	4	80	33	208	34	2	17	23		5	15	1	2	2	2	4		5
Massachusetts	54		1	1	21	1		2	10	8	1	2		1			1			1			2	2
Michigan	25	1	2		3			2	8	3	1	2	1					1						1
Minnesota	4			1	2					1														
Mississippi	5		1		2			2																
Missouri	13		1		5			2	1	2		1											1	
Montana	2							1						1										
Nebraska	9			2	6						1													
Nevada	1				1																			
New Hampshire	6				2					1		2										1		
New Jersey	24		1		6			2	3	1	1			2	8									
New Mexico	0																							
New York	110		4	7	28		1	11	9	11	4	1	2	2	23						1		2	4
North Carolina	26		2	1	9			5	4	2				3										
North Dakota	1			1																				
Ohio	16	1	2		6			2			3		1											1
Oklahoma	4			1	3																			
Oregon	6				6																			
Pennsylvania	57	1	2		22	1		9	4	4	1	1		4	4							1		3
Rhode Island	3				3																			
South Carolina	4		1		1				2															
South Dakota	4		1	1	2																			
Tennessee	12		1		8				1	1				1										
Texas	14	2			10	1		1																
Utah	12		1		7										2		1							1
Vermont																								
Virginia	546	2	13	88	77	17	7	137	30	61	57	1	16	15			12	2		4		1	1	5
Washington	9	1	1		4					2					1									
West Virginia	5		2		1					1				1										
Wisconsin	10		1	1	7							1												
Wyoming	2				1																			1
Alaska																								
Hawaii	2				2																			
Puerto Rico	1									1														
Virgin Islands																								
Foreign	3		3																					
Total number of employees	2,321	17	93	245	481	28	15	312	146	485	152	16	56	100	50	8	40	5	2	10	4	14	6	36

[1] General Accounting Office, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures given represent applicants who had been chosen or tentatively chosen to fill summer jobs in 1959.

[2] The Library of Congress, letter of Mar. 1, 1961. The figures given represent temporary employees hired for varying lengths of time, up to a year, from May 15 to Aug. 15, 1959. The Library has no special program of summer employment.

[3] Department of Agriculture, letter of June 16, 1959. The figures stated represent temporary jobs in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area which were to be filled by students during the summer, 1959.

[4] Department of Commerce, letter of June 18, 1959. The figures given represent student assistants and student trainees hired for the summer, 1959.

[5] Department of Defense, letter of June 10, 1959. The figures given represent students selected for summer employment in 1959 by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

[6] Department of the Air Force, letter of June 23, 1959. The figures given represent student trainees hired by the Department of the Air Force Headquarters for the summer, 1959.

[7] Department of the Army, letter of June 15, 1959. The figures stated here represent students who had been selected or tentatively selected for temporary appointments for the summer, 1959, with the Department of the Army.

[8] Department of the Navy, letter of May 19, 1959. The figures given represent students majoring in engineering or the physical sciences who were prospective employees of the Navy Department for the summer, 1959.

[9] Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, letter of Aug. 19, 1959. The figures given represent students employed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the summer, 1959.

[10] Department of the Interior, letter of July 21, 1959. The figures stated represent students who were appointed to temporary jobs in the Department of the Interior in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area for the summer, 1959.

[11] Department of Labor, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures stated include temporary student assistants who were selected for positions with the Department of Labor for summer, 1959.

[12] Department of State, letter of June 4, 1959. The figures given represent temporary employees and students whom the Department of State had hired or planned to hire for typing, stenographic, and student assistant positions for summer, 1959.

[13] Department of the Treasury, letter of June 23, 1959. The figures given include all summer appointments of students, regardless of the temporary or nontemporary nature of the jobs, themselves, for 1959.

[14] Atomic Energy Commission, letter of June 15, 1959. The figures given include all temporary summer appointments to the entire Atomic Energy Commission for summer, 1959.

[15] Civil Service Commission, letter of June 9, 1959. The figures given indicate students occupying temporary positions with the Civil Service Commission for summer, 1959.

[16] Federal Communications Commission, letter of June 5, 1959. The figures given represent students temporarily employed by the Federal Communications Commission for summer, 1959.

[17] Federal Power Commission, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures given include individuals who were employed on a temporary basis as student assistants for summer, 1959.

[18] Federal Trade Commission, letter of May 28, 1959. The figures given indicate students holding temporary summer jobs as of May 28, 1959.

[19] Interstate Commerce Commission, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures listed include tentative selections of individuals made to fill temporary typing and stenographic positions with the Interstate Commerce Commission for summer, 1959.

[20] National Aeronautics and Space Administration, letter of June 10, 1959. The figures given include summer appointments for 1959 with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[21] National Science Foundation, letter of June 3, 1959. The figures given include temporary stenographic, typing, and student trainee positions that were to be filled primarily by students during the summer, 1959.

[22] Securities and Exchange Commission, letter of June 3, 1959. The figures given include students who were selected for participation in the student assistant program of the Securities and Exchange Commission for summer, 1959.

[23] Veterans' Administration, letter of June 17, 1959. The figures given include temporary summer jobs filled by students in the Central Office Headquarters and the Medical Division of the Veterans Benefits Office for summer, 1959.

Compiled by Sandra D. Worthen, History and Government Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Mar. 17, 1961.

The Inside Story of Stairstep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, "The Inside Story of Stairstep," as published in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest, portrays in a very vivid way the story of the Air National Guard deployment to Europe.

If proof were needed, this performance, as much as anything, proves the National Guard system works.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert this illuminating article so that my colleagues who may have missed it can have the opportunity:

THE INSIDE STORY OF STAIRSTEP

(By Francis and Katharine Drake)

When Russian barbed wire jabbed lengths of lock stitch down the middle of Berlin early last fall, and war before Christmas seemed a possibility, the United States was busy fashioning a counterstroke that is likely to go down in military annals as an unparalleled demonstration of teamwork, preparedness and flexibility. Tagged "Stairstep," this operation bristled with such top secrecy that few are aware of the high stakes that were involved, or of the astonishing events that were crammed into 1 fateful month.

The plan was conceived as a countermove to Russia's mounting threat to "save" Berlin by striking at the West, not with atomic, but with conventional weapons. In a nutshell, this was our objective: to reinforce the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with a nonnuclear armada by airlifting from the United States to Western Europe, inside a seemingly impossible time limit, hundreds of short-range fighters, thousands of men, a Himalayan tonnage of materiel. Planes were to be operationally ready within 1 hour of European touchdown.

To support the transatlantic move, President Kennedy tapped an all-star cast. Virtually every service was represented: the Tactical Air Command to control aerial directions; Reserves to hover over checkpoints; Strategic Air Command to supervise in-air emergency refueling; Military Air Transport Service to carry men and cargo; the Navy, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marine for patrol and emergency-rescue work. Yet Stairstep's brightest spotlight was focused not on the Regulars but on Uncle Sam's remarkable secret weapon—our citizen-soldiers who man the National Guard.

The alerting of the Air National Guard occurred with drop-of-a-hat abruptness. In mid-September, across nearly a dozen States, about 25,000 of ANG's 80,000-man strength received the communication: Report October 1 for active duty. From every alerted area, citizen-soldiers responded instantly, hastening from garages, offices, ranches, banks, factories, concert platforms, coal mines. Of all the guardsmen tapped, less than 1 percent begged off, mostly for medical or hardship reasons.

Domestic upheavals were prodigious. With only 2 weeks' notice, anguished husband-and-wife councils pored over budgets long geared to incomes many times the size of service paychecks, whittling them to austerity proportions. In one community after another, homes went up for sale, for rent, as wives and children prepared to move in with relatives.

Only a handful of ANG's key personnel knew that Stairstep would involve a year's deployment to standby bases in France, Spain, and West Germany. Taking no chances, wing and base commanders jetted hurriedly to Europe to view prospective homes. For the most part, these were bases emptied after De Gaulle's refusal to give tactical nuclear weapons houseroom. Nearly all were mere shells, shy of basic necessities to handle the Guard units—cots, mattresses, kitchen equipment, cutlery, tables, chairs, telephones.

So, back in the United States, base commands literally stripped themselves of everything likely to "come in handy." Office furniture, files, wastebaskets, typewriters, desks, even paper clips, got shipping tags.

On October 1, ANG home bases exploded at dawn with electrifying activity. Out the window went peacetime routines (48 "drills" per year) as all hands began sweating out 16-hour days, 7 a week, to telescope into a 30-day limit the multitudinous A–Z preparations for mass evacuation. (Closest parallel was the Korean operation, which required 7 months.) ANG's pilots, average age 29, trained mostly for 500–800-mile overland missions in defense of the homeland, found themselves converted wholesale into a machine for prevention of war. Few of them had ever island-hopped an ocean, flown in tight-sealed "poopies" (25-pound survival suits) or refueled in air.

Now they cut loose on a spine-chilling retraining program nicknamed "Special Events.'" In the worst weather available they flew 1,500-mile triangular missions, encased like deep-sea divers in made-to-measure poopies. In Link trainers they practiced precision approaches to arctic fjords they had never seen, dived into steep-walled one-way canyons, touched down to crosswind, downwind, no-wind landings. Coached by Air Force instructors, they rehearsed crash-landing procedures for icecaps, snowfields, the sea. Pilots who failed to rate cum laude in the finals were "scrubbed." (When more men qualified than there were planes available, NAG was pleased though not astonished).

Responsibility at each base for tuning up jet aircraft fell on support teams, 40 to a group. Technical specialists, troubleshooters in hydraulics, electronics, radio, sheet-metal, electrical equipment toiled over temperamental Sabres, T-Birds, Thunderstreaks, fitting tail shields, replacing fuel pumps, engines, tires, testing electrical leads and instruments, working 16-hour shifts, enameled from top to toe in lubricating oil. They assembled 1½-ton flyaway kits containing every conceivable part essential to the do-it-yourself repair of jets bereft for 30 days of outside aid. They checked and double-checked each airplane, and then checked again, knowing that one small weakness in the multisystemed whole could cost a life.

In mid-October, Advon (advance echelons) took wing for Europe to prepare the way—groups of 100 to 160 men, technicians, cooks, handpicked "scroungers," each under a base commander. With but 14 days left, the scroungers set up field telephones on packing cases and, with cooperation from the U.S. Air Forces in Europe, hurtled into action.

At Chambley, in France, Senior Sgt. Charles Buckmaster, superintendent of food service, explored channels that might lead to regular delivery of chow supplies adequate to healthy Indiana appetites. He rapidly established an entente cordiale with Amsterdam in the Netherlands (dairy products), with Kaiserslautern in Germany (meat), with Italy, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Norway (fresh fruit and vegetables). At other designated areas, furniture shuttled in from Arabian bases, kitchen equipment from North Africa, pillows by the thousand from Great Britain.

Ten days from scratch, Advon teams, wan and hollow-eyed, braced themselves for the penultimate phase of Operation Stairstep: the arrival, courtesy of MATS, of nearly 10,000 airmen and gargantuan tonnages of freight. The planes, due every hour on the hour for 48 consecutive hours, were under 3-hour turnaround orders. Foul weather notwithstanding, beginning Sunday, October

29, an uninterrupted succession of C–118's and C–121's carrying personnel, of C–123's and C–124's carrying cargo, put down at the bases, while Advon's united strength, sleepless, unshaven, perpetually soaked through, toiled with trucks, tugs, forklifts, ladders. Every single plane was unloaded, swept, serviced, refueled, checked, waved off on its homeward flight within the 3-hour deadline.

D-day for the ANG pilots was Monday, October 30. A day or two before, men and machines converged on the departure centers at McGuire, N.J., and Loring, Maine. Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., TAC's tall commander whose tireless planning sparked every detail, had long since nailed down the only two routes possible to short-range jets: north via Labrador and Greenland; south via Newfoundland and the Azores—longest leg, Harmon to Lajes, 1733 miles (with favorable winds, just within fuel range).

Whichever the route, the formula was this: daylight flights, each squadron leaving in elements of four at 15-minute intervals; overnight rests (sleep concurrent with aircraft tune ups); wheels up at dawn; repeat, repeat, until arrival at European base. Movements of groups were staggered to preserve overall momentum without overtaxing facilities. Should one plane falter, the main flow would disregard it; only the wingmate would stand by, pinpointing position, alerting aid. Should a plane crack up on a runway, bulldozers would blitz it aside.

Regulars were deployed along ocean routes to provide a continuous chain of fixes—radar-equipped "Duckbutts" (C–54's) circling over specified positions to monitor takeoffs and approaches and to vector in cripples; Coast Guard vessels to signal the fighters with low-frequency radio direction finders. Especially diverted from shipping lanes was a string of freighters, primed for patrol and rescue. On both routes the second legs (Goose Bay-Sondestrom, Harmon-Lajes) were the treacherous ones. Despite all precautions, the tense question remained: Could ANG's hastily conditioned pilots rise to the challenge?

Almost before the Regulars could cross their fingers, the command sounded: operation stairstep—execute. The first quartet of planes screamed down the runway, lifted, soared into rain and overcast and vanished. Precisely 15 minutes later the next quartet took wing. Then the next, and the next. Well before sundown Monday, Goose and Harmon were sending back jubilant tidings: They made it. Every last mother's son.

At daybreak, the contingent at Harmon turned sights toward the Azores, pinpoints on immeasurable wastes of sea. Skies were pewter-colored and filled with rain. But the essential element, a tailwind, blew a brisk 30 knots. To glut each tank, planes were tiled back like rockets, enabling 75 extra gallons—15 precious minutes of flight—to be "packed" aboard. Then the aircraft were towed almost to takeoff position.

First to go were Ohio's 121st Tactical Fighters. They teased their topheavy loads along the slippery runway, inched off, zoomed to 35,000 feet, materalizing almost at once on Duckbutt *Bravo Alpha's* radar screen. They travel 400 spirit-lifting miles along it, found themselves passed along like fragile porcelain to CG vessel *Delta*, pitching and tossing while purveying reassurance.

To the pilots, grazing the speed of sound without sense of motion, checking fixes without personal contact, it seemed a far cry from neighborly Ohio. Eight miles below, under a solid linseed poultice, lurked a rapacious ocean. A windshift, a choked line, could trigger this briefing cue: "Eject—spring butt-snapper—proceed downward until striking surface."

Ohio passed midway point CG vessel *X-Ray* with fuel reserves checking neatly with the flight plan. At Duckbutt *Bravo Bravo*, the three-quarter fix, the wind played traitor, whirled, blew head on at 30 knots, making the last 400 miles a grime game of touch-and-go. Just under the wire, with insufficient fuel even to circle, Ohio nipped into Lajes straight onto the crosswind runway. Pilots admitted to two overpowering sensations—relief, and a fiendish itch inflicted by the poopies.

There were only two "unrehearsed incidents" in the stream of arrivals and departures at Lajes. Col. E. H. Bucher, leading the 122d Tactical Fighters from Indiana, had just passed the point of no return with wingmate Lt. V. K. Egley when a violent windshift trapped them—insufficient fuel to make destination, insufficient to return. Bucher drew a deep breath and invoked an emergency procedure which neither he nor Egley had had a chance to practice: a rendezvous in air with a SAC tanker. Tanker and fighters met in blue infinity and, after three tries and a drop to 26,000 feet, finally mated boom and tank. The reprieved aircraft flew on to Lajes.

Capt. John F. Leahy, of St. Louis, Mo., cut it even closer when at 40,000 feet his poopy sleeve accidentally shut off the emergency-fuel switch. The engine flamed out, leaving approximately 6 minutes between him and the wavetops. Forfeiting chunks of altitude as six successive tries failed to reactivate the engine, he snapped out mayday signals, spotted a freighter, resisted an almost overwhelming urge to bail out before the prescribed 5,000-foot altitude. With seconds to go, he gave the controls one final jiggle—and heard celestial music; the hum of a reviving engine.

Holding the fort in Lajes, monkey-suited support teams had every reason for self-congratulation. Of the scores of aircraft checked through only one needed an engine change, only two needed fuel-pump replacements, and of the mountain of new tires (16-ply heaviest nylon) stacked in readiness, only 10 were used.

Meanwhile, ANG aircraft were winging along the arctic rooftop across a wilderness of white. Leaving Goose Bay, Labrador, in a raging blizzard, one by one the pilots of Massachusetts' F–86 Sabres clawed their way to 41,000 feet and headed for the steely, iceberg-littered sea. If Sondestrom, a tiny settlement huddling at the foot of towering canyon walls on Greenland's coast, were to sock in, the alternate touchdown was Frobisher, another arctic pinprick close to Hudson Strait. Luck rode with the Yankees. Greenland, the world's largest ice mass, showed up in the crystal-clear air from 200 miles away, a blue-white diamond glittering in majestic grandeur.

There were "incidents," however. As Maj. Robert Windoffer roared off the runway, his generator cut out. The runway was a trick one, uphill; in the distance, smack across the flight path, loomed rock ramparts. Bereft of electrical power, Windoffer yanked his explosive overload around, described a semicircle on one wingtip, managed to land back without even blowing a tire.

During the critical crossing period, Air Force Chief Gen. Curtis E. LeMay visited every field being used. Piloting his own jet transport, he dropped in to advise, debunk, exhort, cuss, encourage. A perfectionist, he sometimes praised with a noncommittal grunt, and his criticism ripped the hide off any unhappy man who offered excuses. After his first decent sleep in over a week, LeMay sent this message to the newly ensconced units: "I offer my congratulations for the outstanding manner in which this difficult and important task was accomplished."

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara flew over to deliver his tribute in person, observing that the marked change in Russia's attitude was directly traceable to the deterent effect of Stairstep. West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer echoed the same thought: "In my opinion it was the prime factor in influencing Khrushchev in his slowdown on the Berlin crisis."

Quite apart from being a remarkable performance, Stairstep provided a dramatic demonstration of our national will. It reaffirmed before the world that, when America's citizen-soldiers are challenged, they will drop their careers at whatever cost to see to it that "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Return of New Jersey National Guardsmen and Army Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many civilians throughout our great land were called to aid the defense of the free world last fall. New Jersey contributed its share of men who were willing to prove that free nations were determined to stay free and that these nations wished to preserve the rights of man.

Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, chief of staff of the New Jersey department of defense, cited the over 400 returning New Jersey guardsmen and Army reservists for their crucial role in preventing war. Their very presence in Europe signified American might.

I might add that these young men who willingly gave up a year of their lives for the defense of our country and its goals are to be heartily commended.

Mr. John P. Neary of the Courier Post, Camden, N.J., has reported on my State's homecoming for these brave men. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY GI'S CITED FOR ROLE IN BERLIN WALL CRISIS—1,000 GREET RESERVISTS ON ARRIVAL

(By John P. Neary)

Some 400 returning New Jersey National Guardsmen and Army reservists who were called up during last fall's Berlin wall crisis were cited Tuesday night for their role in preventing war.

Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, chief of staff of the New Jersey department of defense, told the back-to-normal civilian soldiers that the country last fall wanted to maintain peace, not go to war over Berlin and the worsening southeast Asia situation.

He said President Kennedy felt peace could be maintained by building our Armed Forces.

ONE THOUSAND WATCH CEREMONIES

The general addressed the men of the four returning units at the Sears, Roebuck parking lot and later reviewed 1,000 marching troops. More than 1,000 civilians turned out to view the ceremonies.

The units were Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment, 30th Ordnance Battalion of the New Jersey Army National Guard, 22d Ordnance Company (DS) NJARNG, Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment, 451st Chemical Battalion, U.S. Army Reserve, and the 677th Quartermaster Company, U.S. Army Reserve. The units served at bases in this country.

He said the callup of 156,000 Reserve component members then enabled three Active Army training divisions to be converted to combat divisions and encouraged our allies to strengthen their forces.

"With your call to active duty, the free world demonstrated to the Communist leaders that we are determined to fight, if necessary, to preserve the rights of free men."

CREATED STRATEGIC RESERVE

He noted the guardsmen and reservists replaced Army units sent from the United States to Europe and created a powerful strategic reserve here.

General Cantwell said that while the units "tipped the balance of power in favor of peace," they are facing "the possibility of losing units and strength in what we think is a shortsighted move to aline this military force with a present budget."

He said that "maintaining a strong and well-trained National Guard and Army Reserve as a backup to the Active Army" in order to deter the Russians was the job of American citizens.

OTHER MILITARY DIGNITARIES

Other military dignitaries who spoke were Maj. Gen. J. D. Alger, commanding general, 2d U.S. Army Corps, Maj. Gen. Edward O. Wolf, commanding general, 50th Armored Division of the New Jersey National Guard and Brig. Gen. John P. Read, deputy chief of staff, New Jersey National Guard.

The generals inspected the troops along with John H. Mohrfeld 3d, administrative assistant to Representative Cahill, Republican, of New Jersey, who was unable to attend.

State Senator Cowgill and Mayor Pierce lauded the troops for serving the cause of the free world.

Also attending were State, county, and city legislators, leaders of veterans groups, and other military officials.

BON-BONS SUPPLY MUSIC

Music was supplied by the Bon-Bons, an Audubon all-girl drum and bugle corps, and the 50th Armored Division Band. Col. William C. Doyle, Combat Command A, introduced the speakers.

Governor Hughes and General Cantwell will welcome back returning State Air National Guardsmen Friday at 10 a.m. at McGuire Air Force Base and at 1 p.m. at Atlantic City.

The units due in at McGuire are the 108th Tactical Fighter Wing and the 141st Tactical Fighter Squadron consisting of some 1,200 men.

They will greet 400 men of the 119th Tactical Fighter Squadron at Atlantic City.

Tribute to Victor L. Anfuso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the Record remarks made at the testimonial dinner given to our esteemed colleague, Victor L. Anfuso, on August 14, 1962, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., at which dinner I acted as toastmaster. My remarks follow:

We are all happy to pay this tribute of respect to Victor L. Anfuso, who for so many years has served in Congress and served in a truly dedicated spirit.

Victor is a good friend of mine—not a sundial friend, useless when the sun goes down. He has built for himself a good name and a good name is like an acrostic, you read it up or down, left to right, right to left, and it spells goodness. Vic has been the recipient of many honors and deservedly so. These honors have come from princes, potentates, and Presidents.

His record and personality belie what Mark Twain once said, "Imagine there is a Congressman, now imagine an idiot. Forgive me, I repeat myself." Of course, we in Congress have always been the butt of jokes, victims of satire and recipients of abuse, but once let the citizen realize that his rights and privileges have been abused, he rushes to his Congressman for relief. Vic has afforded relief to thousands and because thereof we honor him.

Vic has many facets to his character. He is personable and persevering, amiable and articulate. No one is more resourceful. He can generate more novel ideas than a fiery pinwheel lets off sparks. He manifested brilliance and sparkle as a member of the Committee on Space and Astronautics. He showed excellence as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

He will leave our sacred precincts soon to wear the raiment of judicial office. Not so long ago, I was examining a witness at a trial. His name was prefixed with the title, "Colonel." I asked him what the "Colonel" stood for. He sarcastically answered, "'Colonel' is like 'Honorable' in front of your name," and he added, "And it doesn't mean a damn thing." Vic will now have a new prefix—judge. He is going to put a new twist on the meaning of "judge" and above all, he is going to make it mean "worthy." We like him for his becoming boldness and imagination.

He now shrinks from the publicity of congressional life to seek the quietude of the judiciary. I asked him if, as judge, he will use a gravel. "No," he said, "I will use a 50-cent piece. I can rap on the desk for order and when it comes to making a decision, it will come in handy. I will toss it up and decide either head or tail."

Vic is a careful politician. Hence, his success. He was once speaking at a convention of commercial artists. He was asked to name his favorite color and without hesitation he said, "Plaid."

He is a genuine Democrat who has sacrificed much for his party. Rather than enter a bitter internecine primary fight, he has agreed to leave the field and become a judge.

We wish Vic well and Godspeed. We wish him, his dear wife, and children many years of health and happiness.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1962.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, Testimonial Dinner in Honor of Congressman Victor L. Anfuso:

Please express to Victor, his family, and friends, my sincere regret that I cannot be with them this evening. We are all mindful of the distinguished service he has rendered to his district and the Nation in the Congress. His unselfishness has contributed greatly to the Democratic Party and its principles. It is my earnest wish that he will allow me to call upon him in the future so that his broad knowledge and keen understanding of the problems of national government and space will not be lost to the Nation.

Every good wish.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

AUGUST 14, 1962.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, Dinner in Tribute to Congressman Victor L. Anfuso, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.:

One of the most loyal and understanding and patriotic men of my acquaintance is Victor Anfuso. We will miss him in Congress, but we believe the Congress loss is the Judiciary's gain. My affection for him and his family is deep. I send my best wishes to him and his many friends.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

ROME,
August 4, 1962.

Dear Mr. Celler: Thank you for the invitation addressed to me to participate in the banquet in honor of Hon. Victor L. Anfuso.

I am very sorry that the distance, my obligations, and the season prevent me from taking advantage of such a pleasant circumstance to return to the United States of America once again.

I wish to ask you, however, to convey to the guest of honor and all illustrious persons invited to the banquet my cordial regards and most vivid wishes for prosperity.

FANFANI.

TEXT OF SPEECH BY WILLIAM H. MCKEON, CHAIRMAN, NEW YORK DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE, AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING REPRESENTATIVE VICTOR L. ANFUSO, IN STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, AUGUST 14, 1962

I am happy to be here tonight for two reasons. First, to speak as a personal friend of our guest of honor, and secondly and possibly more important, I am proud to be here as the official spokesman of the entire Democratic Party of the State of New York in this tribute to our good friend, Victor Anfuso.

Over the years, Vic has been a good friend. As a friend, his advice has always been timely and wise. As State chairman, his support has been constant and important.

As you know when Vic first came down here, he was assigned to the Agriculture Committee. Some of his friends ribbed him as the farm boy from Brooklyn, but Vic has established for himself a unique and influential role within the committee as the spokesman for the consumer.

When he was assigned to the Space Committee, he served with such fierce dedication that when I first heard that we had put an astronaut into space, I was sure it was Vic himself. As a matter of fact, if there had been room, I am sure that nothing would have pleased him more.

We are honoring a big man tonight—big of heart, big of spirit, and big of mind. If he were not, instead of sitting here in harmony tonight, we might be witnessing one of the worst political Donnybrooks in our State's recent political history.

For those of you who are not entirely familiar with politics in New York State, let me give you a few facts.

Last year it was necessary to reapportion our State's congressional districts. Nelson Rockefeller was as ruthless as a barracuda in gerrymandering our districts with the result of eliminating several Democratic seats. Naturally, his prime target was Brooklyn, the largest Democratic county in our State.

Vic might have stood on his prerogatives which, as I say, could have led to a bitter primary. He did not. He put party unity first. He stepped aside gracefully in the manner of the big man he is. You may not know that he holds one of the highest honors our church can bestow on a layman. As the chairman of the Democratic Party in New York, I wish tonight I had a similar award to bestow on him for his service to his party.

His fellow townsmen have now called on him to serve in the judiciary. You may be assured that he will be elected and will serve with distinction. I do not think, however, that this will be the climax of Vic's career as a public servant—he has far too much energy for that. Rather, I predict his voice will continue to be heard in the vast councils of our party.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration is losing a loyal and ardent supporter in Vic. This as I said can be laid squarely at the doorstep of Nelson Rockefeller.

I assure you, however, that Victor Anfuso and his colleagues in the House of Representatives, whether they are serving here in Washington or in other important posts in our State and Nation will continue the fight for the programs and the ideals of our great President and his helpmate, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner at Dinner in Honor of Representative Victor L. Anfuso

Mr. President, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, if every man's life is truly a book, then Vic Anfuso's fills a library shelf. This is just another in the series of heroic episodes in Vic Anfuso's career.

I can assure you that the people of New York City are going to keep Victor Anfuso in the public service. He knows it, too. We all know it. For Vic Anfuso, every ending is just another beginning.

Public life has been Congressman Anfuso's vocation and avocation for many years. He was running for office, in a primary, as far back as September 17, 1932. He lost the election, but that day his son, Victor, Junior, was born.

Since that day, Congressman Anfuso has been a consistent winner.

Basically, he is a humanitarian.

As a private citizen, in the early 1930's, he helped organize a Citizens Welfare Association to help the jobless and destitute in Brooklyn. He had also been responsible for the organization of the Italian Board of Guardians in Brooklyn which aids delinquent and troubled children.

Congressman Anfuso's legislative record is a fine one. His activity in 1957 as chairman of a Consumers Study Subcommittee to investigate the high cost of living was characteristic.

One measure which, in my judgment, epitomizes his devotion to public service is his pending bill authorizing the establishment of a National Academy for Public Service Training. I believe sincerely that the establishment of such an academy for public service trainees would help lend to public service—at the municipal, State, National and, indeed, international level—the dignity, honor and importance it deserves. Vic Anfuso is fighting for the establishment of such an academy.

But this isn't Vic Anfuso's most important legislative proposal. It is just a typical one. He has fought for liberalized immigration laws, for public housing, for civil rights, and for a more forthright policy of friendship toward Israel.

Name the good cause, and you can be sure that Victor Anfuso has been for it. Name the constituent who has had a problem and Victor Anfuso has been for him, too, and for the solution of his problem.

Vic is a young man still. His greatest achievements lie ahead of him. He will always be found fighting the good fight—for the party, for Brooklyn, for his city and country. We will be hearing more and more from and about Vic Anfuso in the days, months, and years ahead.

Excerpts of Remarks of Speaker John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, at a Testimonial Dinner in Honor of Representative Victor L. Anfuso, Democrat, of New York, Held in the City of Washington, August 14, 1962

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, your excellencies, distinguished guests and particularly our guest of honor, Congressman Anfuso, his charming wife, and his fine family, it is a genuine personal pleasure for me to take part in this testimonial dinner for Congressman Anfuso. The very presence here of so many of you, some from far away—a diverse group united by the common bond of friendship and affection for our guest of honor—bears witness to his nature and the breadth of his friendships.

Our chairman, "Manny" Celler, in introducing Mayor Wagner, remarked that the mayor of New York has the toughest job in the country, next to the Presidency. Now, I wouldn't want to disagree with "Manny," not only because he's the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and committee chairmen are important to me in my job, but because he's a very good friend of mine as well. Still, though I wouldn't want to disagree with "Manny," I do think the job of Speaker is a hard one at times. Admittedly, it has its compensations, and one of them—one of the greatest—is the privilege of knowing the many fine men and women who serve in the House over the years. In my years of serving in the House of Representatives, as majority leader and then as Speaker, I have known many Members of Congress; but I can say that Victor Anfuso stands high among them as a public servant and as a man.

By the way, my remarks about Victor Anfuso are not intended to diminish my regard for all the other Representatives of the State of New York whom I see here tonight. I'd like to mention them all. They are a fine group of men—every one. But I hesitate to mention any of them by name for fear of missing some inadvertently.

The other speakers here tonight have talked about Anfuso the Congressman and public servant. I want to talk about Anfuso the man.

Here, we all know, is a man of heart, unselfish, dedicated to helping others, a stanch friend. He has always taken people on their merits. Neither race, creed, color, nor any other externals or accidents of birth mean anything to him.

He has faith. This faith marks the man.

His name happens to be Anfuso. But what matters is not the name but what's in a man's mind. I know a man by his mind. I don't care what his name is. I don't care what his race is, or his color. A man's religion doesn't matter to me. I love my religion and respect all others; I expect other men to love their religions and to respect mine.

Our guest of honor has striven throughout his life for two goals: he has sought positions of influence, and at the same time he has sought unceasingly to help others less fortunate than himself.

We honor this man. We honor his loyal, devoted wife, and his fine children, who are here tonight. His is the kind of family on which America is built. America's foundation is its family life. Without such families, we could not have the country we have today.

It is an old saying of mine, and used to be a saying of Sam Rayburn's (God rest his soul), that many men who serve in the House of Representatives and are then elected to the other body give stability and substance to the other body. Vic Anfuso is such a man. He will bring stability and all his other fine qualities to any service he may undertake. During his terms in Congress, and especially in recent years as a member and subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, he has revealed himself not only as a man of heart but as a man of vision and pioneering spirit.

Now Victor has shown himself as a man willing to make a sacrifice for the good of his party. This kind of loyalty, putting aside personal wishes, is appreciated. It would be a fine thing for the Democratic Party if there were more Victor Anfusos. We could use a lot more Victor Anfusos in other States and places throughout this Nation.

"Manny" Celler has said that this is not an ending but a new beginning for Victor. This judgment, I am sure, is right. When Victor puts on the ermine, he will bring to his new responsibilities all the fairness and breadth of sympathies he has shown in Congress; he will temper justice with mercy, and enter a new and honorable period of public service. More than that: I predict that Victor Anfuso will not be long in judicial office before his party will seek him for higher office in an elective capacity. Victor has served his party and his Nation faithfully, and I feel sure that he will continue to do so for many years to come.

Address of Victor L. Anfuso, Jr., at Testimonial Dinner in Honor of Congressman Victor L. Anfuso

Mr. Toastmaster, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a difficult thing to fashion words to introduce your own father properly. Mayor Wagner has told us that I was introduced by my father some 30 years ago during the course of a political campaign. However, I do believe it took more than campaign oratory to turn that trick. I guess that just serves to prove that it is not how difficult a task is, but rather how pleasurable. And tonight I have a most pleasurable task.

This occasion is not only the time to review the past accomplishments of your guest of honor, but also an opportunity to reminisce with an old friend.

As I looked around the ballroom earlier I noticed many familiar faces, friends of long standing, people who do not make a habit of attending $50-a-plate dinners, much less traveling hundreds of miles to be present.

I am thinking that my father is a lucky man to be surrounded by so many friends at a time when he closes one chapter of his life and prepares to frame another; blessed as he is by a union with a saintly woman and a devoted wife and mother; and privileged to have achieved a position in life which would content the soul of many a man.

However, it is not fairly correct to give all the credit to luck. Rather, I believe, these are the results of qualities he has kindled from within. Truly he has gone out to meet luck more than halfway.

Someone has written that all of us in varying degrees are propelled by two fundamental urges. These are: "I want" and "I want to be." The first includes the basic instinct of self-preservation, food, shelter, the desire for security. The second, "I want to be," encompasses the more expansive part of personality, magnanimity, the desire to better yourself and those about you.

Perhaps this is a great oversimplification. But I think your guest of honor has bottomed his purposeful actions on this latter motivation to an abundant degree. The seeds he has sown throughout his public career are as many stones thrown into a still pool. The ripples, most times without the spotlight of any publicity, have touched the hearts and lives of many people who were never required to show the credentials of a constituent, the Aryan pedigree so long favored by our immigration laws, or even the label of any particular party.

In close observation of a man who has been a great teacher to me, I have never heard him speak ill of another. I have marveled at his capacity to make and keep a friend.

His approach to problems has always been persuasion rather than force—organize and build by motivating others to desire and accomplish certain tasks and goals. As a matter of fact, when I was a young boy I can still remember his effective use of a hairbrush which had a most persuasive effect on me, and by the way did me a great deal of good.

The man who occupies the place of honor tonight shined shoes for a living at the age of 9; placated his mother's lifelong wish that he become a doctor by having her believe he was enrolled in medical school, while in fact he was attending law school. And as the distinguished Ambassador from Italy has indicated, I know he felt highly honored, as an immigrant to this country, to be appointed by President Kennedy as head of the delegation representing the United States to go back to his native land for the centennial anniversary of Italy's birth as a nation.

If I were to attempt to capsulize and isolate that inner spark of animation in your guest of honor, I would venture to say that he is a man who derives sheer comfort and satisfaction in the mere giving; a person, who has felt an inner need to seek positions of influence and, at the same time, a desire to use that influence to aid those, who by circumstance or station in life, cannot help themselves.

As the pages of his life are slowly turned and he continues to the next stop en route, you may expect that he will carry that philosophy with him, best expressed perhaps in the words of Whittier when he wrote:

> "Heaven's gate is not opened to him who comes alone;
> Save another's soul, and thus thou'lt save thine own."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my extreme privilege to present to you my father, your guest of honor.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, TESTIMONIAL DINNER, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON D.C., AUGUST 14, 1962

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Speaker, reverend clergy, your excellencies, my friends all, I can't begin to tell you how much each one of you has honored me tonight by your presence. Some of you have come from as far as California and many of you, of course, from my beloved State of New York.

"MANNIE," I'm deeply grateful to you for being a chairman and toastmaster par excellence.

Thank you very much, Mr. Harrison, for your kind presentation. Please assure all of your 1,400 members that I shall always treasure it.

Ambassador Fennoltea, I was indeed happily surprised. I have received many awards from your Government. I know this is the highest and I'm deeply grateful. I hope I can continue to play some small part to keep your great country and ours bosom allies.

Ladies and gentlemen I guess all of you can see by now that we have a great New York State chairman in Bill McKeon and a great leader and mayor in Bob Wagner. I am grateful to both of them for their generous remarks.

And, Mr. Speaker, you have always been very kind to me but tonight you outdid yourself.

I think my son made a pretty good speech, too, don't you think? Well, I wanted you to get to know him.

All of you have been mighty good to me, Excellency, an immigrant boy from the south shores of Italy.

I guess I've served on more committees than most Members of Congress. In the 82d Congress I was a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In that capacity I visited almost every post office in the State of New York and helped to improve working conditions in them. I suppose I would still be on that committee had I not been a victim of reapportionment in 1952.

Thanks to my very dear friend, Mayor Wagner, I was appointed a judge of the criminal court but I didn't stay long as a judge because my heart was in Congress. As a matter of fact the first time I ran I had to defeat a Democratic Congressman of 18 years experience in Congress: and the second time, I resigned as a judge to engage in another successful primary fight. I returned to the 84th Congress and I was approved for membership on the House Agriculture Committee. I became known as the gentleman farmer from Brooklyn, although my only credentials were that I had a flower pot on my window sill.

It wasn't long, however, when with the cooperation of that esteemed gentleman and chairman of the committee, HAROLD COOLEY, that we formed, for the first time in the history of Congress, a Subcommittee on Consumer Problems of which I became chairman. If I must say so myself, the hearings we conducted and the reports we rendered went a long way in bringing about a better understanding between our farm and city people. As I used to say in speeches before the Congress, the legislative road is not a one way street. If we from the cities help the Congressmen from farm areas in solving their problems, they must come along with us when we appeal to them for better wages, better working conditions and more housing for our congested areas. The response was equally beneficial and I'm proud to say that I have voted for every wise farm bill that has come out of the Committee on Agriculture, without the loss of any part of my constituency. The reason is that I gave my people leadership and service but at the same time I made it clear to them that we cannot live alone—that a Congressman must represent not only his district but the Nation as a whole.

In 1957, again being mindful of the needs of the consumers and farmers in my own State of New York, I conducted hearings throughout the State and we were particularly helpful in stabilizing milk prices.

I enjoyed being the farmer from Brooklyn. We were giving a voice for the first time to the consumers of America. I urged President Eisenhower and later President Kennedy to create the post of a Consumer Council in the executive branch of Government. I looked forward to heading a permanent Consumer Committee in the House of Representatives. President Kennedy finally appointed a Consumers Advisory Council but the Congress has not had a Consumer Committee since I left the House Agriculture Committee in 1958 to become a ranking member of the newly formed Science and Astronautics Committee as well as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

I have served 4 wonderful years on these committees with Chairman BONNER and MILLER. My good friend, GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, who is doing a great job as general chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, appointed me chairman of the subcommittee on all advance research. I looked forward to spending the rest of my days on this committee and pushing with all my might the space program because I realize that America cannot win this space race or any race by just reacting to what the Russians are doing, or being stimulated into action by a series of shocks—such as the two cosmonauts now circling the earth.

We have lost 4 valuable years, and I am not here to blame anyone for this loss, but the fact remains that we did waste 4 years in not going ahead with a large booster program. And now you can't make up those years by just keeping pace with the Russians. We have got to double our efforts if we are not to remain second best and leave the world in danger of being destroyed by those who would use the new scientific discoveries for conquest and world domination.

By doubling our efforts I don't necessarily mean spending twice as much as we are now spending in the space effort. Money alone won't do the job for us. What I mean is that we must stop reacting and use the intelligence and knowledge we already possess to carry out projects of our own. It is imperative that we try to land a man on the Moon as soon as possible but let us through advance research also establish a space station from which we can launch our vehicles to carry out space exploration to any corner of the universe, without limiting ourselves to the Moon, Venus or Mars. This would be a far greater achievement than engaging in a mere race to the moon and at the same time this would provide greater security for us.

And now on the peace front, my friends, let me say this. As a result of the various committees of Congress on which I have served, having to do with war and peace, I have come to the inevitable conclusion that there is no profit in war for any nation or people. I, therefore, looked forward to a new project, as an aid to the scientific community, to unite the scientists of the world to form an International Science for Peace organization which would conduct or guide research into great world problems such as famine, drought, pestilence and disease which are the causes of wars and strife among nations. This cannot and never will be done by the United Nations because the United Nations is a political organization and the members of every committee therein are guided by political considerations and national interests. But the scientific world can get together, as it did for the International Geophysical Year, and undertake, for example, the elimination of malaria as a world plague, the stamping out of the locust pestilence, the conservation and scientific distribution of water resources, the evaluation of existing uninhabited areas of the world for their possible sources of foods, the development of methods by which the unending resources of the ocean would be converted into acceptable foodstuffs, the peaceful uses of research in outer space, etc. The free world without delay, should take the leadership in forming such a science for peace organization as it will save billions of dollars and help to create an abundant world, making wars and strife between nations unnecessary.

But again the ugly head of reapportionment threatened to interrupt my services in Congress. After months of soul searching and discussions with my family and friends, I again yielded to the wishes of the leadership of our party and withdrew as a candidate for Congress in order to be of even greater service, I hope, to my country.

My friends, we are living in the most critical period of our Nation which demands the strongest, the most vigorous, the most intelligent kind of leadership. It requires also, an understanding of the rights and aspirations of all peoples of the world. We have that leadership and understanding in President Kennedy. And we who call ourselves Democrats must sacrifice personal ambitions to become soldiers in the ranks and follow his leadership. There is no room for demogogues or prima donna's in the Democratic system of government.

In conclusion, my friends, let me say that this dinner is not just a tribute to me alone.

It is also a tribute to my wife, Frances, who has served all of our terms in Congress—going back and forth, to and from New York every single week (not at Government expense, mind you), and in my hour of grave decision and period of torment, my wife read to me this prayer by St. Francis de Sales:

"Do not look forward to what might happen tomorrow, the same Everlasting Father who cares for you today will take care of you tomorrow and every day. Either he will shield you from suffering or he will give you unfailing strength to bear it. Be at peace, then, and put aside all anxious thoughts and imaginations."

I am at peace with myself as I hope all of you will always be.

And now, my friends, would you please rise and toast with me the President of the United States, may he have long years and good health to move this country forward as it has never been moved before, with the help and grace of Almighty God.

DAIS

Abello, His Excellency Emilio, Ambassador of the Philippines.

Albert, Hon. Carl, majority leader, U.S. House of Representatives.

Anderson, Adm. George W., U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations.

Anfuso, Hon. Victor L., guest of honor.

Anfuso, Victor L., Jr.

Anfuso, Mrs. Victor L.

Antonini, Hon. Luigi, chairman, United Italian American Labor Council.

Arango, His Excellency Augusto Guillermo, Ambassador of Panama.

Bailey, Hon. John M., chairman, Democratic National Committee.

Beame, Hon. Abraham D., comptroller, city of New York.

Boggs, Hon. Hale, majority whip, U.S. House of Representatives.

Bonner, Hon. Herbert C., chairman, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Braskamp, Rev. Bernard, D.D., Chaplain, U.S. House of Representatives.

Buckley, Hon. Charles A., chairman, House Committee on Public Works.

Celebrezze, Hon. Anthony J., Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Celler, Hon. Emanuel, chairman, House Judiciary Committee.

Cogliandro, Charles A.

Cooley, Hon. Harold D., chairman, House Agriculture Committee.

Duke, Hon. Angier Biddle, Chief of Protocol, Department of State.

Eastland, Hon. James O., chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee.

Fenoaltea, His Excellency Sergio, Ambassador of Italy.

Garrigues, His Excellency Don Antonio, Ambassador of Spain.

Goodwin, Hon. Richard W., Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

Gurevich, Mrs. Mae, vice chairman, New York Democratic State Committee.

Haley, Andrew G., counsel, American Rocket Society.

Hall, Paul, president, Seafarers International Union.

Harriman, Hon. Averell, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Harman, His Excellency Avraham, Ambassador of Israel.

Harrison, Hunter C., president, National Capital section, American Rocket Society.

Hartke, Hon. Vance, U.S. Senator.

Jacoby, Hon. Aaron L., cochairman, Kings County Democratic Committee.

Kelly, Hon. Edna F., national committeewoman, New York State.

Kiernan, His Excellency Thomas J., Ambassador of Ireland.

Kirwan, Hon. Michael J., chairman, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

Lynch, Hon. John J., cochairman, Kings County Democratic Committee.

McCormack, Hon. John W., Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

McKeon, Hon. William H., chairman, New York Democratic State Committee.

Mansfield, Hon. Mike, majority leader, U.S. Senate.

Mars, His Excellency Dr. Louis, Ambassador of Haiti.

Miller, Hon. George P., chairman, House Science and Astronautics Committee.

O'Connor, Hon. Frank D., district attorney, Queens County, N.Y.

Prigione, Very Rev. Msgr. Gerolamo, apostolic delegation.

Re, Hon. Edward D., Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Rubel, Hon. John H., Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Sevilla-Sacasa, His Excellency Dr. Guillermo, Ambassador of Nicaragua.

Schriever, Lt. Gen. Bernard A., U.S. Air Force, commander, Air Force Systems.

Screvane, Hon. Paul R., president, Council of the City of New York.

Symington, Hon. Stuart, U.S. Senator.

Wagner, Hon. Robert F., mayor, city of New York.

Waterman, Dr. Alan T., Director, National Science Foundation.

Webb, Hon. James E., Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Wiesner, Hon. Jerome B., Special Assistant to the President.

Congratulations to the Coast Guard on Its 172d Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is not necessary to belabor the magnificent work of the Coast Guard of the United States of America. Founded in 1790, it has served us valiantly in peace and in war. A stricken seaman or a disabled fisherman, a boat in trouble or a criminal attempting to defy the smuggling laws all know the might of the Coast Guard. Last year it saved 3,449 persons and answered 35,335 assistance calls involving a property value of almost $2 billion.

The remarkable organization that accomplished these feats is marking its 172d birthday. We should not allow it to go unheeded. Theodore Roosevelt best phrased the ideals of this service:

> We think that the greatest victories are yet to be won, the greatest deeds yet to be done.

To follow this philosophy the Coast Guard stands always ready, or as its motto reads, "Semper Paratus."

The Atlantic City Press of August 4, 1962, has editorially congratulated the Coast Guard. I also wish to extend a birthday greeting to them and I hope that they have many more years of continued success.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Atlantic City Press editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS TO COAST GUARD AT 172

Shore residents are familiar with the work of the Coast Guard. They know how readily the coast guardsmen respond, and how well they perform in emergencies.

An angler overdue, a boat missing or disabled, a seaman stricken at sea and the instant reaction is: Call the Coast Guard.

The guardsmen stand ready to help at all times, in fair weather and foul. More often than not, the elements are in turmoil when the Coast Guard's services are needed. Its motto is semper paratus—always ready.

The Coast Guard marks its 172d birthday today. In war and in peace, it has more than earned its keep. Last year it saved 3,499 persons and answered 35,335 assistance calls involving a property value of almost $2 billion.

Coastguardsmen from the Atlantic City Lifeboat Station maintain an around-the-clock communications watch and lookout tower. They check conditions of pleasure boats, maintain aids to navigation such as channel markers and buoys, keep search and rescue equipment in repair and answer distress calls.

Coast Guard training facilities include a recruit receiving center at Cape May. The recruits are a familiar part of the Cape May scene.

One phase of the Coast Guard's lifesaving activities is the maintenance of an international arctic ice patrol.

The Coast Guard removes derelicts menacing navigation, enforces law on the high seas and strives to prevent smuggling.

More familiarly, the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Auxiliary promote boating safety. After the Federal Boating Act of 1958, it took on the job of registering boats of more than 10 horsepower in States having no registration laws of their own. It was not until this summer that New Jersey put such legislation into effect.

The Coast Guard performs many chores. It is a hard-working, compact organization with good morale and enviable tradition of service.

Our congratulations to the Coast Guard on their anniversary. We hope it will be around for a long, long time to come.

Government Storage: More Bitter Than Sweet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Billie Sol Estes has become symptomatic of the American farm problem and Federal Government attempts to deal with it. This Estes scandal drives deep into the crux of the problem. Americans—whether consumer, distributor, farmer or taxpayer—are awakening to the mess in Washington and are rightfully demanding a house cleaning in the Agricultural Department. Such a house cleaning must scour clean not only Department bureaucrats, but must uncover and critically examine the underlying philosophy of this administration's farm policy.

A forthright statement on this subject has recently come to my attention. Cargill, Inc., is a forward-moving grain merchandiser with an impressive pioneering history in the grain trade. I commend to my fellow colleagues the following Cargill editorial which appeared in the August 1962 issue of Cargill News.

The article follows:

GOVERNMENT STORAGE: MORE BITTER THAN SWEET

The doings—and the present undoing—of the pampered predator of Pecos, Tex., add up to the most widely reported and discussed agricultural scandal in years.

Cargill, because all its business is so closely linked to agriculture, has followed the Billie Sol Estes case with the utmost interest. We approve dragging Billie Sol and those who aided him from under their stones into the light; and we applaud ways in which the greater, underlying scandal, that of the 30-year-old farm program itself, is brought dramatically to public attention with Billie Sol as a case in point.

Cargill has consistently opposed crop subsidies, acreage allotments, and marketing controls as workable means to end surpluses and yield adequate income to farmers. Yet, even while opposing, we have cooperated fully with each administration in helping make the existing program function as well as possible. Sometimes cooperation was profitable; sometimes not. But even when profitable, we have believed we would be better off in a free agriculture, where neither profit nor prejudice derives from the Government.

The most important area of cooperation has been, without doubt, that of surplus grain storage. In fact, at those times in the 30-year period when Government control was most complete, incomes from Government storage was essential to Cargill's effort to maintain and improve its merchandising function, its only long-term reason for being, in the face of a smaller proportion of agricultural products available for traditional buying and selling.

During those years, as the farm program failed again and again, the Government repeatedly called on the grain trade to build new bins and elevators for storing its huge surplus stocks. Cargill responded, as did other established merchandising firms. But Cargill did so only to the extent that new space would fit in its framework of merchandising installations, and so would have long-range economic purposes unrelated to abnormal surpluses.

Many present-day storage firms used no such criteria in building. In fact, many did not even exist 30 years ago, but were born out of Government needs, grew as those needs increased and to this day have no better function than storage of Government surpluses.

Such firms, so far as we know, grew honestly enough. The Government needed storage, asked that it be built and set rates to be paid for its use. The new grain storage outfits, while gaining the title of "Johnny Come Lately's," can hardly be criticized for filling the need. It's their misfortune, not their fault, that the situation which bore them also bore Billie Sol Estes.

Yet it is sobering and shocking to note that in 10 years, from 1952 to April 1 of this year, Government approved storage quadrupled, swelling from 1,240 million bushels to 4,880 million. In centers of surplus production—Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, and other Middle and Southwestern States—there has been room and profits for all, from grocer to dentist to filling station owner, with a blossoming of such business-getting gimmicks as prizes, premiums, and green stamps to lure in the farmer's grain.

Cargill made its choice at the beginning. It could have left agriculture and turned to the making of ballpoint pens or some other uncontrolled product, but it did not. It could have joined others in all-out mushrooming of storage facilities, abandoned grain merchandising, filled all its houses with Government grain and thrown away the keys. It did not do that, either.

Instead, it kept emphasis on retaining or expanding its free-market business, both within the United States and abroad. Its elevator capacity grew, but more gradually than the national total, and only as new space was justified by present or anticipated merchandising.

During the 10 years, while national capacity expanded 400 percent, Cargill's grew 77 percent, from 91,865,000 bushels in 1952 to 162,397,000 this year, and the company exerted itself to use more of that space for handling its own grain and less for storing the Government's. For, as subsidized agriculture gradually is abandoned—and Cargill is convinced that it must be abandoned—we do not plan to become an unlamented adjunct to the farm program's failure. Instead, the company will be more active and vigorous, with all its efforts devoted to its proper calling: the merchandising of farm products in a free economy.

How well have we done so far? Here's a look at the record:

Grain Division statistics for 6 years—in which the transition has been most successful—show merchandising (both dollar sales to others and bushels sold to others) has increased 87 percent, while bushels warehoused for others (mostly Government) declined 10 percent and income received for warehousing decreased 18 percent. Storage space used for our own grain increased more than 50 percent and now accounts for considerably more than half our capacity.

These proportions continue to change within Cargill toward the ultimate goal of "all free grain; no uneconomic Government surplus at all." No one can tell when that goal will be reached, but our aim is the same as it always has been, and final accomplishment can't come too quickly.

The U.S. Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a young man of my acquaintance, Bill Kemp, a high school student, has prepared the following remarks on the attempted packing of the U.S. Supreme Court 25 years ago. It is reassuring to know that a new generation retains its respect for the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers. We live today in an age when complete centralization of authority in the executive branch is once again becoming a growing threat to the maintenance of our constitutional system. I am doubly pleased, therefore, to note that this paper by a young high school student reflects an awareness of the dangers that can be expected if we pursue such a course.

Mr. Speaker, young Mr. Kemp's conclusions are as follows:

In looking back upon the Supreme Court reorganization plan, it must be noted that Roosevelt's plan contained nothing new, revolutionary, or even unconstitutional. Why then, did his plan meet with such extreme opposition from not only the opposition, but also from those who were most friendly to his New Deal laws? The answer can only be guessed, but I feel that it lies in the democratic spirit of the American people.

Roosevelt brought forth his plan in order to be able to pass his ideas into law without having them defeated by judicial review. He must have felt his duty was to do everything possible to carry out his plans, which he felt were approved of by a majority of Americans but the people through their Representatives said "No"; Roosevelt had gone too far, and could not be allowed to carry out his plan.

Roosevelt's plan itself was shortsighted, taking care of only the present. If every President could control the Supreme Court by adding justices of his own opinion, then the Court could get larger and larger, and become not the highest Court in the land, but a political body interested in legislating its own ideas through so-called Court decisions.

The Constitution named a legislative body to make laws. This is and should be a political body, but the Supreme Court is supposed to interpret laws according to the Constitution, and should be divorced as far as possible from the political control of the President and Congress.

Retraining Creates Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this Congress has passed legislation which would allow an unemployed man to be retrained in a new skill. It was the Manpower Retraining Act.

Within a few short weeks, Evansville, Ind., will soon see the conclusive results that this forward looking legislation was a step in the right direction for America.

The Evansville Courier, of Sunday, August 19, 1962, has published an excellent editorial, "Full Employment Increases Labor Supply," about this problem of retraining and the giving to human beings the opportunity to regain full ability to care for his needs."

As you all know, Evansville is my hometown, and I am proud that it was the first city in Indiana to receive the benefits of this legislation. Evansville is also one of Indiana's larger cities which has been declared a city of chronic and persistent unemployment by the Departments of Labor and Commerce, and it is therefore most gratifying to see this city begin to readjust as individuals with new manpower skills will become an asset to society and will be able to provide for their families.

It is, therefore, because of the Evansville Courier's editorial which defends the Manpower Retraining Act as worthwhile legislation, that I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL EMPLOYMENT INCREASES LABOR SUPPLY

Within a short time, Evansville should have conclusive indications of the success of a job retraining program sponsored by the local schools and the Federal Government.

Sixty-three men graduated from the first classes, and chances appeared good that a large percentage of them would be working before long. This would bear out the argument that unemployment can be reduced significantly by fitting workers for jobs that are going begging.

The advantages of the local program are obvious. Every unemployed person who gets a job through retraining is a person who regains full ability to care for his family's needs. He is once again a person who contributes to our society, instead of one who may need contributions from it.

One other aspect of the situation should be noted. Many of the trainees who found jobs before graduation moved out of town. They found better opportunities elsewhere in Indiana.

This does not lessen the need for the course. Relocation of workers who cannot find jobs here is justified in terms of sheer humanity, as well as economics. We should not expect regional ties to prevent a previously jobless man from making a good living elsewhere.

The only way a community can maintain a force of skilled workmen is providing them with ample job opportunities. If the opportunities are not available locally, the skilled worker soon moves elsewhere. If there are good chances for local jobs, the number of youths who will train for any given vocation increases.

Full employment, consequently, is a help in creating a supply of competent labor for new industries. It sounds paradoxical, but in these days of high mobility, that's the way it works out.

San Diego: Dynamic City in Motion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most aggressive building programs of any large city in the United States is presently underway in San Diego, Calif. Within a 24-city-block area, city, county, State, and Federal buildings are being built or on the drawing boards. This government activity is bolstered by an expression of confidence on the part of the business community that is building 3 buildings in excess of 20 stories, plus many other improvements.

This phenomenal growth of a downtown area is expressed in a very well-written story by Mr. Julian Wise, assistant to the city manager of the city of San Diego, that appeared in the June 1962, issue of Western City magazine.

I commend this article to you and our colleagues in the Congress and under unanimous consent I offer it to be printed in the RECORD:

CENTER CITY, SAN DIEGO: COMMUNITY AND OFFICIALS SPARK DOWNTOWN REBIRTH

(By Julian Wise)

The vitality and strength of a city's central area is the most important factor in the continued growth and prosperity of its entire metropolitan area. But the rare romanticism of a city in explosive expansion—a city changing its skyline almost hourly, is unique even in today's nation of rapid progress and impatience for the future.

In San Diego, Calif., a "city in motion"—this phenomenon is currently underway. With the cooperation of the citizens, a center city project is underway that will, during the next 40 years, see the city investing some $46 million in public and governmental facilities. The beginning of this project has already resulted in the announcement and planning of private improvements in San Diego's downtown area in excess of $100 million.

Within the core area of center city (24 city blocks), a county courthouse has been completed and major private construction is underway including the Home Federal Building (20 stories), the First and C Office Building (24 stories), the U.S. National Bank Building (25 stories) and the Community Concourse (a 3-block area to be the site of the city's new 14-story administration building, a 5,000-seat public assembly facility, a 1,000-car parking garage with 75,000 square feet of display space and a 3,000-seat theater).

Seven years ago, a group of downtown businessmen in San Diego witnessed a nationwide trend—a trend that had been growing since 1943. Downtown pedestrian traffic was falling. This group bought a partial study ($5,000) in an attempt to determine the best method of downtown retail promotion to check the trend. The attempt fell far short of its goal.

Then, in 1959, a group of 50 business leaders organized San Diegans, Inc. Western Real Estate Research Corp., was retained to produce a detailed and comprehensive study—an unqualified market analysis of the entire central area. WRERC was asked to determine the logical function of the central area in a modern, large city today. These 50 citizens in San Diego produced $35,000 of their own money to pay for the study.

The research group completed its work in the spring of 1960. The report showed conclusively that this "logical function of the central area" is administrative, financial, cultural, governmental, and general and specialized retail. It also showed that the central area is truly the heart of a metropolitan area and must be developed and retained as the heart.

San Diegans, Inc. presented the study it had purchased to the city council in early 1960 and center city, San Diego, was underway. A center city team was formed in the city's long-range planning section of the planning department, and in February of 1961, the governmental facilities report was completed.

Land acquisition for public facilities was started, utilizing capital provided by the city employees' retirement fund (a leaseback to the city) and capital funds were tabbed for construction of major facilities—beginning with the community concourse. The chain reaction had, by this time, reached fusion proportions. Estimates came in on the concourse while private builders started construction of major office, hotel, and retail buildings in the downtown area.

Community concourse estimates, not including land purchased with city retirement funds; city administration building, $4,400,000; parking-exhibit facility, $3,100,000; and theater and public assembly hall combined (even though these are two separate facilities) $6 million. The city prepared its financing on the basis of the original estimates; estimates that, for the theater and assembly facility included only minimum requirements. It was then learned that minimum requirements in the latter two structures would be inadequate immediately upon completion. New estimates were prepared, and they came in $1.5 million higher—the total now was $7.5 million.

With this occurrence, the miracle of close city government-community cooperation began to take its form. A locally financed project was underway. All funds being used were San Diego funds—no one was asking for anything from anywhere else—nor had they, nor would they.

But what about this $1.5 million shy? Within 4 months, some 150 donations to the Community Concourse Fund—donations from private citizens and corporations as well—donations ranging from $3 to $200,000, created slightly in excess of $1.6 million.

San Diego's Community Concourse will be completed by January of 1965. The public assembly exhibit facility and the parking garage will be ready for use late next year. San Diego's skyline is sprouting new buildings, new growth, and new vitality. The heart of the city is pumping new lifeblood throughout the metropolitan community of more than 1 million people.

Center city has been designed—in planning terminology, to pedestrian scale. San Diegans, Inc. President Ewart Goodwin said, "I know of no other city with a population of more than 200,000 that will have a central retail area, financial district, and city, county, State, and Federal buildings, all within 5 minutes' walking distance from one another."

Along with the concourse area and mushrooming private facilities in this center city area. San Diego has projected its growth requirements to a horizon year—a year now estimated at 2010. During the period of time covered by those next nearly 50-years, the city will be continuing its expansion program in center city. Operations and services buildings will be constructed and police and fire facilities are scheduled as the needs are presented. All of the land for the total requirement is now acquired—land valued today at some $7 million.

The question of a governmental agency removing property and improvements from the tax roll is an important one. San Diego's urban renewal coordinator, William Gerhardt, recently completed an interesting study of center city's effect to date in this regard. Gerhardt added the assessed value of the present improvements on the sites of private development and found a total of $671,643. On these sites, private developers propose to place some $37.8 million in new improvements—a net gain of $35.3 million.

Using the latter figure, and assuming a tax rate of $7.61 (current) and an assessment ration of 25 percent, present improvements pay ad valorem (current value) taxes of $49,270 each year. New improvements will pay $720,913 a year. Public projects will remove from the tax rolls some $153,870 in assessed land value and $763,310 in assessed improvements value. Again, Gerhardt applied the $7.61 tax rate and determined the reduction to be $69,816. This leaves the basic net overall increase at $601,827 a year.

ASSESSED VALUE

Center city San Diego is a continuing program. There is no end to San Diego's story. Early completion of the first phases of the program represent the beginning of a new city—and even more than that, a new method of accomplishing a new city.

New highways are now being constructed to border this downtown area. Highways 101, 395, 80, and 94 sweep through the city past offramps emiting traffic into parking reservoirs surrounding the pedestrian-scale downtown locations. The railroad and air locations are within 5 minutes of the core area.

San Diegans, Inc., has become a continuing organization. The group that met with city planners and administrators every week for 3 years on the development of center city has already commissioned additional economic studies to establish the feasibility of multiunit housing surrounding the center city area, and to additionally determine the market potential for central-area oriented industry. These reports, being produced at a cost to San Diegans, Inc., of some $11,800 (an additional $5,000 is being provided by the city) will be given to the city of San Diego sometime this month.

Under the continuing leadership in San Diego of Mayor Charles C. Dail, the city council and Manager Thomas W. Fletcher, center city is now beginning to take its shape—and the spirit in San Diego is catching.

San Diego: City in motion. Third largest city in California (population 616,500); 16th largest city in the Nation; 5th largest city in land area, nationally (298 square miles); primary market area 1,856,000 people; secondary market area 8,300,000 people; lowest major city tax rate (ranks 9th in California—$1.85); youngest median are population (26.7 years); most modern port facilities on west coast; home of 11th Naval District; world's finest year 'round climate; world's fastest growing high rise business and commercial district.

San Diego has University of California; University of San Diego; California Western University; San Diego State College; Naval Electronic Laboratory; Salk Institute for Biological Research; sea water conversion plant; General Atomic Research Laboratory; General Dynamics astronautics' Atlas; City Research Park; City Industrial Park; Mission Bay Aquatic Park; San Diego Zoo.

The Educational Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, most everyone in America is stirred by the shortcomings of our space program as dramatically illustrated by the Russian cosmonauts, but no one seems to be overly concerned by our educational deficiencies. We have talked for years about it, but little action has resulted.

Two newspapers in my State, the Courier News, Plainfield, N.J., and the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., have once again brought up the embarrassing problem of education. The Home News cites shocking figures, such as the price tag on top quality schools would mean a 110.9 percent increase in current expenditures per pupil between 1959–60 and 1969–70. The longer we wait the more difficult it will be to make our schools ones of which we can all be proud. We are shockingly behind the U.S.S.R., for example, in the educational areas which build national power. During the period 1926 to 1959, the Soviet Union turned out 1.8 as many engineers as we did, 2.4 times as many doctors, and 1.4 times as many graduates in the engineering, theoretical, science, and applied science fields. And the Courier News points out that the teacher shortage is really beginning to hurt. We must do something to increase teacher salaries so we can provide more topflight teachers for our ever mushrooming school age population.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the two aforementioned editorials. The Courier News is from August 13, the Home News from August 15. Furthermore, I ask my colleagues to consider what positive action we may take to remedy these known evils.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION

The New Jersey Education Association said this week that one thing had come to characterize education in our State—change. Change in pupil enrollment, change in teachers, change in curriculum content.

The education association points out that the "baby boom" has not diminished. School enrollment increases will average 40,000 over the next 5 years, and there will be more than 1,450,000 students in New Jersey's elementary and secondary schools by 1970.

It is expected that teacher shortages and teacher turnover will continue. Last year, the report said, more than 9,000 teachers in the State were new to the school district in which they taught.

A world of continually expanding knowledge and opportunity makes change and improvement in content and method of school curriculum an everyday duty. This was brought to our attention forcibly the other day when an editorial writer said that we must constantly seek the truth and be aware that even our concept of the truth changes. "It is no longer true that whatever goes up must come down," he said.

School boards in the State which really serve the public interest have tried to keep up with the problems created by these changes and to meet the demand for educational quality. We support the view of the educators that learning must keep pace with constant change.

TOP EDUCATION'S PRICE TAG IN 1970

Despite the continuous construction of new school facilities, superintendents and administrators are still concerned over the lack of adequate space for the enrollment which is increasing at the rate of 1 million a year in the United States.

With this explosion in secondary education bursting upon our Nation, the National Education Association this week announced the results of a 2-year study of population trends and calculated costs of quality education by 1970.

Quality public schools will cost Americans $33.6 billion per year by 1970, the report states. This price tag is for current expenses only; capital outlay and interest would boost the total a few billions more. The estimates for 1970 are based on—

The enrollment of practically all school-age children and youth in a public or private school;

A substantial increase in the percentage of boys and girls finishing high school;

Salaries for teachers comparable to earnings in other professions, and competitive with salaries offered the best talent coming out of our colleges and the universities;

Considerable improvement in the average training and experience of instructional staff, namely, 57 percent of all teachers would have master's or higher degrees;

A staffing ratio of 50 professionals per 1,000 pupils which is the Educational Policies Commission's formula for providing the staff needed to supply adequate instructional supervisory, and administrative services, plus the supporting services now provided in the Nation's best school systems.

This price tag on top quality schools would mean a 110.9 percent increase in current expenditures per pupil between 1959–60 and 1969–70. It also represents an increase in the average classroom teachers' salary from $5,527 this year to $9,710 in 1969–70.

These will come as shocking figures in those communities where school bond issues have been voted down in a "taxpayers revolt."

Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10113), to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these 2 minutes in order to call attention to the RECORD of yesterday. When the distinguished gentleman from Alabama who just left the well of the House was discussing the senior citizens housing bill when it was considered yesterday, I directed a question to him. I asked if there was back-door spending in that bill, and I certainly understood him to say "No." However, when I read the RECORD this morning I found he had corrected his answer and indicated instead that there was some back-door spending in the bill. I know that of course the gentleman was not trying to misinform me. He simply changed his answer and by the same token I want to change the comment I made following his statement. I want to withdraw the comment I made that I was glad that there was no back-door spending in the bill. There was, and I am sorry, because I am against the back-door method of financing programs.

Mr. RAINS. I misunderstood. I want to give you the correct answer. I discovered it this morning also. I was thinking about new programs. The gentleman asked me if they were recommending back-door spending, which they were not. There was a continuation of one that had been going on for almost as long as we have been here, and there was a small amount of usual Treasury financing in it, but in the item I was discussing there was not. I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. No apology is necessary. I know, of course, the gentleman was not deliberately misinforming me. I want to retract my expression in the RECORD to the effect that I was happy about all provisions of the bill. I regret there was back-door spending and that there was increased borrowing authority which bypasses the procedure of annual scrutiny of a program by the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. RAINS. We had only continued the borrowing authority.

Mr. PELLY. But you increased it by $50 million, as I understand.

Mr. RAINS. I understood the gentleman to be talking about the new program. I apologize to the gentleman. I did not intend to mislead him.

Mr. PELLY. I want to assure the gentleman that I know he was making a statement the way he understood my question. Properly he corrected his answer. I want to correct my part of it too. The legislative branch loses control over finances where an agency of Government can borrow from the Treasury. I intend to oppose this device whenever it is included in legislation.

Federal Aid Issues of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a most penetrating report by a distinguished educator, Ralph C. Norris, who serves as Iowa chairman of an education State-Federal relations committee, has just come to my attention.

Those who are really concerned as to the direction of school aid programs should be interested in reading it, and I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that more people may benefit from this report.

It is as follows:

FEDERAL AID ISSUES OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

You probably know that I have been a member of the State-Federal relations committee for many years and served as chairman for the last 2 years. It has been a very frustrating but interesting job. It is my understanding that someone else will assume the chairmanship for the 88th Congress—1963–65. Before passing out of the picture as chairman, there are some important observations which I believe need to be expressed.

In my opinion the Members of Congress have been for many years, and are now, too anxious to assume the responsibilities of local and State school officers. In many respects the Congresses that I have known have been much like the State legislatures of the past—they have not placed enough responsibility and faith in local school boards and local superintendents.

This is probably natural for them to do this for they see the national needs and are very concerned about them. They forget, or do not realize, that State and local boards could do a much better job if they had more funds with which to develop needed programs.

The following statements as to some of the specific Federal laws and appropriations are, in my opinion, illustrative.

It seems desirable to invite your attention to a glaring inconsistency in the matter of voting Federal funds for school support. While many of our Iowa Congressmen oppose general grants of Federal moneys for support of elementary and secondary schools, they vote to continue the program of so-called federally impacted areas (Public Law 81–815 and Public Law 81–874). This benefits about 10 percent of the Nation's school districts located in 316 of the 437 congressional districts. The moneys come to the local school districts without any strings attached and they are consequently commingled with school revenues from State and local sources. They provide as much as 50 percent to 75 percent of the operating budgets of some school districts. They do not clear through the State departments of public instruction but go directly to local school districts. Since I have been on the State Federal Relations Committee the office of education has set up regional offices throughout the United States to administer certain phases of Federal aid including the impacted areas funds.

On what grounds can our Federal lawmakers reconcile this willingness to help provide for one-third of the pupils enrolled in public schools, while turning a deaf ear to the needs of the other two-thirds? One of their favorite tactics is to claim that such funds are really granted in lieu of taxes that might have been collected on property had not the Federal Government preempted it. Actually the program, which began $8 million in 1950 has risen to $312 million in fiscal 1962 was based on local school costs but no serious attempt has ever been made to calculate exactly the amount of taxes lost to a school district because of Government activity.

Furthermore, liberalizing amendments have been added which permitted school districts, especially those in the South, to base their claims for these funds not on actual local expenditures, which are abnormally low in many cases, but on either State or national per capita school costs, whichever are higher. Many school districts receive far more under this program than they would have been able to raise had the Federal property remained on the tax polls. Many of them are able to collect on the basis of pupils whose parents work on Federal installations located in other school districts or even in other States. Most of the school districts surrounding the District of Columbia fall into this category to a large extent. (Oddly enough, District of Columbia schools receive nothing although technically eligible for $5 million annually). When, as occasionally happens, a parent transfers from Federal to private employment in the Washington area, his children are removed from the list upon which claims for Federal moneys are based, although his tax liability to the school district in which he resides has not been altered in the slightest degree.

When Federal installations are leased to private industry, as in the case of aircraft production facilities, the school districts must subtract the taxes they receive on such properties from their federally impacted grants. A study made in 1958 showed that 685 districts collected $8.3 million under this provision after subtracting only $412,500 in taxes.

Both Democratic and Republican Presidents have tried to readjust some of these inequities without success. President Kennedy recommended these funds be included in a general aid proposal to be distributed to the States and they in turn distribute to the local school districts. It was freely predicted in September 1961, when the program was renewed for 2 more years, that a Presidential veto would be overridden if one was attempted. I have little doubt but what this would have been the case.

Here are the statistics showing how much of this money came to Iowa during fiscal 1960, the latest year for which complete figures are available:

Public Law 81–815—Construction

Congressional District No. 5 .... $115,575

Public Law 81–874—Operation and maintenance

Congressional district	Number of applicants	Total
1st	13	$412,383
2d	1	7,318
3d	1	12,301
4th	1	4,049
5th	5	146,218
7th	1	6,073
8th	2	63,844
Total (7 districts)	24	652,186

NOTE.—The figures do not include expenditures on federally owned or federally leased properties.

When these bills came up for a 2-year renewal, here is the way the Iowa Congressmen voted (1st sess., 87th Cong., roll No. 210, Sept. 18, 1961):

District No. 1: FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, Davenport (not voting).

District No. 2; JAMES BROMWELL, Republican, Cedar Rapids, "yea."

District No. 3: H. R. GROSS, Republican, Waterloo, "nay."

District No. 4: JOHN KYL, Republican, Bloomfield, "yea."

District No. 5: NEAL SMITH, Democrat. Altoona, "nay."

District No. 6: MERWIN COAD, Democrat, Boone (not voting).

District No. 7: BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, Exira, "yea."

District No. 8: CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Republican, Alton (not voting).

The administration had asked for a 1-year extension of the laws in order to make a thorough study of the entire problem. This may have been the chief reason for Mr. SMITH's vote. Mr. GROSS was undoubtedly following his usual policy of thrift when he voted "no." The House also had voted against taking up a 1-year extension under a procedure permitting amendments to the law. SMITH voted for this measure and expressed a desire to amend the law to change the formula and require approval from the State department of public instruction before a local district could receive the funds so that funds would not be given districts contrary to State policy.

He was especially concerned with State and local problems affecting reorganization of school districts. He was also concerned with the fact the funds were allocated on the basis of the impact of Federal payroll rather than impact of children to be educated.

This is not written to condemn the federally impacted areas program. The National Education Association favors appropriate extension of the plan, but the program as now operated causes discrimination among school districts and further accentuates educational inequalities. After all, what part of the country is not federally impacted to a greater or lesser degree? These facts should be pointed out to Congressmen at every opportunity.

Most of the Congressmen from Iowa have consistently argued against general aid to schools for fear of Federal controls and yet most of them either voted to extend this law which actually is influencing State and local school board policy or else they didn't vote at all.

PART II—NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

School administrators in Iowa are much better acquainted with this law since many more districts have applied and received funds under its provisions.

It should be poined out again and again that this law even more than impacted areas is actually doing the very thing that

Congressmen generally and certain specific organizations, as well as many individuals, have preached and preached against; that is, Federal control of education and influence of local school board policy.

This argument is so common that it is almost trite to even mention—"We don't want Federal aid because it means Federal control." As another example the vote on the NDEA funds indicates that Iowa Congressmen vote one way on definite specific legislation which affects school board policy but they are always opposing general aid which would leave the policymaking up to local boards of education as it is influenced by expenditure of public funds. When the rollcall vote on a 2-year extension of NDEA funds was taken, here is the way the Iowa Congressmen voted. Rollcall No. 188, September 7, 1961, page 376 Congressional Digest.

District No. 1: FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, Davenport, "yea."

District No. 2: JAMES BROMWELL, Republican, Cedar Rapids, "yea."

District No. 3: H. R. GROSS, Republican, Waterloo, "nay."

District No. 4: JOHN KYL, Republican, Bloomfield, "yea."

District No. 5: NEAL SMITH, Democrat, Altoona, "nay."

District No. 6: MERWIN COAD, Democrat, Boone, (not voting).

District No. 7: BEN JENSEN, Republican, Exira, "yea."

District No. 8: CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Republican, "yea."

SMITH voted on an earlier action in favor of the privilege of amending this law but the Congress voted this down. Mr. SMITH wanted to amend this law to broaden it so as to cover other areas of need. This would have given local boards more power to determine how the money could be spent in the local districts. Congressman GROSS has at least been consistent with his voting and his expressed opposition.

The National Defense Education Act provides specifically the type of program for which the money can be used. It provides for financing special training of teachers and for cost of equipment and supplies in science, mathematics, foreign language, and guidance. Apparently Congress does not believe the local school boards and administrators are doing a good enough job in these fields; which of course can well be true in many districts. The point, however, is that Congress has determined local school district policy in this program and thus is actually controlling expenditure of Federal funds and at least influencing public policy.

School districts may and probably many times have appropriated matching funds for science, mathematics, foreign language, and guidance as provided under this Federal law at the expense of a balanced program of education.

All this goes to the question of the basic needs for financing education. We are still in the horse and buggy days in Iowa. We still tie practically all our hopes for funds on the property tax principle, whether the property is making money or not.

When will the people of Iowa rise up and require a better system of financing education on a State level?

When will the people wake up to the fact that opposition to a general Federal aid grant to each State (to be distributed under the laws of each State by the chief State school officials) will bring more and more Federal aid for specific purposes and thus more and more Federal control.

The only answer is to be for a general aid unless we want the Federal Government, and by that I mean our Congressmen, to continue to legislate specific programs and thus influence local school district policy.

Again it should be said that Congressmen are not generally to blame. The National Farm Bureau, the chamber of commerce, and even the National School Board Association; also state organizations representing farmers, school board members, and chamber of commerce have opposed general Federal aid. The press has generally been opposed to general Federal aid.

These organizations and persons who represent them are actually encouraging Federal aid for specific purposes when they oppose general aid. Congress cannot be blamed for trying to resolve the school finance problem by appropriating funds for specific and well deserved needs. The important issue it seems to me is whether State and local school boards and school administrators can really convince the people they are actually responsible and can and will provide the necessary programs of education to keep America free. The question is—can we think big enough to do this? Much more could be said about a variety of other aspects of the problem of Federal aid to education.

Sorry to take so long to tell this part of the story. I would be glad to hear from any person who receives this or reads it in the local paper.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH C. NORRIS,
Chairman, State-Federal Relations Committee.

BASIC PRINCIPLES ON WHICH THE NEA LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION HAVE AND ARE CONSIDERING ANY LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

1. Substantial sums of money—granted to the States to be administered by and allocated by the State chief school agency under the State's laws.
2. Freedom of choice at the State level on use of the money.
3. Maintenance and improvement of local and State support of public education.
4. Definite assurance of no Federal interference in the local school district and State administration of the public schools.
5. No grants of public funds should be made to private schools on any level.
6. Members of both houses of Congress should not be denied the opportunity to vote on a sound national school support program.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Edgefield Advertiser, of Edgefield, S.C., has printed in its August 2, 1962, edition some very eloquent and strong comments on the subject of "The American Way." I commend these comments to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that this editorial be placed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY

The recent Russian success in space does not necessarily mean the Russians are greatly ahead of the United States.

But for there to be any question at all about it is a new experience for the American people who, since colonial times, have demonstrated a dynamic will and a growth in every field of endeavor that led the world.

The economic successes—the rate of industrial growth—across Europe, which has caused the administration in Washington to send study groups to see how the United States might benefit, does not necessarily mean that the Socialist countries of Europe are getting ahead of the United States in their planned economies.

But for there to be any question about how and why the United States is even to any extent losing its position should be a cause of concern.

Can the United States compete with socialism by copying after socialism?

The old saying that you can't beat one at his own game may be somewhat applicable.

The American way is the way of freedom. In the countries of Europe, freedom is hardly understood any longer. Socialism in Germany, where almost half of the industrial income now goes to social security (and the same general pattern holds in France and England) is a way of life, and has been for a long time.

Freedom is something else. It has long been the life and breath, the impulse, the drive, in the American way of life.

FREEDOM HAS BEEN THE AMERICAN WAY

Maybe it is not politically right any longer. Maybe the dream of America, the Nation which gave its allegiance to a higher power than government, is no longer understood and pursued for continued fulfillment by the people themselves.

But it should be remembered by those, even though they might be a relatively few, who still believe in it, that their heritage gives them the right as individuals to defend it.

NOW $300 MILLION OF FEDERAL POWER—WHAT IS TO BECOME OF INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM?

The greatest effort in the United States for many years has been in what government can do.

The emphasis is on government form, and presently, democracy as the answer to all the problems of the world.

The people have not been told by their leaders in recent years that democracy even now is limited only in the power of government to take the earnings of the people and use it to guide their lives.

The indebtedness of the central government in Washington has just reached $300 million—a new high—and the limit has already been upped to more than that, indicating that there may never be any firm ceiling put on the power of the Government in Washington. Attempts to write a debt limit into the Constitution have subsided.

This taxing and spending authority, this monetary power in an age of materialism, is the ultimate power of Government. It is the means by which a government can redirect the lives of the people, change their customs and the forms of their institutions; reorientate their fundamental philosophy; create a new and heretofore strange culture; amalgamate races; defy established religious influences while discriminating to advance others.

This taxing and spending, this fountainhead of materialism using the promises and pressures of money in the hands of ambitious rulers, has taken the form of a godhead, to which all must turn for the fulfillment of their daily lives—unless the people resist.

Therefore how, even now, can this be called any longer a land of individual freedom, of free enterprise where the individual is the most important entity, rather than the power of the state?

What difference is there to be soon between the Russian state and the planned control of the American people by their Government?

And how can the growing tyranny against the individual be stopped politically, and by any other method or measure except by individual courage?

The only successes in the cold war have resulted in the spirit of courage.

By the exception, it was proved by Chamberlain 23 years ago in his bowing to Hitler, no less than it has been proved every time the United States has stood adamant against Communist aggressions.

It was proved by the Russians when they constructed the East-West Berlin wall, and backed down the West in a moment when history was handing out leadership to where at the instant the most courage lay.

Courage must have right on its side to ultimately prevail; but right, without courage, is like a fire department without men.

It is so clear that our State Department, the National Council of Churches, the leadership of the country generally is giving ascendancy to the ideal that is exactly opposite to the American tradition of courage for right.

While the changes are being methodically made in what is considered right, sinister pressures are bearing against any manifestation of individual courage, which is being confused and identified with violence.

Any action beyond government action, which advances to establish new forms of right, is not to be tolerated; and the result is instilling a quiet fear in the people, and slanting almost every local and State and National outlook and endeavor toward arbitrary, and anti-individual conclusions.

Thus the Russian and Communist form of state control is taking hold as each day passes, while the strings of government and political power to which are attached the selfish and ambitious public gain-seekers are growing ever stronger and more dominant; and the individual is becoming a conformist, a worker, a sleeper, an eater, a drinker—a consumer—in a planned political experimental laboratory.

VFW Warning on Communist Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous aspects of Communist aggression involves the constant, and all too quite, manner in which the Red strategic planners are furthering their efforts to control the narrow seas, which, in turn, are the key to control of worldwide maritime traffic. This basic strategy of Red aggression is illustrated by the Communist drive through southeast Asia, which has a major goal the control of Singapore and the Straits of Malacca, through which pass the sea lanes from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean.

Also, Red control of Cuba poses grave threats to our wartime utilization of the Windward Passage, the major water route between the Atlantic and the Caribbean. Red efforts to create an anti-U.S. movement in Panama has as its prime purpose disruption of our control and use of that vital waterway between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

It should be crystal clear that this Communist strategy is based upon a realization by the Reds that the free world is, basically, a maritime coalition. Consequently the Red strategy is aimed at controlling the vital waterways. Such control by the Communists would go far toward severing the sea lanes and fragmenting the free world. Such a strategy against United States and free world use of the seas is further underlined by the existence of the Soviet Union's submarine fleet, by far the world's largest. At the present time the Soviet Union has several times the number of submarines which Nazi Germany had at the beginning of World War II.

A very informative article on this much overlooked, but vital, aspect of Communist strategy was contained in the August 1962 issue of the VFW American Security Reporter. This publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is issued monthly and is published under the direction of Mr. Byron B. Gentry, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The article to which I refer is entitled "Communist Eye on Gibraltar," and is by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, national security and foreign affairs, VFW. The article explains some little recognized, but very basic facts concerning the military strategy of Communist aggression, and in so doing, points up the crucial importance of Communist-inspired efforts to undermine the Franco government in Spain and the Salazar government in Portugal. As the article further points out, the purpose of such Red strategy is to gain ultimate control, or at least neutralization, from the Red standpoint, of the Straits of Gilbraltar. This Red activity directed against the Iberian Peninsula, together with growing Red influence in Morocco on the African side of the Straits of Gibraltar creates a genuinely serious threat to the strategic integrity of the free world and endangers the southern flank of NATO.

Because of its importance, I include the article, "Communist Eye on Gibraltar," from the VFW American Security Reporter at the conclusion of my remarks.

COMMUNIST EYE ON GIBRALTAR

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle)

Unquestionably, one of the most vital areas in the world, from the standpoint of the free world survival, is the narrow water passage known as the Straits of Gibraltar. Should this ever fall under the control of, or be neutralized by direct or indirect Communist pressure, NATO and the free world would be in dire jeopardy.

There is far more than an ideological motivation behind the reported Communist-inspired efforts to undermine and ultimately overthrow the Franco government in Spain and the Salazar government in Portugal. If communism or a Communist-front government is successful in overthrowing the Portuguese and Spanish Governments, the eventual seizure or neutralization of Gibraltar, for all practical purposes, is a foregone conclusion. With the Iberian Peninsula in the Red camp, the narrow straits separating Europe from Africa would be closed, or at least endangered. The Mediterranean world would be faced by strategic problems of major magnitude. Water access to southern France, Italy, Greece, and Turkey would be severed. The Mediterranean, the southern flank of NATO, would be largely untenable for the West. North Africa would deteriorate rapidly under Red subversion, for no longer would Communist penetration of Africa have to pause due to Western control of the Mediterranean on the northern rim of that vast continent.

But the Communist master strategists who view the areas of Western strength as worthy of larger Red effort have not departed from the thoroughness which has so often characterized Red strategy. The Communist move on the Straits of Gibraltar is not limited to a desire to control only the northern flank of that vital waterway.

Without fanfare and with very little notice by the free world, which should have been virtually electrified by such a development, the Soviet Union is proceeding with the arming of the Moroccan army on the southern flank of Gibraltar.

A recent special article to the New York Times reported the arrival in Rabaut, Morocco, of a large amount of artillery, tanks, and vehicles from the Soviet Union. This apparently was no routine shipment, for the Times also reported that the dock area was sealed off, the unloading entrusted to Moroccan troops, with the regular stevedores kept away from the cargo. The arming of Moroccan troops by the Soviet Union could well be the precursor of expanding Soviet influence over that government and its armed forces. Moroccan dependence upon the Soviet Union for military equipment and the spare parts for the maintenance of that equipment could give the Kremlin a powerful hold on the area constituting the southern flank of the Straits of Gibraltar.

Consequently, when the strategic situation of Gibraltar is evaluated in terms of the Communist designs against the Franco and the Salazar governments to the north, and the increasing Soviet influence which undoubtedly will accompany the Russian arming of the Moroccan army, the pattern of Communist-planned pressure against Gibraltar becomes evident. That pattern is a grand-scale double envelopment with one arm of the pincer through Morocco on the south, and the other through the Iberian Peninsula on the north.

The survival of Western Europe could well depend on the free world's ability to recognize and repel this vast Communist strategic scheme.

Import Injury—Reciprocity—Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the following appendixes to the statement of Robert L. L. McCormick to the Senate Finance Committee bring out several vital points regarding the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. First, the theory of injury to workers and industries as an accepted fact has never before been part of our trade program; second, the proposed legislation has no true reciprocity provisions; and, third, the recent deterioration of our high labor content goods in world trade must be considered.

INJURY AS A NATIONAL POLICY?

Title III of H.R. 11970 and statements by Federal officials are the first recognition since 1934 that tariff reductions involve injury to industry and workers.

Previous statements of national leaders disavowed injury to industry and workers as follows:

"The exercise of the authority which I propose must be carefully weighed in the light of the latest information so as to give assurance that no sound and important American interest will be injuriously disturbed. The adjustment of our foreign-trade relations must rest on the premise of undertaking to benefit and not to injure such interests. In a time of difficulty and unemployment such as this, the highest consideration of the position of the different branches of American production is required."—From text of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Message to Congress (H. Doc. No. 273, 73d Cong., 2d sess.), "Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, June 1934 to April 1948, 1949, Part 11," U.S. Tariff Commission.

"We have reduced duties only in those cases in which, after a most careful examination of all relevant factors, it was found that existing duties were unnecessarily and unduly burdensome, and we have done so only in those cases in which other countries have agreed to accord better treatment to our exports in return for tariff adjustments on our part. We have reduced duties only to the extent to which, after an equally careful examination, it was found that such adjustments would not be prejudicial to any established branch of production in agriculture, in mining, or in manufacturing industry. Where necessary, as an additional safeguard, we have limited the amount of imports which would be permitted to come in at the reduced rate of duty."—From testimony of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, on H.J. Res. 407, before the House Ways and Means Committee, 76th Cong., 1940.

"I have had drawn to my attention statements to the effect that this increased authority might be used in such a way as to endanger or 'trade out' segments of American industry, American agriculture, or American labor. No such action was taken under President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, and no such action will take place under my Presidency."—From President Harry Truman's letter to House Speaker Sam Rayburn, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 8, 1949, page 12647.

"I wish also to comment on the administration of this legislation if it is enacted into law. Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our working men and women. Repeatedly I have emphasized that our own country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom and will be, administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve. This plain truth has dictated the retention of existing peril-point and escape-clause safeguards in the legislation.—From President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in a letter to the Honorable JOE MARTIN, February 17, 1955.

The discretion in H.R. 11970 is placed in the Executive to permit specific industries to be sacrificed for broader national interest. This would be a wholly new policy of doubtful wisdom.

HARDSHIPS TO DISPLACED WORKERS UNDER H.R. 11970

No worker wishes to lose his job.

That is the first fact of the matter. Nor does he wish to retrain for another. He does not want to be shipped from Terre Haute or Kaskaskia, Ind., to San Diego to work in a missile factory. He does not want to lose years and years of union or company seniority. He does not like to lose the money implicit in the distress sale of his home. He does not like to become a member of a new trade union. He does not like leaving his friends and relatives behind in a community where he has raised his young ones and maintains his family roots.

In other words, H.R. 11970 would treat the worker, under Government edict, as if he were some sort of a commodity, not as an American citizens. I believe that is not what the import-vulnerable worker wants; nor is it the fate that our Nation wants him to undergo.

The average worker does not want to have his job sacrificed to try out an unproved theory. He would prefer to keep his job safe from imports in the first place and not to be retreaded after he is out. Experience in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and elsewhere has already shown this to be the worker's viewpoint on readjustment and retraining. The administration should require some State Department officials to interview the workers at the bus terminals in some depressed towns at 5:00 or 6:00 some Monday morning. They would see how the workers feel about retraining and leaving home all week to earn a living. Whether imports or automation are responsible, the worker doesn't like it, and doesn't want it.

The provisions of this bill would be particularly harmful for our middle-aged workers. Let us take actual examples. Take men who have worked on woolen looms for 20 years. Passaic, N.J., offers poignant examples. Suddenly to be thrown out of work through imports, what are such workers to do? For what can they be retrained? They have spent their mature lives in developing most difficult and complex skills. Are they to start all over again at the bottom of the ladder? Where?

And quite apart from this, there is the problem of the worker's months and months of delay implicit in this bill.

The workers, industry or union could come in before the Tariff Commission and seek assistance by escape clause relief in a manner similar to present law. For that the deadline is 120 days. Or workers could apply to the Tariff Commission for readjustment assistance—the deadline here being 60 days.

The Commission could recommend tariff relief or readjustment to the President.

The President could then act for tariff relief, adjustment for industry, adjustment for workers, or any combination—or none.

For the worker, this will entail a long and painful waiting period. Even in the most obvious and clear-cut cases, industry's course has never been easy in showing that injury has been sustained due to imports—nor will it be any lead-pipe cinch to establish the fact that the worker has been displaced due to imports. In the meantime, the worker is out on the street patiently wondering if he qualifies for the specialized type of relief specified in this bill—when he doesn't want the relief in the first place; he wants to keep his job.

The basic questions here are then:

1. What industry is the worker to be retrained for?
2. Where does he go physically?
3. Will he get a permanent job if he goes there?
4. What happens to his union seniority?
5. How long will he keep the job?
6. What happens to his present home and family?

H.R. 11970 HAS NO TRUE RECIPROCITY PROVISIONS

It is generally known and has been an accepted fact by businessmen for years that the concessions we have made have not been matched by reciprocal concessions abroad. By reducing our own tariffs, by over 80 percent, we have achieved little. The H.R. 9900 testimony lists foreign restrictions against U.S. exports. The testimony to you by Messrs. Charles Shuman and Homer Brinkley list hundreds of barricades against U.S. agricultural exports.

An effort was made in the Committee on Ways and Means to require reciprocity with respect to agricultural products. This was resisted strongly be the Executive and was written into the measure in a watered down form which leaves almost complete discretion in the Executive—a provision actually weaker than the one in present law.

I question leaving this discretion in the Executive without teeth; and I would like in this connection to point out—on the subject of discrimination against U.S. exports—that presently in force is the Tariff Act of 1930, which includes the following language:

"SEC. 338. DISCRIMINATION BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

"(a) Additional Duties.—The President be served thereby, shall, by proclamation, specify and declare new or additional duties as hereinafter provided upon articles wholly or in part the growth or product of, or imported in a vessel of, any foreign country whenever he shall find as a fact that such country—

* * * * *

"(2) Discriminates in fact against the commerce of the United States, directly or indirectly, by law or administrative regulation or practice, by or in respect to any customs, tonnage, or port duty, fee, charge, exaction, classification, regulation, condition, restriction, or prohibition, in such manner as to place the commerce of the United States at a disadvantage compared with the commerce of any foreign country.

"(b) EXCLUSION FROM IMPORTATION.—If at any time the President shall find it to be a fact that any foreign country has not only discriminated against the commerce of the United States, as aforesaid, but has, after the issuance of a proclamation as authorized in subdivision (a) of this section, maintained or increased its said discriminations against the commerce of the United States, the President is hereby authorized if he deems it consistent with the interests of the United States, to issue a further proclamation, directing that such products of said country or such articles imported in its vessels as he shall deem consistent with the public interests shall be excluded from importation into the United States."

While this language has never been invoked, it remains in law and could be invoked in many cases today if the Executive so desired.

While obviously some form of discretion must be left to the Executive on reciprocity, the Congress should have a much stronger mandate placed in this bill in order to insure that the myriads of protective devices used to keep American goods out of foreign markets are relaxed or done away with. In this connection, Mr. James M. Ashley's brilliant testimony on tough Yankee horse trading by the State Department on automobiles is cited.

"A curious omission in H.R. 9900 is its lack of any requirement for reciprocity in trade agreements, except in the case of tropical agricultural commodities in section 213. It is generally conceded that other countries have not matched U.S. trade concessions in past negotiations. Perhaps the omission of a reciprocity requirement in H.R. 9900 is tacit admission that true reciprocity will not, and cannot, be forthcoming.

"Following the announcement of the latest GATT negotiations, there has been much discussion of the 'concession' we won whereby the ultimate EEC external tariff on U.S. automobiles was reduced from 29 to 22 percent. The 29 percent import duty was the originally proposed external tariff for the EEC but was not yet in effect. Actually the import duty which has been paid on U.S. automobiles exported to the Benelux countries and to Germany has been 18 percent and is now to be raised to 22 percent. These four countries in past years have accounted for more than 75 percent of the U.S. automobiles sold in EEC countries. France has imposed a 29 percent import duty on U.S. automobiles plus a discriminatory annual use tax of $202.55 for cars over 16 fiscal horsepower—the class into which almost all U.S. autos fall. The French import duty will be reduced from 29 to 22 percent, but the use tax remains. The Italian import duty has been in a range from 35 to 45 percent plus an annual registration fee based on horsepower which amounts to $240 on a six-cylinder Chevrolet, and an annual road tax which amounts to $379.20 for a Ford Galaxie compared to $29.00 for their domestically made Fiat. The Italian import duties will be reduced to 22 percent, but the registration and road taxes remain.

"In return for an increase in duty from 18 to 22 percent in the four countries where the bulk of U.S. automobiles have been sold in the EEC, and a reduction of duty, but not of discriminatory supplementary taxes in the two countries which together purchased 2,917 U.S. automobiles in 1961, we reduced our import duties on foreign automobiles from 8½ to 6½ percent. The results of our negotiators' efforts seem hardly to justify the fanfare with which they were announced.

"True reciprocity is unlikely to be forthcoming from the European Common Market because the Common Market is the economic way station en route to the political federation of Europe. It is understandable that it will not permit its freedom train to be derailed—that is, to put it in practical terms, it will not give up the discriminatory trade policies by which it intends to weld an economic and political entity with a homogeneous mass market and mass production industries to match.

"Offers made by the United States to the EEC bloc and extended then to all most-favored nations including Japan are not likely to inspire true reciprocity. Common Market countries have been discriminating against Japan, and under GATT have denied most-favored-nation treatment to Japan, because of her low-wage rates. If we open our door wider to Japan as well as to the Common Market, the latter would gain little net advantage. Despite concessions which would give them a relatively advantageous position over American competition, EEC producers would be forced to meet Japanese price competition on an even tariff basis in the U.S. market. In my judgement, this effectively reduces our bargaining power with the EEC.

"Fear in Europe of Japan as a low labor cost competitor underlines our own contention that wage differentials are a meaningful determinant in the directions which international trade takes."

This keen analysis by Mr. Ashley does not represent any new situation. Hamilton's 1791 "Report on Manufactures" stated:

"But the system which has been mentioned is far from characterizing the general policy of nations. The prevalent one has been regulated by an opposite spirit. The consequence of it is, that the United States, are, to a certain extent, in the situation of a country precluded from foreign commerce. They can, indeed, without difficulty, obtain from abroad the manufactured supplies of which they are in want; but they experience numerous and very injurious impediments to the omission and vent of their own commodities. Nor is this the case in reference to a single foreign nation only. The regulations of several countries, with which we have the most extensive intercourse, throw serious obstructions in the way of the principal staples of the United States.

"In such a position of things, the United States cannot exchange with Europe on equal terms; and the want of reciprocity would render them the victims of a system. * * *

"Remarks of this kind are not made in the spirit of complaint. It is for the nations whose regulations are alluded to, to judge for themselves, whether, by aiming at too much, they do not lose more than they gain. It is for the United States to consider by what means they can render themselves least dependent on the combinations, right or wrong, of foreign policy.

"It is no small consolation that, already, the measures which have embarrassed our trade have accelerated internal improvements which, upon the whole, have bettered our affairs."

One hundred and seventy-one years later, it is neither a contrast nor a consolation to read some 200 pages in the 1962 hearings on H.R. 9900, listing today's restrictions abroad against U.S. exports.

And in addition, we would like to point out that, with respect to agricultural commodities, the European Common Market has already expressed its intention to become self-sufficient in all nontropical products for which it has the capability by 1964 without regard to Britain.

Are we to expect, through a vague and loose working in this measure, suddenly to have the Europeans reverse this very major policy?

We would hope that the administration's insistence upon a reciprocity provision with no teeth in it does not mean that they intend to act unilaterally on reductions in trade barriers as has been so often the case over the past 28 years.

THE DETERIORATION OF U.S. HIGH LABOR CONTENT GOODS IN WORLD TRADE

One matter which concerned many members of the committee was testimony based upon a very thorough, able, and uncontested study by the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. of the relative world trade position of U.S. goods with a high labor content. (A copy of this study may be obtained from Mr. James M. Ashley, vice president, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., 811 Madison Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.)

The record is clear from this historic study that in the decade, 1950–60, the U.S. world trade position declined seriously in virtually all products with a high labor content—airplanes being the single major example. In this connection, we would like to cite the testimony to Congress of Mr. James Ashley, vice president of the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., and president of the Trade Relations Council of the United States:

"Industry leaders have testified before this committee and before the Tariff Commission that, as far as their own industries are concerned, their higher labor costs have priced them out of world markets. They have also said that the successive reductions in U.S. import duties, which have made us a low tariff country among major industrial nations, have made it increasingly difficult to meet low-wage foreign competition in this market. Proponents of the administration's trade program have answered that, although hourly wage rates are much higher in the United States, superior American productivity more than offsets the wage rate differential.

Believing that this committee would like to consider more than isolated facts pertaining to individual industries on the one hand or unsupported assertions on the other, I refer now to an import-export study covering all product classifications. This study is attached to the copies of this statement distributed to members of your committee. It appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5, 1962, beginning on page A834.

"If it is true that labor costs are at prejudice to U.S. sales in world markets, this fact should be apparent in a comparison of the product-by-product import and export records of two different years separated by enough time to allow an important cost element to influence results. And U.S. exports of products with high labor content should show a less favorable trend line than products with low labor content.

"In our study, all of the imports and exports of the year 1951, as listed in the official figures of the Bureau of Census, were segregated as to high and low labor content items. Imports and exports of each item were added together to get the dollar volume total of foreign trade in those items, and the export percentages calculated. The identical process was repeated for 1960, still the latest year for which official figures are available. The product-by-product share of market measures the strength of each domestic industry against that of its foreign competitors in a given year. And a comparison of the share of market in each product in 1960 with the share of market of the same product in the earlier year indicates whether the product registered a gain or loss in competitive position.

"'Perhaps some explanation of high and low labor content is in order. A tree, as it stands in the forest, has inherent value. Some labor is added by the work of felling it, trimming branches, and transporting the log to the point of sale, but the inherent value of the tree is still a large percentage of the sale price of the log. More value is added by labor at the sawmill in cutting the log into boards. Still more value is added by labor in finished wood manufactures, where the labor of the carpenter, joiner, and finisher completes the chair. A chair, then, is a relatively high labor content item while a log is a relatively low labor content item.

"That seems too obvious to need comment. But in individual company operations, labor cost, for bookkeeping purposes, includes only the money paid by that factory to its own employees. The labor in prior processing of materials is concealed under the heading, "Cost of materials."

"Under that bookkeeping approach, it might be said that labor accounts for a relatively small percentage of the cost of a machine tool. But machine tools are really iron ore in a highly processed form. The labor of mining the ore, transporting it, smelting it into pig iron, and making it into steel mill products to be sold to the machine tool factory is all part of the cost of the machine tool. And if labor cost is truly at prejudice to U.S. export sales, we would expect to see the competitive position of machine tools deteriorate by comparison with the competitive position of a product with smaller labor content—for example, pig iron.

"Between the years 1951 and 1960 U.S. foreign trade—the sum of all that we buy from foreign countries and all that we ship, but not necessarily sell, to foreign countries—increased from about $25½ billion to almost $35 billion. In 1951 the U.S. export share of this trade was 57.9 percent. In 1960 the export share of this trade was 58.1 percent. Not a significant change—two-tenths of 1 percent.

"What is significant, and what the official figures of the Bureau of Census show, is that the character of our exports has changed. U.S. exports have registered gains in share of market in raw materials and manufactures with relatively low labor content: Live animals; hides and skins; furs; fodders and feeds; crude synthetic rubber; natural gums, resins, and balsams; oilseeds; raw cotton; goat hair; logs; paper base stocks; pig iron; and scrap iron.

"These gains were offset by losses in share of market in exports of manufactures with relatively high labor content: Leather manufactures, fur manufactures, grain manufactures, rubber manufactures, cotton manufactures, products made from man-made fibers, steel mill products, metal manufactures, all kinds of machinery except agricultural and all kinds of vehicles except aircraft.

"This is true in small industries as well as large, and applies to the whole range of products in foreign trade—as the footnotes to the various tables clearly show.

"If the trend toward the export of more low labor content items and fewer high labor content items is allowed to continue, massive unemployment in manufacturing industry will be the inevitable consequence. Equally serious, the manufacturing segment of the economy will provide no growth—no new job opportunities for our expanding population. If this frightening trend has developed under our existing import duty schedules, it will be accelerated if import duties on manufactured goods are cut in half or eliminated altogether—as they would be under the provisions of H.R. 9900 as presently drafted.

"Let us take an example of an industry where our export position appears favorable, electrical machinery and apparatus. How can this be considered unsatisfactory when U.S. exports were 74 percent of our foreign trade in those items? By considering the figures for a single year, it is impossible to judge whether the industry in question is growing competitively stronger or competitively weaker. It is true that our exports of electrical machinery and apparatus were 74 percent of our foreign trade in those items in 1960. But in 1956 they were 85 percent. In 1951 they were 96 percent. In 1926 they were 97 percent. Like the work of the medical internist, it is the function of business analysis to diagnose cancer in its early stages. This cancer is demonstrably present."

This Libbey-Owens-Ford study has had wide impact. Its circulation is already in the tens of thousands.

Weaknesses in H.R. 11970 and Its Lack of Overall Business Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Trade Expansion Act has been loudly touted as having the backing of business groups. The following section from the statement of Robert L. L. McCormick to the Senate Finance Committee disputes this claim. In addition, this material points out the vital importance of maintaining strong escape clause and peril point provisions. Other deficiencies in the legislation proposed by the administration are also explored. It is my sincere hope that this material will prove of interest and value to my colleagues.

LACK OF OVERALL BUSINESS SUPPORT FOR H.R. 11970

Spokesmen for the administration have stated or implied that the instant measure has substantial overall business support. For example, the President's address on May 4, in New Orleans, La., specifically included the word "business" as supporting the measure.

Many businesses and associations of businessmen support the measure and many oppose it.

However, none of the better recognized large overall associations of businessmen can really be said to support H.R. 11970. Specifically:

1. The National Association of Manufacturers is neutral on "Title II: Trade Agreements." It strongly opposes "Title III: Tariff Adjustment and Other Adjustment Assistance."

2. The Committee for Economic Development, in a report with 14 separate statements and dissents, some of them signed by several members, generally supports "Title II: Trade Agreements," but oppose "Title III: Tariff Adjustment and Other Adjustment Assistance."

3. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has stopped much of its propaganda on this measure since its annual meeting of May 2, 1962. In view of the statements placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 8, by Congressmen KING and STRATTON, of New York, I think it is fair to say that the national chamber's membership has a neutral position. The Associated Press says that the main membership vote—for neutrality—was overwhelming. Their failure to appear here in person yesterday underscores their problem.

4. The overwhelming number of large and small businesses and business associations especially manufacturers which testified before the House were either against the bill, or else, while favoring healthy world trade, stipulated specific qualifications totally unacceptable to the measure's proponents.

Thus, we are here concerned with the measure designed to help business, but which most business does not wish.

In particular, Congress is placed in the curious position of being asked to vote Federal subsidies for import-vulnerable businesses that do not wish to receive the subsidies. Usually, it's the other way around.

A SENSIBLE CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER ESCAPE CLAUSE DECISIONS

An amendment, which has been approved by the Committee on Ways and Means to H.R. 11970, would permit the Congress, by a majority vote of both houses, to overturn the President's decision when he disagrees with, or rejects, a Tariff Commission escape clause recommendation. This provision would not be any help to domestic producers.

Here is what would happen under this amendment. Let me say the President would turn down a Tariff Commission recommendation as he recently did on straight pins and baseball gloves. Under the amendment, as accepted in the Ways and Means Committee version of H.R. 11970, any Member of either House could introduce a resolution in his House to overturn the President's rejection and reinstate the Tariff Commission's recommendation. (As a matter of fact, he can do that right now, except that such a resolution, if passed, would almost inevitably be vetoed.)

A resolution of disapproval as in H.R. 11970 would go to the Senate Finance Committee or to the House Committee on Ways and Means, and could be there lost, even with no hearings, if these committees should so choose. If the two committees should report the rejection resolution favorably, it would be acted upon by Senate and/or House in the regular manner—without privilege.

There are major matters of procedure in H.R. 11970 as passed by the House—compared against the Reorganization Act and against the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, the present law.

The major provisions of the present trade agreements law which H.R. 11970 would drop are two:

First, the 1958 law makes a resolution of disapproval of a Presidential disapproval of a Tariff Commission recommendation by any one Member of either House highly privileged.

Second, the 1958 law requires a two-thirds vote of both Houses to overturn the President (an obvious impossibility and, hence, never yet invoked by Senators and Congressmen friendly to domestic industries).

"Privileged" is the important word in the 1958 law; the two-thirds is "window dressing" in that Congress can overturn any Executive action by a two-thirds vote of both Houses whenever it wishes.

Under section 7 of the 1958 act, if the Finance or Ways and Means Committees were to hold up a resolution to overturn the President's decision for more than 10 days, any Member of either House could move its discharge from committee and the vote on such a discharge motion would be highly privileged. In laymen's terms, this means it goes to the front of the line of bills to be voted upon. Or it may be that, within the 10-day period, the committee will have reported the bill favorably or unfavorably.

Under section 7(e)(1) of the 1958 law, when the House or Senate has voted to discharge the committee of, or the committee has reported out, the disapproval measure, any Member can then move for the whole House to vote to overturn the President's recommendation. Again, this motion is highly privileged.

This is almost identical to the procedure in the reorganization act, under which over 50 congressional actions have been taken on a similar privileged basis. Under the reorganization act which stemmed from the First Hoover Commission and later amended, the congressional veto powers were weaker than under present law whereby one House can veto a reorganization plan.

For many years, scores of reorganization plans have been submitted to the Congress and have, by law, been upheld or overturned by simple majorities (constitutional) either of one House or of both Houses.

If such a procedure is constitutional in the case of the reorganization legislation, it would be equal in its applicability to tariff proclamations.

Anything else would mean that the scores of reorganization plans which have occurred since the First Hoover Commission in the late forties are null and void. It would, for example, be quite a shock to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to know that it has not been existing for the last 9 years (Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953).

Reorganization plans are highly privileged. In fact, the 1958 Trade Agreements Extension Act's wording was based upon language in the early reorganization acts in the privileged wording and techniques followed.

In the present trade agreements law, any one Member can move to discharge the cognizant committee and any one Member can move for the House to vote to overthrow the President's decision. Both motions are privileged. But it is so hopeless for a Member to obtain the two-thirds vote that no proponents of the industries which have been denied relief by the President have even gone through the effort.

The House change in H.R. 11970 does not amount to much, since it does only this:

The two-thirds majority to overturn in the 1958 act would be replaced by a majority of Members (a constitutional majority) in H.R. 11970.

The high privilege in the present law would be dropped.

Thus, the two-thirds formula was dropped; so was the privilege.

This is a fair enough swap. Under the law, the domestic industry has virtually nothing; nor will it have anything under the House version of H.R. 11970.

A fair trade. Nothing for nothing.

Under H.R. 11970, it would be very difficult or impossible for most individual or small industries to get a disapproval motion out of committee or to muster a majority of both Houses. Without the privilege, the House amendment is virtually useless. Even with the privilege, a motion to disapprove can mainly be an annoying harassment in that every time the President overturns the Tariff Commission, any single Member could distress the machinery of either House by evoking these two privileged motions.

If, as under the present reorganization act, the industry were to be entitled to a one-House veto and high privilege—using as a precedent the Hoover reorganization acts—this would conform to existing congressional practice, and prevent the Executive from running roughshod over the constitutional rights of the Congress in article I, section 8.

In effect, the House has accepted an amendment which is no concession or help to domestic industry.

WEAKENING THE ESCAPE CLAUSE AND PERIL POINTS

The Congress over recent years has been burdened with requests to do something to improve the escape clause. The historical record of actions under the escape clause is set forth in the following table:

Present status of escape clause applications (June 1962)

	Number
Investigations instituted by the Commission:	
Dismissed at applicant's request	9
Terminated without formal findings	9
Cases pending	3
Completed cases	112
Total	133
Investigations completed by the Commission:	
Relief rejected by Commission	71
3-3 cases	8
Relief recommended	33
Total	112
Cases sent to the President:	
Relief rejected by President	26
Relief invoked by President	15
Total	41

Thus we see relief granted in only 15, or 11 percent, of the 133 cases initiated; 13 percent granted in the 112 cases completed.

Yet, the escape clause would be weakened even further in H.R. 11970. The definition of industry would be, in effect, made so broad as to make it extremely difficult to obtain relief. In addition, any relief obtained would be statutorily set as temporary.

When the escape clause has proven so unsatisfactory in executing the purposes Congress intended for it, how can it be considered as reasonable to weaken it even further?

The peril points would be in effect destroyed

The peril points have long been considered by Congress as a most effective method of preventing negotiations from reducing tariffs to levels below which American industry would be injured. For many years, these peril points were abided by. It is only in the most recent negotiations at Geneva that, in scores of cases, our negotiators went below the peril points.

As H.R. 11970 is now written, there would be a public hearing but there would be no requirement that any attention whatsoever be paid to the recommendations of domestic industry and of the Tariff Commission.

Thus, a principle long held by the Congress would go into discard.

OTHER DEFICIENCIES IN H.R. 11970

The inadequacies of H.R. 11970 also include some other weaknesses. These include:

(a) The complexity of obtaining relief: Both for labor and for business, the cost, complexity and delay in obtaining relief is almost monumental. This measure could become a lawyer's paradise—and besides there is no assurance whatsoever that after having gone to the time, trouble and expenpense, any relief will be forthcoming to anyone, business and labor alike.

(b) More bureaucracy: An inevitable growth of bureaucracy will occur under this measure. The adjustment assistance features require detailed advice to management on loans, technical assistance and the like. The determinations as to whether or not the labor, union or nonunion, is injured by imports will be a complex technical matter. Administering the relief and retraining will take money and manpower. The already overburdened staff of the Tariff Commission will have another large job thrown at it—adjustment assistance. In addition, the established departments and agencies, as specified in the bill, would be concerned with its administration in the adjustment phases and would necessarily require more manpower.

(c) Transshipments from Communist countries: No real attempt appears to have been made in the measure to prevent the transshipment of goods from Communist countries. We have seen already how easy it is to transship goods from Japan via such areas as Hong Kong. The measure could permit vast transshipments into Europe (which trades freely with the Communist bloc) into the United States.

(d) Exports at the expense of the domestic economy: The measure encourages exports at the expense of import-vulnerable industries. This is a historical departure from our customary method of equalizing the impact of trade between various segments of our economy and not discriminating for one in favor of the other. This traditional principle is vitiated (or more likely destroyed) in H.R. 11970.

The bill's main purpose is to encourage exports. Another of its main thrusts is to encourage imports. The idea here is that exports will increase at a rate greater than imports. Regardless of whether this will prove to be the fact, encouragement of one form of American trade at the expense of another is open to question.

(e) Will exports increase faster than imports? The premise that exports will increase faster than imports is pure blue sky. The record shows that this is not the case. Even without eliminating our vast subsidized exports, recent months show that the proportionate increase in our imports has exceeded the proportionate increase in our exports.

(f) Relative tariff levels: In H.R. 11970 there has been a consistent failure to require other countries to meet past tariff reductions of the United States by comparable reductions in their own tariffs and other restrictions. It is said by official spokesmen and their friends that, just pass H.R. 11970, and other countries will come down in their tariffs to levels comparable to ours. This is not the case at the moment, as the following figures from a survey of the Joint Economic Committee quoted by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. indicate:

Industrial tariffs (weighted averages)

	Percent
Japan	19
Austria	19
United Kingdom	17
New Zealand	17
Italy	16
Canada	16
France	15
EEC	14
Australia	12
United States	11
Norway	11
Benelux	11
West Germany	9
Sweden	8
Switzerland	8
Denmark	6

Source: Joint Economic Committee.

It is unreasonable to expect a reduction in our duties of 6½ percent to zero on automobiles to be matched by reduction of 22 percent to zero in EEC tariffs on our automobiles abroad. Past reductions like this have not been met. It is said that our future reductions will be met, but experience shows the contrary. The easiest way for us to solve this serious problem would be to increase our own duties to levels commensurate with those of other nations—or conversely, require them to reduce theirs to our levels—before the bargaining begins.

(g) Japan: The most favored nation clause under H.R. 11970 will extend all our concessions to Japan and the Orient. This will vitiate most of the usefulness of the law as it applies to the EEC in that Japan will end up the primary beneficiary of many of the reductions in tariffs to zero—and as we have noted previously, there is no flexibility provision in H.R. 11970 whereby when one nation causes the 80-percent formula to be broken, tariffs automatically readjust.

(h) The consumer: On protecting the consumer by imports this argument is much overstated. Two facts should be noted. The United States has strict antitrust laws and tough competition. This is not new.

Alexander Hamilton was of the opinion that competition here was sufficient to keep prices down, tariffs or no tariffs:

"But, though it were true that the immediate and certain effect of regulations controlling the competition of foreign with domestic fabrics was an increase in price, it is universally true that the contrary is the ultimate effect with every successful manufacture. When a domestic manufacture has attained to perfection, and has engaged in the prosecution of it a certain number of persons, it invariably becomes cheaper. Being free from the heavy charges which attend the importation of foreign commodities, it can be afforded, and accordingly seldom or never fails to be sold, cheaper, in process of time, than was the foreign article for which it is a substitute. The internal competition which takes place soon does away with everything like monopoly, and by degrees reduces the price of the article to the minimum of a reasonable profit on the capital employed. This accords with the reason of the thing and with experience.

"Whence it follows, that it is the interest of a community, with a view to eventual and permanent economy, to encourage the growth of manufactures. In a national view, a temporary enhancement of price must always be well compensated by a permanent reduction of it."—Alexander Hamilton, "Report on Manufactures."

But quite apart from this, the tendency on the importing nation—and this is only a wise course of commercial action—is to set prices in the United States at the highest possible level necessary to seize the market from the U.S. producer. In other words, if the U.S. shirt wholesales for $2 and the foreign-made shirt wholesales for 50 cents—over the long run; not at first—the tendency of the exporter from abroad or the U.S. importer will be to set the eventual shirt price at a figure of $1.90 or thereabouts, just enough to cut under the price in the American market and thus get the largest possible profit.

Thus this argument of protecting the consumer is vastly overrated. Its results have always over the long run proven to be chimerical.

(i) Jobs: Congress and the American public have been belabored with wild statistics on the subject of jobs due to exports and jobs vulnerable to imports. Administration spokesmen have made some remarkable statements on this point. I will not belabor or insult the committee by quoting and refuting these wild statistics, since they are so obviously full of water.

One fact is very simple. If it takes 100,000 man-hours to make x widgets for export, it also takes 100,000 man-hours for making x widgets for the domestic market.

Exports make jobs here. Imports destroy jobs here. The proportions, on the average, equalize out.

Highly automated plants make for less jobs than those with a higher labor content, on exports and imports alike—$1 million in exports from a highly automated plant thus means less jobs than $1 million imports on a high labor content item.

Further, a domestically-produced item requires two hauls—one, the haul of the raw material into the factory; the other, the haul of the finished product out of the factory to the point of consumption. The import requires one domestic haul; from the seaport to the point of consumption.

(j) Our export surplus: Administration spokesmen have made much of our so-called export surplus. Under questioning, they have cut the $5 billion in half—eliminating Public Law 480, food, foreign aid, and other materials given away. If they took the trouble, they could probably eliminate the other half by deleting charity and the U.S. goods purchased with loans made by international or Federal banking instrumentalities and U.S. companies' shipments of goods to their foreign subsidiaries.

In other words, the so-called export surplus has been much overstated. Probably little if any exists at all.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Sea Battle Between U.S.S. "Constitution" and H.M.S. "Guerriere"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and yours, Maj. Gen. Michael J. Galvin, of the Massachusetts National Guard, has been thoughtful enough to send me material on the ceremony held at the Charlestown Navy Yard on August 19, 1962, to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the history-turning sea battle between the U.S.S. *Constitution* and the H.M.S. *Guerriere*. Like yourself, I feel that this commemorative ceremony is more than worthy of national recognition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it will not be duplicated again until the 200th anniversary.

Accordingly, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to at this point insert into the RECORD the story from the Boston Herald before the ceremony, the story from the Boston Globe after the ceremony, the program and the Governor's proclamation:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Aug. 19, 1962]

U.S. NAVY FORGED BY "OLD IRONSIDES"

Today is the 150th anniversary of the sea battle in which the frigate U.S.S. *Constitution* won world prestige for the American Navy along with her nickname—*"Old Ironsides."*

Today at 1 p.m., a peaceful ceremony will mark that anniversary aboard the old fighting ship under sponsorship of the Massachusetts Chapter of the United States Daughters of 1812.

JONES TO SPEAK

Capt. Frank C. Jones, commandant of the Boston Naval Shipyard, will give the address of welcome and the response will be by Mrs. Charles W. Crankshaw, president of the National Society, United States Daughters of 1812.

Skipper of *Old Ironsides* now is Navy Lt. Victor B. Stevens of Worcester.

The great sea battle came in the North Atlantic between the *Constitution*, Capt. Isaac Hull commanding, and the British warship, H.M.S. *Guerriere*.

"Old Ironsides" was armed with 54 guns and carried 475 men. The *Guerriere* mounted 49 guns and carried 280 men.

Hottest part of the battle went about 30 minutes between 6:20 and 6:50 p.m. British casualties were 26 killed and 56 wounded; American casualties, 7 killed and 7 wounded.

LOSER BURNED

The British crew was taken aboard *"Old Ironsides"* and sailed to Boston after Captain Hull ordered the blasted *Guerriere* burned at sea.

This was the first naval action of the War of 1812 and it was far more than a single victory at sea.

Up to that time even Americans had not taken their own Navy very seriously. The British had laughed or sneered at it almost every chance they had. Typical was their slur that American naval vessels were "fir built" and "manned by a handful of outlaws."

But they sang a different tune in the echo of "Old Ironsides" port and starboard guns.

The Times of London said, of the victory: "It is not merely that an English frigate has been taken after what we are free to confess may be called a brave resistance, but that it has been taken by a new enemy—an enemy unaccustomed to such triumphs, and likely to be rendered confident by them.

TWO CAPTURED

"He must be a weak politican who does not see how important the first triumph is in giving a tone and character to the war."

Even good Bostonians are apt to forget that Captain Hull and his frigate sailed on to other victories in the War of 1812. *"Old Ironsides"* blasted victory over another British frigate, *Java*, and then captured two British ships, *Cyane* and *Levant*.

At war's end the *Constitution* joined the peacetime Navy and today on this anniversary she is the only sailing frigate still under commission in any navy in the world.

Bostonians remember, of course, how *"Old Ironsides"* was saved from being sold or scrapped in 1830 by a Boston poet, Oliver Wendell Holmes. Holmes wrote the ringing poem which has come down to this age of nuclear warships—*"Ay*, tear her tattered ensign down." He ended his three stanzas with —"And give her to the god of storms, the lighting and the gale."

Those three stanzas set the country afire for the old fighting frigate and Congress appropriated funds for repair.

REPAIR EXCELLENT

Today she is in excellent repair as millions of American tourists over the years can testify after boarding her as one of the shrines along the freedom trail.

Today the commemoration ceremony will do honor to the memory of Captain Hull and his fighting sailors. All Boston did them honor when they came home from that victory—the *Guerriere's* ensign flying beneath the *Constitution's* ensign.

At a great victory banquet in Faneuil Hall, history records that 17 toasts were downed which could indicate that even her sailors had iron sides, too.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Aug. 20, 1962]

"CONSTITUTION'S" ENSIGN FLYING STILL

Tourists from throughout the Nation swarming over the historic frigate U.S.S. *Constitution* yesterday at the Boston Naval Shipyard observed ceremonies marking one of her greatest exploits.

Yesterday was the 150th anniversary of the *Constitution's* naval battle with the *Guerriere*—then the pride of the British fleet.

The *Constitution* shot the *Guerriere* to pieces and earned herself the nickname *"Old Ironsides"* when the British cannonballs bounced off her sides.

Among those attending yesterday's ceremonies on the forward deck were Governor Volpe, Capt. Frank C. Jones, shipyard commander, and Lt. Victor B. Stevens, of Worcester, commanding officer of the *Constitution*.

Gail Galvin, of Newton, president of the Massachusetts Chapter, U.S. Daughters of 1812—Juniors, placed a wreath on the deck of the frigate in honor of Capt. Isaac Hull and his crew aboard the *Constitution* 150 years ago.

Priscilla H. Galvin, chairman of the memorial markers committee of the Massachusetts Society, Daughters of 1812, gave the commemorative address.

Comdr. Ross H. Currier, president, extended the greetings of the Society of the War of 1812 in Massachusetts, and there were selections by the 94th Infantry Division Band.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAVAL ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN THE U.S.S. "CONSTITUTION" AND THE BRITISH "GUERRIERE" AUGUST 19, 1812 BY THE MASSACHUSETTS SOCIETY OF THE U.S. DAUGHTERS OF 1812, ON THE U.S.S. "CONSTITUTION," BOSTON NAVY YARD, SUNDAY, AUGUST 19, 1962

Musical selections by the 94th Infantry Division Band under direction of CWO Arthur Bizier, U.S. Army Reserve.

Invocation: Lt. Arlo J. Dahm, Chaplain Corps, U.S. Navy.

Pledge of allegiance: Mrs. Francis J. Campbell, chairman, Historic Landmarks Committee, Massachusetts Society U.S. Daughters of 1812.

National anthem, by the 94th Infantry Division Band.

Greetings from the U.S. Navy; Capt. Frank C. Jones, U.S. Navy, commander, Boston Naval Shipyard.

Greetings from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; His Excellency, John A. Volpe, Governor, Commander, U.S. Naval Reserve.

Response to welcome: Mrs. Charles William Crankshaw, national president of the National Society U.S. Daughters of 1812.

Introduction of distinguished guests and representatives of other patriotic societies.

Greetings from the Society of the War of 1812 in Massachusetts; Comdr. Ross H. Currier, president.

Tribute to Capt. Isaac Hull, commander of the U.S.S. *Constitution* on August 19, 1812, by the present commander of the U.S.S. *Constitution* in 1962, Lt. Victor B. Stevens, Jr.

Commemoration address: Miss Priscilla H. Galvin, chairman, Memorial Markers Committee, Massachusetts Society U.S. Daughters of 1812.

Placing of wreath in honor of Capt. Isaac Hull, his officers and men by the officers of the Gen. Stephen Badlam IV Chapter—Juniors of 1812—Miss Gail Galvin, president and Miss Carol Pearce, vice president.

Benediction: Lt. Arlo J. Dahm, Chaplain Corps, U.S. Navy.

"Stars and Stripes Forever," by the 94th Infantry Division Band followed by other selections.

A Proclamation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by His Excellency John A. Volpe, Governor, 1962

Whereas this year marks the 150th anniversary of the victorious battle of the U.S.S. *Constitution* against the British warship *Guerriere* on August 19, 1812; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States recognized this was a victory of consequence, voted the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Constitution* $50,000 in prize money for their victory over the *Guerriere*, and ordered silver medals be struck to honor the victory and presented to the officers and men; and

Whereas the U.S.S. *Constitution* was instrumental in aiding the cause of the independence of the American people during the War of 1812, and thereby helped to establish the present independent United States of America: Now, therefore,

I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim Sunday, August 19, 1962, as U.S.S. *Constitution* Day and urge all of our citizens to observe this day by displaying the American flag and taking part in ceremonies which do honor to those who fought on the U.S.S. *Constitution*.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 7th day of August in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two, and of the independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and eighty-seventh.

By His Excellency the Governor.

John A. Volpe.
Kevin H. White,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Project Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we in San Diego are very proud of the work being done by Dr. James Turpin in assisting the underprivileged of the world. The attached article which appeared in the July 1962 issue of San Diego magazine, dramatically illustrates the work being done by Project Concern and is an excellent example of American generosity and American medicine at work.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be included as a portion of my remarks in the Record:

Project Concern

(By Alice Sue Hardin)

James W. Turpin, M.D., practices general medicine and surgery in Coronado, where one might safely generalize that patients pay their bills fully and on time, and where the well-groomed "old California" look of the place generally inclines' one to a relaxed view of things.

It didn't seem to have that effect on Dr. Turpin, only 28 when he opened practice there 4 years ago. For one thing he was also a Methodist minister. He wanted to be of use in the community; he was elected to the city council. Soon he was instrumental in starting a sister-city relationship between Coronado and Puerto Montt, Chile. Then, 2 years ago, he and his wife, Martha, volunteered their services on a once-a-week basis to a medical clinic at Casa de Totos in Tijuana. Each Thursday, in the most underprivileged section of the border city, the canyon area, the Turpins helped treat some 50 to 75 wretchedly poor, ill people. Thursday evenings they returned to Coronado, that spectacle of misery still haunting them. Before long Coronado's serenity seemed almost illusory; reality for the Turpins lay in the services they gave freely below the Mexican border.

"We found more and more that those Thursdays became the focal point in our week * * * that we were directing more of our plans toward the clinic," Dr. Turpin recalled. "To me that work became increasingly significant. It helped to crystallize the feeling that I was not going to achieve the inward sensation of peace that so many people seem to be seeking unless I used all my energies where they are so obviously needed."

So the decision finally was reached by the pair to devote themselves to the work that had become so important to them—showing humane concern through medical relief. Dr. Turpin conceived an idea he calls "Project Concern." His hope was that it would generate a response from others who feel a personal desire to help the world's needy directly. And so it has. In August a full staff will sail to Hong Kong to open two clinics to help the thousands of Chinese there without medical aid.

Although he is a minister, Dr. Turpin plans no active missionary or political effort, feeling that Project Concern's actions will better demonstrate humane concern and the democratic way of solving problems. "In my opinion, these people are little interested either in religion or our politics—they have to have some of their basic needs met before they can give abstract questions any real thought," he explained.

The British Crown Colony of Hong Kong was settled as the first geographical "target." Hong Kong, whose translation, "beautiful lagoon," once was meaningful, now is the refugee capital of the world. In the new territories of the Chinese mainland are more than a million refugees. The housing problem is serious, not only because of this influx but also due to the severe damage of World War II. About 13 percent of the city's people live in squatter shacks, a prime fire hazard, or in rooftop dwellings. An estimate in 1957, now distorted with the refugee influx, showed 325,000 people still in need of regular housing.

Some 200,000 of them are "boat people;" they live on sampans and junks, and there is not a doctor among them. Dr. Turpin's typically simple approach is to bring in a specially designed Chinese junk, which will move among the people, seeing to their medical and minor surgical needs. According to the doctor, the government has sanctioned the plan and even offers encouragement (nonfinancial), an attitude which is unusual for the Hong Kong administration. The junk, now under construction, is to be 40 feet with a 13-foot beam and a 55 horsepower British Marine diesel engine. It is being handcrafted at a cost of $8,000.

The second clinic under the Turpin program will be located within the walled city of Kowloon on the mainland, an area not included in the original lease to Britain. It has lacked both law enforcement and urban services until very recently. In an area of 10 square blocks 250,000 people live in the worst imaginable squalor, Dr. Turpin reported.

Dr. Turpin's undertaking has grown into an organization of major proportions including numerous committees over the country, some of which are helping to solicit donations and pledges through trust funds. Board of Directors for Project Concern is chairmaned by Dr. E. M. Hayes, of Imperial Beach, who was born and reared in China. Other members include Dr. Turpin, Dr. William C. Rust, president of Cal-Western; Dr. William Van Valin, of Solvang, who was the surgeon for the late Tom Dooley, of Laos, and recently spent a month with Dr. Albert Schweitzer in Africa; Paul Fleener; J. Jackson Wills; Fred Davies; Dr. William Boyce, Board Surgeon, of Escondido; Dr. Paul Kleykamp, of Ashland, Ky.; Dr. Ralph Nivens, of Kansas State University; and Robert Edwards, of Atlanta, Ga. Executive committes operate in Atlanta; Manhattan; Kiowa County, Kansas; Jacksonville, Florida; Ashland, Kentucky; in Hong Kong itself and in Coronado.

Project Concern has not only drawn dedicated people to work in numerous capacities for its fulfillment; it has already spawned a like project by San Diego County optometrists, "Operation Save-A-Sight." Dr. Gerald Easton heads this group which includes most local optometrists. Dr. Sam Sloan of Lakeside has proposed that he work in Hong Kong, rotating with other members. Among those interested are Dr. Doyle Dannenberg of Escondido, former president of the State Board of Optometry.

Aid to both projects has flowed in from many sources. The Barnes-Chase Advertising Agency, the organization's public relations firm, is now negotiating with three major airlines to the Orient, Pan-American, Japan Air Lines, and Northwest Orient, to work out a plan for transporting the doctors to and from Hong Kong on an "as space permits" basis. In Hong Kong Dr. Robert Taylor, an ophthamologist formerly of San Jose, is training a young Chinese optician to assist in the work. Operation Save-A-Sight is collecting ophthalmic material and equipment for the propect with help from eastern committees. The U.S. Navy's Project Handclasp has agreed to deliver this material and other supplies such as blankets, small toys, nonperishable foods like dried milk or multiple-purpose foods, used clothing, and medical samples—all free of charge. (Donations will be accepted at the San Diego warehouse, Building 123, Naval Supply Center, Harbor Drive, packaged and labeled. A Navy warehouse in Los Angeles will collect goods there.)

"Naturally the program requires money and drugs," admits the doctor. "We calculate a modest $25,000 will cover minimum expenses, or at least open the doors of the clinics. Roughly, it would provide promotion, transportation, purchase of the junk and medical equipment not donated.

"We have collected $16,000 so far. A second fund with pledges of $2,000 per month for an initial 2-year period is at the $1,250 mark. The plan is to use the monthly pledges for salaries, drugs which are not donated, supplies, and upkeep."

Although large gifts definitely are needed, Turpin is interested in enlisting small financial contributions because he believes all those who help experience an inner satisfaction in showing a tangible concern for people in need.

The doctor's "right hand" in the project will be Paul Fleener, who first met Dr. Turpin when he was stationed in Coronado as a Naval Air Corps navigator. Fleener gave up his job as radio programer and announcer at Kansas State University when he heard of his friend's new enterprise.

The group sails August 10 from Los Angeles; along with making the detailed preparations each member including the Turpins' older sons is studying Cantonese this summer.

Subsidizing Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier properly takes issue with the contention of Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, that American taxpayers should be required to pay for the distribution of Communist propaganda through the U.S. mails.

This subsidy of Red mail should be stopped, and I find it incredible that Murrow and other Kennedy administration spokesmen would oppose the Cunningham amendment to the postal rate bill.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, which appeared in the August 23 issue of the Courier:

MURROW: UNITED STATES SHOULD SUBSIDIZE RED POSTAGE

The doctrine of free speech under the American Constitution is that the individual shall have the right to say anything he pleases as long as it is not libelous, obscene, or a plea for commission of a criminal act.

But certain people are attempting to stretch this valuable doctrine to an absurd point. Their concept is that free speech includes the individual's right to demand that everyone else listen whether they wish to do so or not.

Thus these people are saying that it is a violation of free speech when colleges refuse to allow the use of their facilities for Communist speakers. As a matter of fact, this charge is a gross perversion of free speech. For, if the individual has a basic right to say what he likes, a concurrent doctrine is the other individual's right to refuse to listen. College authorities have the full responsibility to determine the academic environment and they are not by any means violating the right of free speech if they refuse to make a college auditorium available to a Communist speaker.

In another field, Edward R. Murrow, Chief of the U.S. Information Agency, went before the Senate Post Office Committee this week to plead not only that Communist propaganda mail should be admitted to this country but that the American taxpayer should pay for its distribution.

The issue was an amendment added to a House bill by Representative GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska, which would bar the distribution of Soviet propaganda mail at the taxpayers' expense but would permit its distribution under fourth class rates which pay the cost. Under the International Postal Convention, each country agrees to pay the cost of mail distribution in such country in exchange for reciprocal rights from other countries. The Communists have taken advantage of this convention by distributing millions of pieces of propaganda mail in this country while refusing, of course, to distribute any American propaganda behind the iron curtain. Most of the American recipients do not want the Soviet propaganda.

But Murrow testified against adoption of the Cunningham amendment, saying: One of our main messages to the world, that we are an open society where the individual's freedom of choice is paramount, would be significantly diluted.

This is poppycock. No one is proposing that any Soviet literature be barred or that Americans should be prohibited from receiving it. The only issue is whether the sender should pay the cost of delivery of this unwanted propaganda. If Murrow's concept of his office is to urge that the American taxpayer subsidize Communist propaganda efforts, we have grave doubts of his fitness for the important position he holds.

Economic Highlight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the editorial comment of community newspapers throughout the country is a sound barometer by which to evaluate grassroots public thinking.

Obviously, the public and therefore the publications that serve it are interested in our current economic problems and the future of our Nation's economy.

The Semmler newspapers serve numerous communities in my area and the Thursday, August 23 issue contained an extremely penetrating and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Economic Highlights" which I insert into the RECORD.

ECONOMIC HIGHLIGHTS

There is continuing discussion, and continuing controversey, over the state of the relationship between business and the national administration. Mr. Kennedy's basic attitude toward business was a matter of concern to business leaders during his campaign and at the time of his election. It reached a peak of crisis when he forced steel to withdraw the price increase, using, in the view of many, harsh and arbitrary methods which, it has been feared, could represent a precedent for future actions of a comparable character.

Since then, Mr. Kennedy has gone to some lengths in efforts to try to reassure the business community. At the same time, he has made it clear that he will not hesitate to use the powers of his office to control business when its actions oppose his policies. Thus, the business community is still wary, still uncertain. That is the state of affairs at a time when heavy capital investment is needed to spur a lagging, if not a dormant, economy.

The basic problem, from the business point of view, antedates the Kennedy Administration. Recently a British publication said, "In many respects the American economy is one of the most regulated economies in the free world." A publication of a leading American oil company quoted this, observing: "And altho we may consider this an astonishing appraisal of a country that has long been regarded as the citadel of competition and unshackled capitalism, it points up sharply the direction in which we are moving today."

Th magazine went on to elaborate the point: "The truth is that the concept of competition is under attack, and that Government regulation of business is growing. Businessmen are seriously concerned over the trend. Some 500 of them meeting in New York City recently, wrestled a full day with the problems of how to operate a business competitively today without being indicted under one or more interpretations of the antitrust laws."

The word "interpretation" is the operative one in this connection. No one is foolish enough to object to prohibition of monopoly and price gouging. But there is no doubt that Government lawyers concerned with antitrust law enforcement have, in specific instance after specific instance, attempted to carry the intent of these laws to extremes. Proof of that is found in the fact that numbers of government antitrust actions, including some outstandingly important ones, have lost in the courts and, on occasion, brought biting critical comment from Federal judges. But, before the end is reached, years of litigation may go by, at heavy cost in money and resources to the parties concerned. And newly proposed laws would give still more power to various enforcement and regulatory agencies. One, for instance, would authorize the Federal Trade Commission to issue a "cease and desist" order to any company which, in its judgment, is following an "unfair competitive practice". This order would ban the practice until the matter was decided in court, no matter how long it took. So, in effect, this would place upon the company the burden of disproving the charge, rather than requiring the FTC to prove its case. That certainly seems to go squarely against the judicial principle that a person is deemed innocent until proven guilty.

What, then, does the businessman seek and need? The magazine states it this way: "What he needs most of all, in the face of mounting competition both at home and from abroad, are some clear and reasonably undeviating guidelines that encourage competitive performance. This would not be a boon merely to business, but to all America. For when the Nation's businessmen can stop expending their energy on efforts to interpret the conflicting signals of their masters in Government and instead devote their full talent to providing better goods and services at lower costs, the whole country will profit."

Everybody Gets It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 16, 1962.

EVERYBODY GETS IT

Recently a House subcommittee charged with processing the foreign aid bill asked one of the top brass present to give the names of any nations in the world not yet receiving our handouts. This executive responded that he was sure there must be some, but he had no idea where they might be. It seemed reasonable when the foreign aid folks were requested to get this information and submit it to the committee at the earliest possible time.

Two days later a representative of the Library of Congress called the chairman of the committee, inquiring for this identical information. When asked why he wanted it, he responded that it was needed to fill a request of the Foreign Aid Administration. If any of our readers keep scrapbooks of items which show the evil of big government in general and of our foreign aid program in particular, here is a small addition.

The United States and the U.N.: A Reappraisal of the National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our State Department for initiating the program of regional briefing conferences that have proved so effective in helping to keep the American people abreast of developments in international affairs. Never before have the citizens of our great Nation taken such a keen interest in the world around us and the State Department deserves a warm word of praise for bringing our foreign policy and the people who plan it close to the American public.

Since the first regional briefing conference was held in San Francisco in July 1961, audiences in Denver, Kansas City, Dallas, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Chicago, and Toledo have been able to hear top State Department officials such as Charles Bohlen, George McGhee, and Chester Bowles present firsthand reports on current world problems. Even more important, there has been on each occasion an opportunity through a series of workshops to ask questions and explore issues in depth. The overwhelmingly enthusiastic response has prompted the Office of Public Services in the State Department to continue the regional briefings and to plan several national conferences in Washington next year.

Because I feel it is typical of the thoughtful, informative addresses being presented through the regional conference program, I am entering into the RECORD a speech delivered by Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Affairs Richard N. Gardner to an audience of 800 community leaders at the Toledo, Ohio, conference on April 24, 1962. Mr. Gardner addressed himself to a subject which is of utmost importance and concern to every thinking American and which each Member of this body soon will be called upon to decide for himself, "The United States and the U.N.: A Reappraisal of the National Interest." I earnestly commend this speech to the attention of my colleagues:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE U.N.—A REAPPRAISAL OF THE NATIONAL INTEREST

(Address by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs)

For the first time in many years U.S. participation in the United Nations has become a subject of national debate. To be sure, there has always been a small minority of Americans hostile to policies of international cooperation who have opposed our participation in the U.N. as a matter of principle. What makes the present situation different, however, is that a number of citizens who accept the necessity for our involvement in world affairs and for our membership in the U.N. are raising questions about the place of the U.N. in U.S. foreign policy. They are asking whether we are not placing too much emphasis on the U.N. and whether our attempts to strengthen the organization continue to serve the national interest.

This new situation is understandable. The United Nations today is a very different organization from the one which was created in 1945 and to which most Americans have become accustomed. It has grown from a small, Western-oriented institution of less than 60 countries to a parliament of 104 nations in which the newly independent countries of Africa and Asia hold nearly half the seats. Even more significant, it has evolved from being mainly a forum for discussion to an executive instrument with an increasing capability for promoting economic progress and keeping the peace.

The fact that U.S. participation in the U.N. has become a subject of intense national interest is something to be welcomed, not deplored. It was easy for people to pay lipservice to the United Nations so long as it was regarded good society. But human institutions, like the human body, develop muscle only painfully. Our Congress, our Executive, our Supreme Court all achieved greater strength only in the stress and strain of national controversy.

The United Nations actions and the U.S. relationship to the U.N. are now a matter of national concern, simply means that the United Nations is doing things that are important enough for us to argue about among ourselves. Far from dying, the United Nations is increasingly being recognized as a significant mechanism of international politics—one of the important arenas for the exercise of national power.

With these facts in mind let us turn to the central question: Does our present policy toward the United Nations serve the national interest?

I trust that no one will take exception to the form in which this question is put. There may be some who feel that the U.S. commitment to the United Nations should be a matter of faith and that questions of selfish national interest are not involved. I fear I cannot accept this view. All of us who serve in Washington are under an obligation to further the national interest of our country. There can be no other test in our decisionmaking.

In fact, the difference between those who think our commitment to the United Nations should be a matter of faith and those who think it should be contingent upon the national interest is probably more apparent than real. There is a profound sense in which idealism is realism. When we say that the United States is committed to the support of the United Nations we really mean—or ought to mean—that the United States is determined to help make the U.N. a success out of conviction that the long-term interest of our country requires the development of a civilized system of collective security.

I

Before we can decide whether our present policy toward the United Nations serves the national interest, we must consider carefully just what the United Nations is—and how we presently use it in the development of our foreign policy. This may seem to some an unduly elementary exercise, but such a return to fundamentals is essential. Listening to some of the things that are being said about the United Nations and our relation to it, one gets the impression that there is no institution in our domestic or international life less understood than the organization whose headquarters is located at 42d Street and the East River in New York City.

What, then, is the United Nations, and what is our national strategy for making use of it? The U.N. is really three institutions in one—and each of them has a unique value for the United States.

First, the United Nations is a place for debate—a center for publicity, education, and persuasion—a forum in which the weak as well as the strong can make their case.

It is fashionable to some quarters to denigrate this aspect of the United Nations. It is said that the U.N. is a "cave of winds"—a "debating society." These are strange words for Americans to use. Our whole history and tradition have taught us the value of free and open discussion, of commerce in the marketplace of ideas. Our parliamentary institutions in the West all place great emphasis on debate and are not notably more disciplined than the General Assembly. Most Americans believe—rightly in my opinion—that in the long run free debate works against error and for truth and justice. Those who deplore the United Nations as a "debating society" are really saying that they have lost confidence in the capacity of our country to present its case successfully in the councils of nations.

Of course, no one claims that world opinion is self-enforcing, or that debates in the U.N. can work miraculous changes in the behavior of nations. The Soviets have demonstrated their contempt for what the rest of the world thinks on numerous occasions, notably in their brutal suppression of Hungarian freedom and in their recent decision to break the moratorium on nuclear testing. But it would be absurd to conclude from this that "there is no such thing as world opinion," or that U.N. debates are utterly futile.

The fact of the matter is that, starting with the Security Council debates which led to the Soviet withdrawal from Iran in 1946, the United Nations has served as a useful instrument to throw the spotlight of publicity on acts of injustice, or to vary the metaphor, to "blow the whistle" on breaches of the peace. This function of the U.N. has real vitality where small powers are concerned—the dispute between Iraq and Kuwait is a recent example. This function has value, too, though to a lesser extent, in moderating the behavior of larger powers, even of the Soviet Union. The Soviet posture on the Congo, disarmament, outer space, economic development, and countless other issues has been influenced by concern with its "public relations," both in the industrialized West and in the less-developed countries, and particularly as reflected in the United Nations.

The role of the U.N. as a place for debate serves our national interest by providing us with a useful instrument to build support for American policies. We use debates in the General Assembly, the Security Council, and other U.N. organs to defend and explain American positions on a range of subjects from disarmament to economic development. If we fail to persuade all members of the U.N. of the justice of our positions it is not the fault of the U.N.—we would have to take account of the views of other countries in any case. The point is that the existence of the U.N. has enabled us in case after case to change the opinions of foreign representatives to an extent which would otherwise not have been possible. These changes are not always reflected immediately in U.N. votes, but they are reflected in gradual shifts in direction in a country's foreign policy. And even in the U.N. itself, the last General Assembly has seen significant changes in voting patterns of some of the new nations—changes notably favorable from the U.S. point of view—changes which testify to the utility of the U.N. as a crucible for the moulding of world opinion.

II

Second, the United Nations is a place for negotiation—a standing diplomatic conference where the peaceful settlement of disputes can be sought through quiet diplomacy.

This aspect of the United Nations is still only dimly understood. It is the seven-eighths of the iceberg below the surface of the water. Diplomats and historians, schooled in the arts of old-fashioned diplomacy, continue to deplore the "glass house" on the East River where there are "open disagreements openly arrived at."

In spite of such critics the United Nations offers one of the greatest opportunities for quiet diplomacy the world has ever known. It is a place where the representatives of 104 sovereign states can meet on an informal and continuing basis, rubbing elbows in countless conferences and social occasions, from formal dinners and receptions to amiable chats in the delegates lounge.

To be sure, we will continue to rely heavily on our relations with the diplomatic corps in Washington and on our Embassies around the world as the principal vehicles of quiet diplomacy. But the United Nations does have advantages which make it of distinct usefulness in particular situations. It is a natural forum for a multilateral negotiation which involves the interests of many countries. It is a place where diplomatic encounters can be conveniently managed on an informal and quiet basis.

The U.N. as a facility for negotiation has demonstrated its value on countless occasions. One famous example occurred a dozen years ago when a series of informal meetings between American Ambassador Phillip C. Jessup and Soviet Ambassador Jacob Malik led to an agreement which settled the Berlin crisis of that day and made it possible to terminate the Berlin airlift. More recently, quiet negotiations with the Soviets broke the longstanding deadlock which had prevented the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space from commencing its work and laid the foundation for the hopeful negotiations on outer space cooperation now underway between the Soviet Union and the United States.

III

Third and last, the United Nations is a place for action—an international executive—a vehicle for doing things rather than merely talking about them.

It is this third function of the United Nations, its capacity to act, which is now the subject of particular controversy. Does the strengthening of the U.N. as an action agency serve our national interest?

The answer to this question must be in two parts in accord with the two-pronged nature of the U.N.'s executive role.

One area of U.N. operations is in the economic and social field. This is by far the largest part in terms of money and personnel involved. It is much less controversial than the U.N.'s political and military role but by no means beyond controversy.

This facet of the U.N. in action seldom makes the headlines, nor are its manifestations seen within our borders. But its influence in the less-developed countries is enormous. The U.N. and its specialized agencies together are spending some $300 million a year on programs for economic and social betterment around the world. The U.N. is at work in dozens of countries healing the sick, feeding the hungry, teaching the illiterate. It is setting standards for workers in factories, for air and ocean transport, for peaceful uses of atomic energy. It is building governmental services in less-developed countries and aiding these countries in the drawing up of rational development plans. It is training the human resources of the future in the manifold tasks required to make a reality of independence, a success of self-determination.

How does this aspect of the U.N. at work serve our national interest? Part of the answer lies in the familiar argument that the promotion of economic growth in an environment of freedom abroad promotes the prosperity and security of our own country. But this argument does not provide the whole answer. We can, and do, give technical and economic aid to other countries outside the U.N. Indeed, our contribution to U.N. programs is but a small fraction of our total aid effort.

The case for using the U.N. as an instrument for promoting economic and social development rests on one fundamental point. The less-developed countries badly need advice and financial aid from the United States and other industrial countries in building healthy economies and free institutions. But the political leaders in many of these countries do not dare to depend for aid entirely upon the United States or even upon a group of Western countries. Such dependence would render them too vulnerable to the charge of homegrown nationalists or neutralists that they were becoming tools of Western policy or compromising their neutrality in the cold war. Such leaders can, however, accept aid and advice when it comes under a United Nations umbrella. Thus, in many circumstances, the United Nations provides the essential bridge from the United States and the prosperous nations of Europe to the developing nations of the Southern Hemisphere.

The pattern of economic development assistance that has been emerging in recent years defies easy classification. It goes beyond bilateralism but stops short of complete multilateralism, if that term is thought to mean the administration of all aid by international agencies. A large part of technical assistance and a smaller part of financial aid is now administered by the U.N. and other international organizations. For much of the rest there is gradually emerging a kind of multilateral bilateralism, or multilateral coordination of bilateral programs, in which countries supply, on a voluntary basis in each case, technical, financial, and commodity aid in support of projects and programs drawn up under international auspices. This pattern well serves the national interest of the United States by assuring the maximum financial contribution from other donor countries and the maximum cooperation in self-help and domestic reforms from the recipients themselves.

The second aspect of the United Nations as an action agency is its political and military role. This role extends from the diplomatic initiatives of the Secretary General in mediation and conciliation through the use of U.N. representatives for observation and factfinding, to the mounting of actual military operations such as the policing of the uneasy truce between Israel and her Arab neighbors and the preventing of civil war in the Congo.

How does this political and military role of the U.N. serve our national interest?

To answer this question it is useful to recall the choice that confronted the United States in the Congo in the summer of 1960. The Congo had been granted independence suddenly and, as it now appears, prematurely by Belgium. Almost immediately after this event, Congolese troops rebelled against their own officers. Looting, killing, and general disorder followed. The Belgians started flying back their troops and personnel to protect the European population. At this point the two leaders of the Congo, President Kasavubu and Prime Minister Lumumba, together appealed to the United States to send American troops and other assistance to protect the Congo against Belgian "aggression."

President Eisenhower rightly declined this appeal. It was apparent that for the United States to airlift thousands of American boys into the Congo would have the gravest domestic and international political implications. We would have become directly embroiled through the presence of American troops in fighting between our Belgian allies and the new Congolese Nation—with the ugly overtones of racial warfare. Worse still, we would have provided the occasion and the excuse for competitive Soviet intervention in the heart of Africa.

With these considerations in mind, President Eisenhower told the Congolese leaders that if they wished American assistance they would have to get it through the United Nations acting in the name of the world community. Kasavubu and Lumumba then sent a second appeal, this time to the United Nations. At the time of making this appeal they also issued a public warning that if United Nations assistance was not forthcoming they would look for help elsewhere. There is not the slightest doubt that "elsewhere" meant the Soviet Union.

The alternatives open to the United States, therefore, were clear:

We could do nothing, in which case the Congo would wallow in chaos and bloodshed and the Soviet bloc would be free to move in to pick up the remains.

We could intervene directly, and trigger a confrontation in the heart of Africa of the great powers, a confrontation which could lead to another "Spanish Civil War" and be the prelude to a wider conflict.

Or we could do what we in fact did—propose that assistance to the Congo be given through the United Nations.

No one pretends that the United Nations operation in the Congo has been an unqualified success. How could it have been, when 20,000 troops from 21 different countries, speaking different languages and following different military traditions sought to keep order in a country one-third the size of the United States with no effective public administration or basic services?

The test of the Congo operation is not whether it achieved some imaginary standard of peacekeeping excellence. It is whether the operation resulted in a situation better than would have occurred through the use of any available alternative. I believe that sober reflection will confirm that the use of the United Nations in the Congo was the least dangerous of the three dangerous alternatives confronting the United States and the world at large in the summer of 1960.

The Congo story reveals in microcosm a basic truth about the United Nations, namely, that in some situations in some parts of the world it represents the lesser of several evils—the least undesirable alternative of American action. When critics complain about the use of the United Nations in situations of this kind, they have the obligation to answer the question: What is the alternative?

The relevance of this question is illustrated by the story of the mouse who worked for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. One day this mouse was walking down the street when he was hailed by one of his fellow mice.

"Mickey," said the fellow mouse, "What are you doing these days?"

Mickey answered, "Why, I am working for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration."

"That sounds interesting," said the fellow mouse. "What's it like?"

"Well," said Mickey, "it is pretty awful. First they squash me in the nose cone of a rocket; then they shoot me up through the Van Allen radiation belt, which is very painful; then I become weightless and suffer from nausea. Then I fall into the ocean and get all wet. And then they take me out and put me in a laboratory and stick pins and needles into me."

At this point the fellow mouse was beginning to perspire profusely.

"Mickey," he said, "that sounds terrible. Why don't you go back to your previous line of work?"

"What," exclaimed Mickey, "back to cancer research?"

Those who attack U.N. operations in the Congo or elsewhere have an obligation to explain whether they consider these operations worse than the avaialble alternatives—or whether, in fact, they want us to go "back to cancer research."

To put the point in a more general way, there is good reason to believe that the United Nations is better than cancer research in a number of situations in our unhappy world. A prime reason for this has to do with Communist strategy. The Communists do not believe in true peaceful coexistence because they know that in any peaceful oompetition they would eventually lose. Khrushchev must know in his heart what we all know—that communism cannot win without violence and that no people has ever chosen communism as a matter of free choice. Therefore his definition of peaceful coexistence specifically includes wars of liberation against so-called rotten reactionary regimes. This means that the Communists claim the right to intervene everywhere in the world to help impose communism by force. We are witnessing such intervention at this very moment in places such as Berlin and Vietnam.

How is the United States to respond to the Communist campaign of forceful intervention in the affairs of other nations? In the face of this behavior, can the United States follow a principle of nonintervention, a hands-off policy which gives a free hand to Communist subversion and aggression in every part of the world?

A century ago, at the time of czarist Russian intervention for Austria and against the Hungarian Revolution of 1848, John Stuart Mill posed the same question. He concluded that "the doctrine of nonintervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must consent to be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue: That the wrong side may help the wrong but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent."

Applying this insight to our present situation, we can surely agree that "intervention to enforce nonintervention" continues to be a rightful and moral policy essential to the defense of a free and open international society. To enforce nonintervention, Communist aggression or subversion must sometimes be met by forceful counteraction by free nations acting together through military alliances. But, in Mill's phrase, such unilateral or regional action may not be always prudent—or, to put it another way, always the most effective political alternative. In some situations, it may prove incompatible with the wishes of the affected country or involve too great a risk of escalation into a wider conflict. In these situations the most effective type of counteraction by the non-Communist countries is counter action taken in the name of the world community under the aegis of the United Nations. The world organization has special advantages of acceptability and noninflammability because it can intervene more easily in the name of nonintervention—because its actions are taken in the name of the community of nations as a whole.

This important potentiality of the United Nations has not been lost upon the Communists. The Soviet bloc has consistently opposed the development of the third function of the U.N.—its capacity to act. During his famous visit to the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, Premier Khrushchev noted significantly: "Experience of the work of the United Nations has shown that this body is useful and necessary, because in it are represented all the states which are called upon to solve, through negotiations and discussion, the pressing issues of international relations so as to prevent them from reaching a point where conflicts and wars might break out. That is the positive aspect of the work of the United Nations. That, indeed, constitutes the main purpose of the creation of the United Nations."

Notably missing from this Soviet benediction of the U.N. was any reference to the U.N.'s function as an operating agency—as an instrument for building free nations and keeping the peace. This is not surprising. The Communists are clearly alarmed by the prospect of a greater operational ability of the United Nations to carry out a charter full of dangerous thoughts about freedom of choice for all men—a capability that could bury the Communist version of history without the necessity of a major war. That is why the Soviet bloc has insisted upon the "principle of unanimity", why it has flagrantly misused the veto, why it has pressed its troika demand for a veto within the executive of the organization, and why it has sought through its financial boycott to starve the U.N. to death as a peacekeeping agency.

These Soviet actions are disquieting. But they do not doom to frustration the United Nations as an operating institution. We must not allow ourselves to get into the frame of mind that nothing can be done in the United Nations without the approval of the Soviet bloc. The whole history of the organization—in Korea and the Congo, in technical assistance and economic aid—proves that the contrary is the case. This will continue to be so as long as the United States and other free nations work together to maintain and strengthen the United Nations as an action agency on the basis of the common interest of the vast majority of U.N. members in the promotion of an open society of prosperous and independent states.

IV

This, in summary form, is the case for the proposition that the U.N. has been and continues to be a useful instrument for the promotion of our national interest. But we cannot rest the case on such a general statement. In recent months a number of specific criticisms have been voiced about our relation to the United Nations. Let us examine the most important of these criticisms in some detail.

1. The United Nations is a failure because it has not brought peace.

This is one of the most frequently heard, and least substantial, of the criticisms. The United Nations is not a guaranteed patent remedy for all the ills of our unhappy world. It has failed to do a number of things—free Hungary or defend Goa, for example—but since neither the United States nor anyone else was willing or able to do these things it seems a bit hard to blame them on the U.N. The U.N. has no more solved all the world's problems than our foreign aid program has cured political instability and economic stagnation—yet both institutions have brought measurable improvements in the state of the world. Recalling once again our mouse story, the test of the success of the United Nations is not whether it has solved every problem but whether the world is better off on balance than it would have been if the United Nations had never existed. Looking at the record of the U.N. in economic and social development, in peace-keeping undertakings in Iran, Palestine, Suez, Lebanon, Jordan, Kuwait, the Congo, and many other places, no one can seriously doubt the answer to this question.

It is probably true that the U.N., like most new institutions, was oversold at its inception. To some people, it heralded the dawn of a new era in which power politics would vanish and the rule of law would be achieved. We know now that this view was hopelessly inadequate, not merely because it failed to forecast the cold war but also because it misconceived the true nature of international relations.

The United Nations is not the substitute for power politics or the clash of national interests. It merely provides a new arena for the play of politics and the adjustment of interests and hopefully a substitute in some situations for the use of force. The organization is not a superstate—it cannot make or enforce law for any of its members.

Sir Gladwyn Jebb employed a useful metaphor to answer the objection that the United Nations had not brought peace to the world. "The United Nations is a mirror of the world we live in," he liked to say, "and if the reflection is ugly it is not the mirror which is to blame."

Unfortunately there are still a number of people who are prone to "blame the mirror." For example, public support for the United Nations still tends to gyrate up and down in accordance with the way the Congo operation is going in a particular week. When an outbreak of violence occurs or relations between Tshombe and Adoula deteriorate, the stock of the United Nations plummets. When order is restored and there is progress in the achievement of a unified Congo, the stock of the United Nations rises.

Surely our support of the U.N. must be based on a more solid foundation than this. Our opinion of our family doctor does not go up and down in accordance with the temperature of his patient. If we have confidence in the doctor, we support his best efforts and understand that sometimes people sicken and even die in spite of everything he can do to help them.

2. The United Nations costs too much for the United States.

To evaluate this charge it is necessary to see the U.N. financial picture in broad outline. There are four kinds of United Nations operations toward which the United States contributes:

First, there is the regular assessed budget of the United Nations. In 1961 this totaled $72.7 million. The United States paid 32.5 percent of this, or $22.3 million. The U.S. share of the regular budget has been steadily decreasing and this year will be 32 percent.

Second, there are the regular assessed budgets of the specialized agencies. In 1961 these totaled $64.9 million, of which the United States contributed $18 million. The U.S. share in these budgets is in most cases the same as its share in the U.N. budget; in a few cases it is even less.

Third, there are the voluntary programs—such as the expanded program of technical assistance, the United Nations Special Fund, the United Nations Children's Fund, and the Arab Refugee Agency—in which each country puts up what it wishes to contribute. In 1961 these programs totaled $159 million, of which the United States contributed $79.8 million. The U.S. share in the individual programs varies from 40 percent to two-thirds—overall, our share is about half of the total.

Fourth, there are the peacekeeping activities in the Middle East and the Congo. In 1961 these cost about $140 million, of which the United States contributed something over $60 million.

With the gradual expansion of United Nations activities, the total annual budget of the U.N. family will soon reach $500 million, of which the U.S. share will be something like $200 million.

Is this too expensive for the United States? It amounts to little more than $1 a year for every man, woman, and child in our country. It is less than the cost of one B-70 aircraft—a weapons system which the

Congress has been urging the President to procure. In terms of the net return to world peace and prosperity and therefore to our national interest, it could hardly be termed an unreasonable cost.

Of course, the most frequent objection to U.N. financing is not that the cost of the U.N. is too great, but that the United States bears too great a share. The United States has pressed successfully over the years for a reduction in its share of the cost of U.N. programs in recognition of the growing prosperity of other countries and also of the desirability of maintaining the multilateral character of the institution. Our share in the regular budget has been reduced from 40 to 32 percent; in technical assistance from 60.7 to 40 percent; in UNICEF from 72 to 44 percent. The present share of the United States in U.N. costs is not unreasonable when one bears in mind that the United States accounts for some two-fifths of the world's national income and that our standard of living is approximately double the average in other industrialized countries and some 20 times greater than the average in less-developed countries.

The question of our share in U.N. costs is related to the controversy over how to deal with the U.N.'s present financial crisis. This crisis does not derive from the regular U.N. budget, from the regular budgets of the specialized agencies, or from the voluntary programs.

Although the Soviet contribution to the voluntary programs is obviously inadequate, and although some of the poorer countries are occasionally slow payers to the regular budgets as well as the voluntary programs, the United Nations has no problem of arrearages on account of these three sets of operations.

The problem arises because of the failure of the Soviet bloc and certain other countries to pay for the Congo and Middle East operations. Some of these countries, such as the Soviets, argue that there is no legal obligation to pay for these peace-keeping expenses; others that they are unable to pay. As a result, the U.N. was $114 million "in the red" on the peace-keeping operations as of the end of 1961.

To deal with this predicament Acting Secretary General U Thant presented last December, and the General Assembly approved, a three-part financial plan. This plan provided for another assessment to carry forward the Middle East and Congo operations to July 1, 1962. It called for an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice to settle the question of whether the obligation to pay for such assessments was a binding obligation on all members. And it authorized the issuance of $200 million of United Nations bonds bearing 2 percent interest and repayable over 25 years.

The United States supported this program because it represented the only sound and workable way open at this time to restore fiscal responsibility to the U.N. and permit it to carry on its peace-keeping mission in the immediate future. The Senate has now enacted legislation authorizing the President to lend the United Nations up to $100 million. This legislation clearly gives the President authority to purchase U.N. bonds if he believes this will serve the national interest.

There are some people who oppose our coming to the aid of the U.N. in its present financial crisis on the grounds that we will be paying for the Soviet share. This charge is completely incorrect. The International Court of Justice opinion called for under the United Nations financial program is expected to confirm the legal obligation of the Soviet bloc to pay for the Middle East and Congo operations. If this expectation is fulfilled the continued refusal of the bloc countries to pay their arrearages will confront them with the loss of their votes in the General Assembly as of January 1, 1964.

In the meantime, it makes little sense for the United States to withhold its financial support for the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations because the Soviet bloc does so. The United States has a very big stake in the peacekeeping mission of the United Nations. By contrast, the Soviet bloc appears to be convinced that strengthening the U.N. as an action agency in promoting order works against its goal of world communism. This is why it is seeking to starve the U.N. to death as an action agency. Should the U.S. refuse to support U.N. programs which serve its interest because the Soviet Union boycotts the very same programs on the grounds that they work against communism? A town's No. 1 householder does not refuse to pay for the police force and the school board because the town's No. 1 delinquent refuses to pay. To do so would put the safety of the householder at the mercy of the delinquent. Such a policy makes no more sense in international organizations that it does in domestic affairs.

3. The voting procedures of the General Assembly are unreasonable and work against American interests.

Much is heard these days about the unreasonableness of the rule of one nation-one vote in the General Assembly and about the dangers which have resulted from the inflation of that body through the influx of new members.

Naturally, it is easy to criticize the system of one nation-one vote, just as it is easy for critics of our domestic institutions to criticize the principle of two Senators from each State or to pick flaws in the electoral college. But in criticizing international as well as domestic institutions the critics have the obligation once again to answer the question: What is the alternative?

Any system of weighted voting in the General Assembly would have to weigh population as a major, if not the major factor. It is questionable whether such an arrangement would suit a country like ours which has 6 percent of the world's population and which, even with its NATO allies, has only 16 percent. If population were a major criterion India with its 400 million people, might well end up with more votes than the United States. Of course, it is always possible to imagine a system of weighted voting which would offset the population factor with such factors as literacy, per capita income, and military power. But those critics are living in a dream world who think that any charter amendment is presently possible which would deprive the small and poor countries of all the prerogatives they now enjoy.

We should not overlook the fact that as between the free world and the Communist bloc the present system of voting in the General Assembly is far from unfavorable. To the critics of the present arrangement, we should put the question: Can you show us a politically possible alternative which would confine the Communists to what they now have—only 11 votes out of 104?

But it is not such speculations, but solid experience, which provides the answer to this line of criticism. The fact is that most of the new nations which have come to the U.N. find that their desire for political independence and economic progress puts them on the same side as the United States on a large majority of U.N. votes. Moreover, it is possible to see in the voting patterns of the new nations a perceptible trend in favor of positions advocated by the United States.

Let us look at the record of the last General Assembly—an Assembly which has been dubbed by a leading news magazine as the "sensible 16th":

The President of the United States presented a comprehensive program before the General Assembly on September 25. The reception this program received provides some interesting clues to the way the General Assembly is going.

The President asked that the Soviet troika demand be rejected and that a single impartial Secretary General be appointed to succeed Dag Hammarskjold. The troika demand was overwhelmingly rejected, the candidate we supported was chosen, and the integrity of the Secretariat was maintained.

The President called for responsible measures to cope with the U.N.'s financial crisis. A three-part financial plan proposed by the Secretary General and supported by the United States was passed despite Soviet opposition.

The President proposed a broad program of international cooperation in outer space. When the details of this program were presented to the Assembly later in the session, they received such wide endorsement that the Soviet Union, after some initial hesitation, asked permission to cosponsor. The program was unanimously approved.

The President proposed a U.N. development decade to strengthen the work of the U.N. in the economic and social field. This program was unanimously approved. Its first concrete manifestation, the U.S.-sponsored world food program, was approved overwhelmingly despite Soviet bloc abstention.

The President asked support for free world positions on basic cold war issues. The Assembly gave resounding majorities to free world positions on Korea, Hungary, and Tibet. The Communist attempt to substitute Red China for the Republic of China was defeated by a larger vote in the 16th Assembly than in the 15th.

To be sure, the United States did not win every vote at the 16th General Assembly. In a world in which there are substantial differences of opinion between nations this could scarcely be expected. But when one looks at the record as a whole, as distinguished from the record on individual votes, one finds little to support the charge that the voting procedures of the General Assembly, combined with the inflation of membership, have made it impossible for the United States successfully to prosecute its foreign policy in the United Nations.

4. The Afro-Asian bloc is irresponsible on colonial issues and our desire to please them in the United Nations has divided the NATO alliance.

There are three main points to be made about this charge.

In the first place, there is no such thing as a cohesive Afro-Asian bloc with a unified view on colonial (or other) questions. There are more than 50 U.N. members from Africa and Asia. So far as the countries of Asia are concerned, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Nationalist China, Malaya, Burma, and others often find themselves on the same side as the Western countries. In Africa there are at least 3 distinguishable groups of countries—the Western-oriented Brazzaville group of some 12 former French colonies, the Monrovia group led by such moderate countries as Tunisia and Nigeria, and the Casablanca group of countries such as Egypt and Ghana which take a more militant view on colonial questions.

When these various views are distilled in the 104-nation General Assembly, it is the moderate resolutions calling for orderly progress toward self-government which command the necessary two-thirds majority. The record of the 16th General Assembly on the colonial issue reflected genuine progress over previous years. An irresponsible Soviet proposal calling for independence for all colonies in 1962 was categorically rejected. So, too, was a bloc resolution calling for sanctions against Portugal over Angola. So, too, was a Soviet demand to reopen Security Council debate on the Congo in order to attack the U.N.'s Congo policy. On this latter maneuver, 20 African countries backed Premier Adoula of the Congo in opposing the Soviet move.

The United States, of course, has an interest in maintaining and strengthening the NATO alliance. It also has an interest in promoting orderly progress toward self-government by those relatively few peoples around the world who have not achieved independence. So far as the vast majority of NATO members are concerned, the pursuit of these objectives is not inconsistent. Indeed, the record of the 16th General Assembly reveals one startling fact—the United States voted with the majority of NATO countries on every one of the 20 colonial issues which came to a vote in the Assembly. In most of these votes it was only Portugal (in some cases also France and Iceland) who voted against the NATO majority.

5. The United Nations make U.S. foreign policy.

So far as this charge is concerned, it would be more accurate to say that the United States makes U.N. foreign policy—or, to be more precise, that the United States influences profoundly the outcome of U.N. votes, and more importantly, the nature of the U.N. actions.

U.S. foreign policy is not made by the United Nations, nor is U.S. foreign policy made by the U.S. Mission to the United Nations. The center of decision on U.N. affairs, as on all other matters of our foreign policy, is Washington, D.C.

To be sure, the facts and recommendations received from the U.S. Mission to the U.N. receive considerable weight, as do the facts and recommendations received from within the Department from our embassies around the world, and from other executive agencies. But on any question which arises in the United Nations, the determination on U.S. foreign policy is made in Washington on the basis of a total appreciation of the national interest.

The United States uses the U.N. facilities for debate and negotiation to build support for our foreign policy positions. Equally important, we use the U.N. to carry forward action programs which we could not carry out as well on a unilateral basis. The Congo operation is an obvious illustration. The U.N. outer space program is a less obvious, but no less revealing example. We need the assistance of many nations if our national space program is to be successfully carried on. In weather and communications, for example, the technology of the United States can yield dividends to ourselves and others only if many nations join in allocating radio frequencies, in tracking and communicating with space vehicles, and in placing necessary ground installations on their territories. By developing some of our outer space activities within the framework of the U.N. and its specialized agencies we encourage needed cooperation from a number of countries which might not otherwise be forthcoming.

6. The development of the peacekeeping role of the U.N. is dangerous because it might be used against us.

There are essentially three reasons why we have much more to gain than to fear from the development of the U.N.'s peacekeeping capacity.

First, the Charter of the United Nations is our kind of charter. It is an eloquent restatement of the values which lie at the center of our national policy. It embodies the concept of an open world society of independent states which stands at the opposite extreme from the Communist pattern of standardization and coercion. It should be possible for the United States to pursue its interests of the world within the framework of charter principles. The same cannot be said for the Soviet Union.

Second, the United Nations capacity to act in peacekeeping as well as economic programs depends crucially on our support. The Soviet bloc boycotts nearly all of the main executive operations of the United Nations. In the world of symbolism, U.N. actions are taken in the name of global universality. But in the real world, the U.N. in action is the free world in action.

The United States, the members of the North Atlantic Community, and the British Commonwealth pay for three-quarters or more of the economic and peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. Without the support of the Western Powers, the U.N. would quite suddenly lose its capacity to act. Its executive arm could not be used against us because it would largely cease to exist.

Third, the procedures of the United Nations provide us with important defenses against peacekeeping actions which we do not approve.

The United States has a veto in the Security Council. Under the Uniting for Peace Resolution, a veto can be overridden and a peacekeeping operation sent to the General Asembly only if there is an affirmative vote of 7 of the 11 members of the Security Council. In other words, the United States could stop a peacekeeping operation if it could muster a "blocking five" negative or abstaining votes in the Security Council. When one considers that the Council includes as permanent members the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Nationalist China; and as elective members a friendly European country, two Latin Americans, and two African countries, it is hard to conceive of a situation where the necessary five negative or abstaining votes could not be secured.

In the unlikely event that 7 of the 11 members of the Security Council voted a peacekeeping operation over American opposition, the operation could still not proceed without a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly. Here again it would be extraordinary if the United States could not muster a blocking third, considering all the abstaining votes which would result in a situation where the United States expressed determined opposition to a peacekeeping action.

Of course, there is no ironclad guarantee for the United States in the present procedures of the United Nations. All one can say with assurance is that the procedures are extremely favorable to our country and that the authorization of a peacekeeping action against our opposition is difficult to imagine assuming always that the American position is reasonably founded in justice and the United Nations Charter.

There can be no assurance that the United States will succeed 100 percent of the time in the United Nations. But in an age when the arsenals of the two super powers contain warheads the largest of which have a destructive power greater than all the bombs dropped during the Second World War, it should be obvious that the interest of nations in having some means for the peaceful settlement of disputes outweigh their interest in winning every one of them.

7. The United States should rely on the Atlantic Community rather than the United Nations to promote its national interest.

Both the supporters and the critics of the United Nations should avoid an either-or philosophy. Despite some of its uncritical enthusiasts, the U.N. is by no means the only instrument of our foreign policy. We have many important institutions for the promotion of our national interest. We have the Strategic Air Command. We have Polaris submarines. We have NATO. We have the OECD. We have the Alliance for Progress. We have the United Nations. There is no necessary inconsistency between our use of all these instruments of national policy.

We should be on our guard in particular against thinking that there is a necessary conflict between the building of the North Atlantic Community, on the one hand, and effective Western participation in the United Nations, on the other.

What we see emerging today are two concentric circles. At the core—in the inner circle—are the regional organizations of Western Europe and North Atlantic Community, such as the Common Market and OECD. In the outer circle are the institutions of the United Nations family.

These two circles are complementary—not competitive. The outer circle—the United Nations family—needs the inner circle of North Atlantic institutions with their great accumulation of experience, power, and wealth. But the inner circle also needs the outer circle as a bridge to the less developed countries and the Communist bloc.

Our task today is to build a concert of free nations, not in any one of these circles alone, but in both of them at once.

The North Atlantic institutions could be invaluable to Western interests if they were used—not as an alternative to the U.N. but to concert Western support of the U.N. and to increase the Western contribution to the U.N. in both money and personnel.

V

The conclusion of this reappraisal of the U.S. interest in the U.N. is not that the U.N. is perfect. We are not wholly satisfied with the U.N. as it now exists. In the months ahead we intend to press for needed improvements in a number of areas—for better coordination of U.N. economic activities, for better ways of financing U.N. peacekeeping operations, for more efficient and orderly General Assembly procedures, and for more effective means of factfinding, observation, and pacific settlement.

To make progress in these and other areas will require a maximum effort on the part of the United States. This effort will be aided by frank and constructive criticism of U.N. shortcomings. But to be successful it must also be founded on a broadly based American conviction that, with all its shortcomings, the United Nations remains a valuable institution for the United States. Such a conviction, I submit, is justified not merely as a matter of faith but as the result of a careful scrutiny of the recent record in the hard light of the national interest.

Tax Reform Most Pressing Need; Not Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Tax Reform Most Pressing Need; Not Tax Cut," which appeared in the August 23 issue of the Leitchfield Gazette, of Leitchfield, Ky.:

TAX REFORM MOST PRESSING NEED; NOT TAX CUT

Cold figures show that even after taxes and adjusting the relative value of the dollar, American people have almost twice as much net income as they did 20 years ago before war time inflation and astronomical Federal budgets. Despite the constant complaint about high taxes and high cost of living, every person regularly employed at average wage scales can live without hardship, enjoy the highest standard of living in the world and be able to save a substantial portion of his income.

America has reached its position of strength through increasing productivity. With that gain in production per man-hour, there has been a corresponding gain in personal income and the standard of living. While we do not claim to challenge experts who insist a tax cut would spur the economy, we cannot see why money spent to reduce the debt would be less effective in releasing capital for new investments than lowering income and corporate taxes. Money to buy bonds to finance deficit spending must come from somewhere.

Present tax laws appear to be written to confuse the small taxpayer, to give unfair concessions to certain groups, and to be confiscatory in some instances. Simpler and more broadly based tax procedures would eliminate much of the legal or illegal evasion of a fair share of taxes. Efforts to write concessions into tax laws add to their complexity without bringing relief to more than a comparative handful.

While it is certain that an attempt to rewrite tax laws will result in something less acceptable to special groups, almost everyone admits that reform is needed. Some brackets are too high and some are too low, and in one particular branch there is wholesale evasion to the tune of almost a billion dollars a year.

A few months ago when the administration made an effort to plug the nearly billion dollar leak, a pressure group turned on a propaganda drive that was swallowed hook, line, and sinker by enough to defeat it. Failure of the reform move is an indication that any effort to provide equitable tax laws will meet opposition from the sharpers and the obtuse.

Ten Years of Sport Fish Restoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of 10 years of outstanding sport fish restoration carried out under the Dingell-Johnson program for sports fishing restoration authored by my beloved late father and predecessor, the Honorable John D. Dingell, and his friend, Senator Edwin Johnson, of Colorado. The legislation has been the heart of a program of Federal-State cooperation to restore sports fisheries across this country.

My dad was indeed proud of this legislation, and were he living today he would take immense pleasure in the tremendous success as a result of this legislation. It is a milestone of legislative accomplishment in the field of conservation and is so viewed everywhere.

This program together with the kindred Pittman-Robertson Act has financed a great reinvigoration of wildlife management and habitat acquisition by the States.

The statement follows:

SPORT FISHING INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1962.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: We of the Sport Fishing Institute are most pleased to submit to you a published report on 10 years of fish restoration in the Dingell-Johnson program. It is a tribute to both your father, Congressman John Dingell, of Michigan, and to Senator Edwin Johnson, of Colorado, that this program has been so successful. As the fish conservation agency representing the fishing tackle industry, we are doubly proud of the results of this first decade. It is largely for this reason that we were invited to cooperate with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior, in the preparation of this report. We were happy to lend our financial support for its publication.

You will remember that after World War II, tremendous interest in angling brought a great need for management and restoration of sport fisheries in the United States. Early in the postwar period, it was evident that State agencies responsible for sport fishery management did not have sufficeint funds or personnel to expand their fishery management and research programs.

The demands of the increasing number of anglers were recognized when Congressman Dingell and Senator Johnson introduced bills to assist the State fish and game departments, and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act was signed by President Harry S. Truman, August 9, 1950. As you know, this act provides for financial aid to the States and territories for fish restoration and management projects. A 10-percent Federal excise tax on the purchases of fishing rods, reels, creels, artificial lures, baits and flies is paid into the U.S. Treasury. This money is then made available to the States and territories on a $3 (Federal) to $1 (State) matching basis, with a formula in the act considering the number of fishing license holders (60 percent) and land and water areas of a State (40 percent) in relation to the total license holders and total land and water areas of all the States.

Restoration and management projects are designed and developed by the fish and game departments within the States and territories. Such projects are limited to fishery research and management and investigation, purchase and development of lands and waters, restoration of environments, and maintenance of completed projects. When approved by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the States and territories proceed with their individual projects and are reimbursed by the Federal Government for up to 75 percent of the approved cost on completion. Such project areas become the property and administrative responsibility of the State, as do the structures built thereon, and the equipment used in their construction.

A summary of major accomplishments during this first 10 years of the D–J program includes the following items:

1. One hundred and sixty sport fishing lakes built in 37 States covering a total of more than 21,000 acres, Dingell-Johnson money spent, $7,144,279; State money spent, $4,847,536.

2. One thousand two hundred fishing access sites to 2,200,000 acres of lakes and coastal areas and 1,300 miles of streams in 28 States have been acquired or developed at a total cost of $3,192,072.

3. Four thousand six hundred and forty-two abstracts published in Sport Fishery Abstracts—a review of important technical periodicals covering current literature related to sport fisheries.

4. Much improvement of fish sampling methods, management techniques, and development of new management tools—vital objectives of Dingell-Johnson programs.

5. Six hundred and seventy miles of stream improved for fishing and fishlife in 16 States.

6. Sixty stream barriers built in 11 States to prevent escape of desirable fish and to block out undesirable fish.

7. Two thousand five hundred miles of streams and 225,000 acres of lakes restored to good fishing in 34 States by use of chemicals.

8. Much research is being carried on today to provide better fishing tomorrow. Information on this work has been transmitted through publication of more than 200 technical reports and 1,000 popular articles.

A summary of how excise tax funds were spent over the period 1952–61 is given as follows:

Research, investigation, and surveys	$23, 061, 195
Habitat improvement, development and maintenance	18, 708, 052
Land acquisition	4, 437, 877
State administration	2, 867, 235
Federal administration	2, 406, 204
Total	51, 480, 563

State cost-sharing contributions added approximately $20 million to the total program. The support of the fishing tackle manufacturers was an important factor when Congress enacted the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act. The fine cooperation of the industry since enactment has contributed to the success of the Dingell-Johnson program. This is a splendid example of vision and dedication to sport fish restoration.

TEN YEARS OF SPORT FISH RESTORATION

THE DINGELL-JOHNSON STORY

After World War II, tremendous interest in fishing brought a great increase in the need for management and restoration of sport fisheries in the United States. Early in the postwar period, it was evident that State agencies responsible for sport fishery management did not have sufficient funds or personnel to expand their fishery management programs.

The demands of the increasing numbers of anglers were recognized when Congressman JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, and Senator Edwin Johnson, of Colorado, introduced bills in the Congress to assist the State fish and game departments, and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act was approved August 9, 1950. This act provides for financial aid to the States and territories for fish restoration and management projects.

Dingell-Johnson and D-J have become the usual references to the activities under the cooperative Federal aid in fish restoration program, a fitting memorial for the sponsors of the act.

A Federal excise tax on the manufacturer's, producer's, or importer's prices on fishing rods creels, reels, artificial lures, baits, and flies is collected by the Federal Government. The money is made available to the States and territories in accordance with a formula in the act based upon the number of fishing license holders and land and water areas of a State in relation to the total license holders and total land and water areas of all the States.

Restoration and management projects are designed and developed by the States and territories. Project activities are limited to fisheries research, purchase and development of lands and waters, restoration of environment, and maintenance of completed projects. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and

Wildlife reviews the proposed projects to determine if the proposals are compatible with the provisions of the act. When a project is completed, the Federal Government reimburses the State for up to 75 percent of the approved cost. All areas become the property of the States and are administered by them. Structures built and equipment purchased with these cooperative funds likewise become State property.

Fishermen provide practically all of the funds—both State and Federal—for the accomplishments under the Dingell-Johnson program by paying fees for fishing licenses and permits and excise taxes on fishing tackle.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in cooperation with the Sport Fishing Institute has prepared this report to illustrate Dingell-Johnson accomplishments during the 10 years since passage of the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act.

Fishing lakes constructed with Dingell-Johnson funds—10-year summary, 1952–61

State	Number of lakes [1]	Surface acreage		Total cost	Total Dingell-Johnson contribution
		New	Restored		
Alabama	5	688.5		$385,452.53	$289,089.40
Arizona	9	553.3		636,871.94	296,646.16
Arkansas	6	2,336.1		278,611.27	208,958.45
Colorado	9	1,103.1	1,100.0	1,102,440.98	600,791.65
Connecticut	1		150.0	33,191.70	24,900.00
Delaware	3		96.0	97,677.73	73,277.02
Idaho	1	60.0		20,447.85	3,880.28
Illinois	7	450.8		1,074,749.52	692,096.57
Indiana	9	22.0	253.0	46,958.53	16,289.18
Iowa	4	374.9		274,680.62	101,156.56
Kansas	6	626.0		848,448.43	486,146.44
Kentucky	7	1,273.5		316,317.74	237,238.32
Maryland	9	97.1		199,525.22	147,396.46
Michigan	2	1,713.0	61.0	44,174.08	12,820.18
Mississippi	3	485.0		189,475.67	127,896.09
Missouri	3	267.0		302,979.35	159,478.06
Montana	1	20.0		42,667.38	4,846.16
Nebraska	3	179.0	33.5	445,534.09	308,492.23
Nevada	1	20.0		62,403.00	46,802.25
New Mexico	5	215.8		590,812.66	229,848.47
New York	3	2,015.5		121,562.37	33,048.75
North Dakota	5	658.0	432.0	250,029.77	99,780.63
Ohio	3	149.0		465,318.84	348,791.07
Oklahoma	9	1,216.0		1,053,486.91	517,360.39
Oregon	1	45.0		46,737.19	35,052.89
Pennsylvania	8	567.0	74.0	1,105,843.63	829,704.73
Rhode Island	2	10.8		13,900.00	10,425.00
South Carolina	6	663.0		164,998.15	88,031.83
South Dakota	3	396.0		253,359.76	94,794.68
Tennessee	2	329.8		400,180.37	300,137.28
Utah	4	227.0		215,473.04	148,354.77
Vermont	4	35.0	708.0	114,639.23	85,997.32
Virginia	4	471.0		228,612.68	171,459.52
Washington	6	89.2	24.4	105,218.80	78,914.10
West Virginia	2	205.0		143,923.40	71,961.70
Wisconsin	1	455.0		246,394.50	110,877.53
Wyoming	3	94.5		68,716.31	51,537.23
Total	160	18,111.9	2,931.9	11,991,815.24	7,144,279.35

[1] Includes combination projects (FW projects).

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY DINGELL-JOHNSON LAKES IN 37 STATES

Additional opportunity for recreation based on fishing must be made available to sportsmen throughout the United States. An effective and quick method has been construction of dams to impound water at suitable sites. A small stream that provides no fishing may be adequate to maintain an artificial lake.

In almost every part of the country, new and restored lakes built by State game and fish departments as Dingell-Johnson projects have given fishermen more opportunity to wet a line.

LET'S GO FISHING

More than 21,000 acres of additional fishing opportunity are provided by 160 new and restored lakes built with Dingell-Johnson funds. These waters are of vast importance in satisfying the increasing public demand for outdoor recreation. Total man-days of sport fishing in the United States increased about 15 percent from 1955 to 1960. The already heavy pressure on the Nation's fishery resources is expected to increase, and acceleration of lake development programs will be needed.

Lakes and other fishing waters are being utilized to the fullest extent in many instances. Automobiles and trailers loaded with boats and fishing gear can be found on highways in all sections of the country. There were more than 25 million anglers in the United States in 1960, an increase of about 17 percent since 1955. Licensed fishermen during this period increased about 10 percent. Salt water fishermen account for much of the increase in numbers of fishermen, but only five States require a marine sport fishing license.

Improving access to streams and lakes is an objecive of many Dingell-Johnson projects. Nearly 1,200 sites have been acquired or developed in 28 States to provide new or improved fishing access to about 1,300 miles of streams and 2,200,000 acres of lakes and coastal areas.

Roads, trails, parking areas, boat-launching ramps, mooring areas, and other public use facilities have been constructed to assure more fishing opportunity for the ever-increasing number of anglers.

Access to fishing areas has become a major fishery management problem. In many areas coastal waters, streams, and lakes are isolated from public use. Access easements and purchase of fishing rights have been helpful in making some of these areas available to fishermen.

Dingell-Johnson access projects—10-year summary, 1952–61

State	Sites acquired	Sites developed	Total costs
Alabama	47	48	$139,362
Alaska		79	35,771
Connecticut	1	49	132,673
Delaware	4	23	172,500
Florida	16	16	22,320
Hawaii		5	500
Idaho	11	1	75,826
Illinois		2	53,780
Indiana	43	47	265,348
Iowa	31	18	284,585
Michigan	177		$519,287
Mississippi	1		4,877
Montana	12		101,555
Nebraska		1	5,340
Nevada	1	2	18,451
New Jersey	1		77,497
New York		18	6,300
North Carolina	8	12	55,384
Ohio	1	6	87,220
Oregon	39	26	298,608
Rhode Island	8	20	153,747
South Dakota	2	4	6,730
Tennessee	124	114	141,175
Utah	5	4	18,181
Vermont	71	33	147,744
Washington	23	7	78,265
Wisconsin	1		250
Wyoming	5	11	288,796

Sport fishery management is the application of scientific knowledge about fish populations to the problem of obtaining maximum hours of fishing. This knowledge concerns the changes in fish populations, their environments, and their responses to variations in the environments. Through the Federal aid in fish restoration program the State fish and game departments are obtaining much of the scientific knowledge they need to make fishery management plans.

Our sport fisheries—fresh water and marine—must be properly managed and developed for maximum utilization.

To sustain a high level of utilization, information about fish populations and their environments must be kept up to date.

Biologists utilize many sampling methods to obtain information needed in developing fishery management programs.

Improvement of sampling methods and management techniques and development of new management tools are vital objectives of Dingell-Johnson programs.

Fish that spend part of their life in the ocean and return to fresh water to spawn—salmon, striped bass, alewives, smelt, sea-run trout, shad—must ascend streams to reach suitable spawning areas. Where fish are prevented from reaching good spawning habitat by dams or natural obstacles, fish passage facilities may be feasible. Fishways are usually expensive and must be justified by an accurate evaluation of the fishery to be benefited. In three States and one territory there have been 65 fish passage facilities constructed as Dingell-Johnson projects.

Stream barriers are not undesirable in all instances. Impassable obstacles in some areas have prevented undesirable fish from invading waters in which they are not established. Barrier dams or screens have been used in some States to prevent species from reinvading waters from which they have been eradicated. There have been 60 barriers built in 11 States with Dingell-Johnson funds to prevent fish either from escaping or from entering streams or lakes.

SIX HUNDRED AND SEVENTY MILES OF STREAMS IMPROVED

Stream improvement can provide better fishing. Elimination of pollution, removal of undesirable obstructions, watershed improvement programs, erosion control measures, and devices to improve the streamflow pattern are methods utilized by State fishery workers to provide better stream fishing. About 670 miles of streams in 16 States were improved by Dingell-Johnson projects.

The use of chemicals for vegetation control and as a fishery management tool is practiced throughout the country and probably is the best means for controlling fish populations in smaller lakes and ponds. Many substances toxic to fish—including copper sulphate, cresol, calcium hypochlorite, and many insecticides and herbicides—have been used extensively. Dingell-Johnson biologists in 34 States have used chemicals to restore good fishing in about 2,500 miles of streams and more than 225,000 acres of lakes and ponds.

Dingell-Johnson programs in several States include experimental artificial reef development. Designed to provide a fish concentration area where cover is lacking, the artificial reef may prove to be an effective habitat improvement device. Although efforts so far have been concentrated in coastal waters, experimental work in large inland lakes has been proposed. Reefs constructed of several different materials—streetcars, car bodies, large boulders, rubble, concrete—are being evaluated to determine economic feasibility and effectiveness in the concentrating sport fish.

Scuba diving is for many an exciting and exhilarating form of recreation. For the sport fishery biologist it is another tool for use in his never ending quest to provide more fishing for more people. Artificial reef development and evaluation requires arduous work and careful recording of data by biologist-divers working below the surface.

RESEARCH TODAY—BETTER FISHING TOMORROW

Lack of facts has always been a stumbling block in the path of successful fishery management. Prior to the Dingell-Johnson era only a few States could finance modern fishery research. Today nearly every State employs at least a few professional fishery biologists. Scientific investigation is now replacing guesswork and casual observation. Research workers equipped with the necessary tools—both in the field and in the laboratory—are substituting facts for guesses and research biologists are now available in most areas to assist the management biologists.

Many Dingell-Johnson survey projects include lake and stream mapping. Maps are exceptionally useful records and are essential for planning good management programs.

Modern survey instruments are used by Dingell-Johnson workers to obtain the accurate information needed for preparation of detailed maps used by fishery management biologists.

Maps for sportsmen are published in some States and are of great value to anglers and other recreationists. Primary purpose of these maps usually is to provide a brief, accurate summary of information about a particular fishing water.

The best measure of a sport fish management program is the harvest of fish and the recreation that is provided. Creel census is one of the most useful tools available for fishery management since it provides information on the harvest of fish.

Salt water or fresh water, lake or stream, surf or offshore, winter or summer, night or day, the fishery biologist seeks the angler's cooperation.

Publications are an important aspect of the Federal aid in fish restoration projects. More than 200 technical reports and about 1,000 popular articles about the program and its accomplishments were published during the 1952–61 period. Both fishermen and fishery workers benefit from these publications, and biologists in most States are encouraged to publish their findings.

Millions of Americans take advantage of outdoor recreational sports. Fishing is enjoyed by every member of the family—women as well as men, teenagers, and elders, mom, dad, sis, and junior, all take part. More than 25 million people over 12 years old went fishing in 1960. Those anglers spent billions of dollars, hundreds of millions of days, and traveled billions of miles to enjoy sport fishing. Personal expenditures on all recreation rose by almost 60 percent in the 1950's, and sport fishing has been a significant ingredient in the growth of these expenditures.

In 1960, $3 billion

	Percent
Food and lodging	10
Transportation	14
Fishing tackle	11
Other fishing equipment	37
Licenses	2
Other costs	26

FINANCING THE PROGRAM

Fishermen finance the entire program.

Fishermen provide the Federal share through the excise tax of 10 percent on certain types of sport-fishing tackle—rods, reels, creels, and artificial baits, lures, and flies. The Fish Restoration Act does not require any tax on cane poles, hooks, lines, sinkers, various other tackle, boats, and motors.

Fishermen also provide the State's share through fishing licenses, stamps, and permits.

Thus fishermen pay the entire cost of Dingell-Johnson projects and in so doing they serve all who benefit from more and better water and good fishing.

DISTRIBUTING THE FUNDS

The Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act provides that the Secretary of Interior shall, after deducting an amount necessary for expenses, apportion the remainder of the appropriation for each fiscal year among the several States in the following manner: 40 percent in the ratio which the area of each State including coastal and Great Lakes waters bears to the total area of all the States, and 60 percent in the ratio which the number of persons, holding paid sport fishing licenses bears to the number of such persons in all the States. No State receives less than 1 percent nor more than 5 percent of the distributed funds.

How fish restoration funds were spent, 1952–61

Research, investigations, and surveys	$23,061,195
Habitat improvement, development, and maintenance	18,708,052
Land acquisition	4,437,877
State administration	2,867,235
Federal administration	2,406,204
Total	51,480,563

SPORT FISHERY ABSTRACTS

About 250 technical periodicals are reviewed and abstracts of more than 200 reports are published in each issue of Sport Fishery Abstracts. Through 1961 there were 4,642 abstracts. Primary purpose of the abstracts is to bring to the attention of fishery workers current literature related to sport fisheries. State and Federal biologists throughout the country and fishery workers in 45 foreign countries receive the publication. This service has become almost indispensable to fishery biologists everywhere.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife publishes Sport Fishery Abstracts, a major Dingell-Johnson achievement. The need for an abstracting service was recognized in 1953 and evidence of support of an abstract journal was received from 38 States. Resolutions by the western and southern divisions of the American Fisheries Society affirmed this support, and the first issue of Sport Fishery Abstracts appeared in July 1955.

THE SCORE SHEET

Accomplishments during the first 10 years of the Dingell-Johnson program have been substantial.

Acquisition and improvement of access to lakes, streams, and coastal areas, construction of new lakes and rehabilitation of unproductive waters have provided more fishing for more people in all parts of the Nation.

Few States in 1950 had an adequate staff of specialists to manage sport fishery resources, and information for successful fisheries management was not available in most States. Today nearly every State has a technical fisheries staff, and management of sport fisheries is now on a sounder basis. Many Dingell-Johnson biologists have gained enough experience in supervision, budgeting, and programing to move into administrative echelons.

Dingell-Johnson studies now being conducted include diagnosis and treatment of disease and parasites, methods for controlling undesirable fish, feasibility of introducing exotic species, evaluation of regulations, and effects of pollution on fish and fishing. Investigations also are being conducted to develop, improve, and evaluate management techniques.

Sport Fishery Abstracts published by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife as a Dingell-Johnson activity, provides an indispensable tool for fishery biologists.

Conservation of basic natural resources has been well served by many Dingell-Johnson projects. Although designed to benefit sport fisheries, these projects have properly emphasized basic conservation concepts such as protection of stream banks, stabilization of eroding slopes, establishment of vegetative cover, removal of stream barriers, and preservation and establishment of permanent water areas.

Our sport fisheries will be subjected to ever increasing pressure and by the year 1976 will have to provide fishing opportunity for 50 percent more anglers. The imperative need of the fishery management agencies during the next 10 years will be additional sources of money.

A WORD OF APPRECIATION

The support of the fishing tackle manufacturers was an important factor when Congress enacted the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act. The fine cooperation of the industry during the 10 years since enactment has contributed to the success of the Dingell-Johnson program. This is a splendid example of vision and dedication to sport fish restoration.

Nisei of Biennium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, every 2 years the Japanese American Citizens League honors a number of outstanding citizens of Japanese descent by awarding them the title, "Nisei of Biennium." This year the citations and awards were made at the 17th biennial convention of the Japanese American Citizens League held in Seattle, Wash.

I am particularly honored that two of the five selected come from the district which I have the privilege to represent. The Honorable Tom Kitayama, of Union City, Calif., has devoted his activities to the welfare of that community and, more than once, the people of Union City have recognized him by electing him as mayor of the city. He has done a magnificent job and is a credit to his city and his country.

The only Federal employee to be so honored this year is John Yoshino, who is with the President's Committee on

Equal Employment Opportunity in the Department of Labor. Mr. Yoshino is a native of the city of Alameda, my home city, where his family has long distinguished itself in the affairs of Alameda.

I am very happy to make part of these remarks extracts from the August 3 and 10 editions of the newspaper, Pacific Citizen, the official organ of the Japanese American Citizens League:

[From the Pacific Citizen, Aug. 3, 1962]

Minoru Yamasaki Humbly Accepts 1961–62 "Nisei of Biennium" Honors

Seattle.—Minoru Yamasaki, world renown Nisei architect of Detroit, was announced as winner of the coveted Nisei of the Biennium award at the convention banquet, 17th Biennial Japanese American Citizen's League convention, July 30.

The citation as read by immediate Past National Japanese American Citizens' League President and National Recognitions Chairman Shigeo Wakamatsu, stated: "Minoru Yamasaki has gained for the profession of architecture, not only in this country but throughout the world, a new distinction filled with beauty and serenity. By artfully blending his understanding of Japanese art and culture with that of Western architecture, he has attained in his profession a philosophy of humanism which seeks to elevate the dignity of man in his environment—a philosophy dedicated to and consistent with the highest ideals of democracy.

"His contributions to American and world architecture are impressive and enduring. They serve to highlight the distinguished contributions of Japanese Americans to the contemporary American scene. The personal recognition and prestige accorded this eminent American has brought immeasurable honor to all Americans of Japanese ancestry.

"The Japanese American Citizens League is proud to bestow its highest honor upon Minoru Yamasaki—Nisei of the Biennium, 1960–62."

Yamasaki was also presented with the Japanese American Citizens' League gold medallion with the inscription engraved, "Nisei of the Biennium, 1960–62, Minoru Yamasaki."

OTHER FINALISTS

Yamasaki was declared winner from five finalists submitted to a panel of distinguished judges who met June 26 in Chicago, Ill. The nucleus National Recognitions Committee in Chicago, chaired by Shigeo Wakamatsu narrowed the field to 5 finalists from 13 candidates nominated by individuals, local Japanese American Citizens' League chapters, or Japanese American Citizens' League district councils.

The four receiving silver Japanese-American Citizens' League medallions were Thomas Kitayama, businessmen and mayor of Union City, Calif.; Dr. Kiyo Tomiyasu, scientist and senior electronics engineer with General Electric of New York City; Caesar Uyesaka, businessman, civic leader, and sportsman of Santa Barbara, Calif.; and John Yoshino, expert in the field of human relations and Deputy Director, Field Services of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity of Washington, D.C.

The Nisei of the Biennium award is one of the very highest honors that Japanese Americans can bestow upon a fellow Nisei. Nominees are nominated in one or both of two categories: (a) Distinguished community leadership—based upon signal success and meritorious accomplishment which have help to advance the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry and which has brought about a greater acceptance of the Japanese Americans into the American way of life, and (b) distinguished achievement—based upon signal success and outstanding achievement in special fields of endeavor where such accomplishments have been nationally recognized and thus have contributed to the status and prestige of Nisei in America.

Min Yamasaki was nominated by the Detroit chapter, Japanese American Citizens' League in the distinguished achievement category. Yama to Tinky, as he is known to his friends, is a native of Seattle, and received his degree in architecture from the University of Washington. He was a designer for some of the country's leading architectural concerns from 1935 to 1949 when he commenced his own practice in Detroit.

His honors and awards number more than a score for architectural designs of edifices located here and abroad. They include, among the many, the following received 1960 to date:

Honorable mention in architecture, Gold Medal Exhibition, Architectural League of New York, for McGregor Memorial Community Conference Center, Wayne State University in Detroit.

Certificate of Fellowship, American Institute of Architects.

Honorary degree, doctor of humanities, Wayne State University.

Alumni's Summa Laude Dignatus Award, University of Washington.

Fellow, Fine Arts and Literature, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Boston, Mass.

A.I.A. First Honor Award, Reynolds Metals Regional Building, Southfield, Mich.

Honorary degree, doctor of architecture, University of Michigan.

Honorary degree, doctor of fine arts, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.

In addition, his written works have been published in leading architectural publications. He has also broadcast over Voice of America on the topic "A Humanist Architecture for America and Its Relation to the Traditional Architecture of Japan." This Nisei has been the subject of over 130 articles appearing in nationally and internationally distributed periodicals and earlier this year was the subject of dissertation by nationally syndicated radio commentator, Lowell Thomas, in relation to the Yamasaki-designed Science Pavilion at the current Seattle World's Fair.

It was befitting that Min Yamasaki received the highest accolade of his fellow Nisei at the scene of his latest triumph, and in the city where he grew up and studied to eventually become a world renown contemporary architectural designer.

[From the Pacific Citizen, Aug. 10, 1962]

Citations: Nisei of the Biennium 1960–62

Only citation presented at the recognition banquet was the beautifully illuminated scroll to Minoru Yamasaki, the 1960–62 Nisei of the Biennium and Japanese American Citizens League gold medallion awardee. The citations of the four silver medallion winners were read to the audience and are being published in this week's Pacific Citizen.

MINORU YAMASAKI, DETROIT, MICH.

Minoru Yamasaki has gained for the profession of architecture, not only in this country but throughout the world, a new distinction filled with beauty and serenity. By artfully blending his understanding of Japanese art and culture with that of Western architecture, he has attained in his profession a philosophy of humanism which seeks to elevate the dignity of man in his environment—a philosophy dedicated to and consistent with the highest ideal of democracy.

His contributions to American and world architecture are impressive and enduring. They serve to highlight the distinguished contributions of Japanese Americans to the contemporary American scene. The personal recognition and prestige accorded this eminent American has brought immeasurable honor to all Americans of Japanese ancestry.

The Japanese American Citizens League is proud to bestow its highest honor upon Minoru Yamasaki—Nisei of the Biennium 1960–62.

MAYOR TOM KITAYAMA, UNION CITY, CALIF.

Tom Kitayama epitomizes the American who, successful in his own business, has been moved by a deep social consciousness to turn his talents and energies to public affairs. Twelve years ago, when the Kitayama Brothers Nursery was started, the first week's gross income went to pay the lone hired man's wages. Today that hired man is foreman of a staff of more than 130 employees, the Kitayama Nursery is the largest producer of carnations in the United States, and Kitayama himself is a leader in the California floral industry.

In 1959, when Union City was first incorporated, Kitayama ran for city council and was named mayor by virtue of receiving the greatest number of votes. He was reelected mayor in 1962 on his record of good government and far-sighted planning for a thriving, fast-growing community composed of persons of many diverse backgrounds.

Over and above his professional and political success, Kitayama is a man of impressive personal warmth and understanding. Residents of his community look to him as friend and counsellor. Many come to him with business, personal and organizational problems. He has taken a leading role in civic groups and campaigns too numerous to list here. "He is," as one of his friends remarked, "not only a credit to the Nisei but to the whole human race."

Kitayama, 38 years old, was born in Port Blakely, Bainbridge Island, Wash. He and his wife, Heidi, are the parents of five children. Kitayama was nominated by the Eden Township Japanese American Citizens League Chapter, of which is a member and former officer.

DR. KIYO TOMIYASU, SCHENECTADY, N.Y.

Among those holding high the torch in mankind's exploration of the bewildering new frontiers of science is Kiyo Tomiyasu, our second silver medallion winner. Tomiyasu is an internationally recognized authority in the field of radio microwave, and probably the world's foremost expert on lasers, a newly developed scientific device which is expected to have a key role in space communication. In the pursuit of knowledge, Dr. Tomiyasu has authored more than 20 papers published in professional journals, and has had 12 patents issued for his original discoveries.

Dr. Tomiyasu studied at the California Institute of Technology and Columbia University, and received his doctorate from Harvard in 1948. He joined the staff of the Sperry Gyroscope Co. in 1949 and was promoted to engineering section head for microwave research in 1952. After being named consulting engineer at the General Electric Microwave Laboratory in 1955, he transferred in 1960 to General Electric Co. where today he is technical director of the laser laboratory.

In the race to unlock the secrets of the physical world, a race on which the survival of our civilization may well depend, this Nisei has contributed new knowledge and offered new concepts in scientific fields of immense significance.

Dr. Tomiyasu, born in Las Vegas, Nev., 42 years ago, was nominated by the New York City chapter.

CAESAR UYESAKA, SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

In a time when we face the dilemma of what to do with increasing leisure, Caesar Uyesaka has provided Santa Barbara with concrete answers as to how that leisure may be most profitably employed by persons of all ages. A partial list of his activities in this field may serve to measure this man's impact on his community:

Commissioner of city recreation; Boy Scout commissioner; vice president of the Basketball Booster Club, University of California at Santa Barbara, a club he organized; membership drive worker for the Community Chest, Red Cross, Boy's Club, a Child's Estate; chairman in 1959 of the YMCA building fund; coach of junior baseball teams for the Lions Club and Shrine.

Earlier this year Uyesaka brought professional baseball to Santa Barbara. He set up a nonprofit corporation to operate the Santa Barbara Rancheros, a farm team of the New York Mets, and was elected its president. All the corporation's earnings are to go to the Youth Foundation.

Uyesaka, who operates an automobile supply firm, in 1961 was chosen Santa Barbara's "Father of the Year" for service and devotion to the community's youth. "The people whose lives have been touched and helped by this man are manifold," his citation read.

Uyesaka, 46 years old, was born in Carpinteria, Calif. He and his wife have three children—Robert, Paul, and Linda—each of whom is also a leader. The nomination was made by the Santa Barbara chapter.

JOHN YOSHINO, WASHINGTON, D.C.

No internal problem of American democracy is more explosive, more critical, more challenging, than the problem of race relations. John Yoshino, because of his particular skills and background, was loaned by his agency to a special White House task force with the difficult mission of eliminating discrimination in places of public accommodation along Route 40 between Washington and New York City. Yoshino's work resulted in desegregation in a number of establishments and in helping to bring legislative action in the State of Maryland, to alleviate a problem with important international implications.

In his regular position with the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, Yoshino has been instrumental in developing job opportunities without regard to race, creed or color in many State and local situations.

Yoshino, now 52, received a bachelor's degree in labor relations at Roosevelt College of Chicago, and a master's degree in public administration at Loyola of Chicago in 1953. He is a native of Alameda, Calif., and has served as Japanese American Citizens League chapter officer in Alameda, Chicago, and Washington. Presently he is chairman of the Eastern District Council and represented the Japanese American Citizens League at the White House Conference on Youth, and the White House Conference on Aging. He was nominated for Nisei of the Biennium by the Washington, D.C., chapter.

The Hanna Co.'s Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN R. DURNO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Speaker, the nickel mountain near Riddle, Oreg., is within my congressional district. So much has been said about the Hanna Co.'s operation, much of which is distorted or untrue that I feel the Representative from that district should include within the Congressional Record facts that he knows to be pertinent to the operation.

I think that this can best be done by the publishing of two editorials by Mr. Charles V. Stanton, of the News-Review in Roseburg, Oreg. I include the editorials of August 17 and 18, 1962, in the Record:

[From the News-Review, Roseburg, Oreg., Aug. 17, 1962]

Profitable Racket

(By Charles V. Stanton)

It has been my extreme pleasure and good fortune to know George Humphrey. Humphyer was Secretary of the Treasury in the Eisenhower Cabinet. Earlier he was president of the M. A. Hanna Co. In that capacity he helped negotiate the plan which resulted in opening the nickel operation near Riddle. Now he's being mauled at a congressional investigation.

I have the highest regard for Humphrey's integrity and honesty. Perhaps my personal liking for the man influences my opinions of the investigation. But I feel Humphrey is getting a dirty deal. Whatever his defense may be, I'm quite confident it will not receive nearly the sensational treatment now being given the statements against him.

Congress, it seems to me, has stretched to extreme thinness its authority to make investigations. Such authority supposedly is only for the purpose of determining if new laws are needed. But the investigative procedure has been used to spread propaganda, expound political theory, blacken characters, lower prestige, destroy influences, and to mislead the public.

Time and again congressional committees have sensationally developed one side of an issue, then postponed or bidden the other side to limit press reports. The public forms an erroneous opinion.

For example, we're currently reading that Humphrey received large sums of money from his stock dividends while serving as Secretary of the Treasury. It is mentioned time and again that he served under Eisenhower. The public thus is led to believe that Eisenhower was responsible for the Hanna affair, and that something wrong was involved.

NAME BLACKENED

Actually the negotiations with the M. A. Hanna Co. occurred long before Eisenhower was elected or before Humphrey was asked by Eisenhower to serve on the Cabinet. The agreement was made during Truman's time in office, although it did not reach the signature stage until later.

But the U.S. Government was in dire need of strategic metals. It particularly needed nickel. It has been known for a half century or more that Nickel Mountain, near Riddle, contained a great deal of nickel ore. But it was low grade ore. Attempts to mine it had been financial failures. No major company would tackle it.

At the request of the Government several concerns looked into the possibility. Hanna finally undertook the project.

The agreement provided that Hanna, at its own expense, would buy the private holdings and would, at its own expense, install and operate mining equipment. It also would lease and operate a smelter to be built with a loan from the Federal Government. The loan, in turn, was to be repaid by the delivery of a fixed amount of metal at an established price over a certain period of years. Delivery of this amount of metal, it was calculated, would pay off the loan, whereupon Hanna could buy the smelter at its depreciated value.

This whole transaction was negotiated while Truman was President, not Eisenhower. But that isn't the impression the uninformed public gets.

Instead, the testimony being developed at the hearing apparently is designed to smear and blacken Humphrey's good name and reputation.

A FEW QUESTIONS

But let's assume, for sake of argument, that Humphrey did have an income of several millions of dollars while he served as Secretary of the Treasury.

What's wrong with that? Humphrey was a multimillionaire before he was picked for Ike's Cabinet. Ike picked him because he was a hard-headed, efficient businessman (not a college professor) who knew how to make and handle money. Did he make any more money because of his Cabinet position than he did before entering the Government? He quit a very lucrative job to answer the President's appeal.

Didn't the Hanna subsidiaries, in operating the Riddle project, conform to every letter in the contract with the Government? The company, as I understand it, built the smelter for far less money than the Government offered to loan; produced every pound of nickel the Government sought in the contract and charged the price agreed upon, even though the open market price was much higher; completed the contract a year before the specified time, and bought the property under the terms originally stipulated.

Then there's another interesting question.

Who made the profit? If Humphrey made the millions the investigators report (and, for the sake of argument, we'll say the amount is correct) who got the money? The Government's graduated rates on income taxes would put Humphrey in the 90 percent bracket. The Federal Government, then, would have taken 90 percent of what Humphrey received and Humphrey would have been able to keep only 10 percent.

If that's graft, as some of our congressional investigators apparently would have us believe, it seems to me it's a mighty profitable racket for the Federal Government.

[From the News-Review, Roseburg, Oreg., Aug. 18, 1962]

Is Profit Evil?

(By Charles V. Stanton)

Press reports concerning the congressional inquiry into the affairs of the M. A. Hanna Co., its satellites operating the nickel smelting plant at Riddle, and the personal affairs of George Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury under President Eisenhower, cause a person to ask several questions.

As nearly as I can interpret the attitude of the Government investigator testifying before the congressional committee, the fact that the Hanna subsidiaries made a profit was evil. Furthermore it appears to be the investigator's contention that Humphrey had no moral right to any income from his vast wealth and his far-flung investments and business operations while serving the U.S. Government as a member of the Cabinet.

That, it seems to me, is an interesting angle. It seems to fit closely into theories being presed upon the American people by Socialist propagandists.

Oregon's senior Senator has won headlines for himself, while a candidate for office, by a filibuster that finally caused disgusted Senators to take an action they hadn't taken for 35 years—action to limit debate. His theme was that private industry should not be permitted to make a profit through utilization of knowledge and experience gained at public expense.

A GAMBLER'S PROFIT

Is it wrong for private industry to make a profit? Private industry for many, many years has been gambling. A man invests risk capital with the expectation that he will recover his investment through a substantial profit. Is that evil?

Our Federal Government has a policy of taxing away any excess profits. It limits through taxes a man's opportunity to make a killing if he takes a long gamble. Is it good economic policy to destroy the incentive to profit from a long shot?

That, it seems to me, is the principle question involved in the Riddle nickel production case, as I read the press releases.

The largest deposit of nickel ore in the continental United States is at Nickel Mountain, here in Douglas County. Following the Second World War the U.S. Government was desperate for strategic minerals. It learned in that war it was vitally dependent upon certain metals. It had to slow down some items of production because it didn't have metals available in this country and had to import. The loss of China and Malaya, for example, cutting off imports of tin, seriously hurt this country's production.

One of the critical metals was nickel. All nickel came from imports and thus was subject to blockade. Consequently, there was an anxiety to stockpile nickel.

The only deposit of possible size was at Riddle in Douglas County. The Government asked several companies to investigate and help out if possible.

The idea was rejected by all except Hanna. The Hanna Co. for many years has been one of the country's leading producers of coal and iron. It previously hadn't deviated from the mining of those minerals.

NEW PROCESS PERFECTED

But, at the request of the Government it decided to take a gamble on nickel.

And it was a gamble. The company could have lost many millions. What would have been the Government's position had the project been a loss rather than showing a profit?

French scientists had invented a new process, but it was unproven. Hanna bought the patent rights for this country, experimented with a completely new form of production, did some changing of formula, and came up with a profitable operation on a low-grade ore other outfits had rejected.

The Federal Government, in its anxiety to stockpile nickel, aided in the experiment. It reached an agreement. The Hanna Co., I am informed, furnished every pound of nickel specified in the contract, repaid every cent of the money borrowed, and met every stipulation.

Accepting at face value the statement that the operation resulted in a profit, is it evil that the gamble on an unproven process and a rejected pile of low-grade ore paid off? Is it evil that because of the company's experience and mining knowledge it was able to supply the government's needs and, at the same time, profit while so doing? Is there any evidence that George Humphrey used his position as a member of the Cabinet to in any way further his personal fortune? Should the Federal Government, after making a contract, renege because the contracting private agent might make a profit? And, is Humphrey being given any credit because the operation has provided employment for from 400 to 500 people for the past 8 years, adding millions to the payroll income of the county, and that the county is some $16 million richer in assessed valuation, thus spreading the tax load, because of the Hanna success? Or is that evil, too?

Report on Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an informative article on Brazil by Dr. Robert Morris, former president of the University of Dallas of Texas, was published in the August 18, 1962, issue of the Tablet, the well-known weekly newspaper of Brooklyn, N.Y.

The article follows:

REPORT ON BRAZIL

(By Robert Morris)

Brazil dominates South America much in the same way that the United States dominates North America. Its area, 3,288,000 square miles, is greater than this country's without Alaska. It has a population of about 70 million and it borders Venezuela, Dutch and French Guiana, the fledging Soviet satellite British Guiana, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, Peru, Colombia, and Argentina.

Its coastline on the Atlantic Ocean extends for 4,889 miles. The principal river of South America, the Amazon, is navigable for 1,700 miles as it courses through this strategic country. Its mineral wealth is enormous, its natural resources are great indeed.

PRIME SOVIET TARGET

Brazil is the most strategic country in South America. It is a prime Soviet target and its fall would leave the vital South American Continent dominated by our mortal enemy, world communism.

During the past few weeks I have been visited by missionaries of all denominations from Brazil who have an urgent note to their appeals. They stridently and graphically tell of great Communist gains in this rich country and a completely inadequate response on the part of our Government to the looming threat.

The Communists in Brazil, although technically outlawed, are a powerful force. They have strongly infiltrated the labor unions, the press, the peasant leagues, and the intellectual life of the country. They are now mounting a powerful offensive.

LEFTIST PRESIDENT

They have achieved a major breakthrough with the assumption of Presidential powers by Joao Goulart, "Jango" as he is affectionately called by his friends.

When the upheaval that shook Janio Quadros from power took place last September, Goulart, his Vice President, was in Red China with Mao Tse-tung. When Goulart tried to assume the Presidency he met the solid opposition of Carlos Lacerdo, the strong anti-Communist Brazilian Governor, and other sturdy defends of Brazilian freedom.

But Jango's brother-in-law, Leonel Brizola, Governor of the State of Rio Grande do Sul, moved quickly and engineered Goulart's assumption of the Presidency. Their success was not complete however, and the opposition managed to effect a compromise whereby Goulart's powers were shared by strong congressional influences. Goulart's open friendship for Soviet powers had strong opposition and this opposition curtailed his power considerably.

Jango did surround himself—as did Fidel Castro in his ascent to power—with strong Communist assistants. But as long as his congressional opposition curtailed his power, he could not make his move.

When Goulart's Prime Minister, Tancredo Neves, resigned last month to become a candidate for the Congress, events moved quickly. Neves had been installed to block Jango's power and his resignation sparked the Communists to action.

The powerful Soviet apparatus called a general strike. Communist-incited mobs looted shops and generally rampaged outrageously. They showed their fangs and their power. They wanted Goulart to have a free hand.

Lacerda, the Governor of the State of Guanabara, which includes the city of Rio de Janeiro, stated, "Communists trained in Czechoslovakia and in Cuba have been preparing to subvert public order * * * the disorders have been deliberately organized by Communists."

But the Communist show of force succeeded. On July 10 a terrorized Brazilian Congress elected Goulart's handpicked Prime Minister Brochado Da Rocha, an intimate friend of Goulart's brother-in-law, Brizola, who has achieved fame as the great confiscator.

Goulart now is freed of his restraining forces. He is tightening his control over strategic Brazil. His appointments are Soviet oriented. He is now beginning to muzzle anti-Communists, including Lacerda.

SERIOUS DANGER

Brazil is now in serious danger of being dragged from neutrality to the Soviet orbit. The months ahead are critical.

When I asked my missionary friends what our State Department people there are doing about this obvious threat, they said, "The wrong thing, of course. They give the appearance of helping Goulart in every way."

And as Brazil goes the way of Cuba and British Guiana, our planners keep insisting that communism is a declining force.

Simplified Government?—Wanted: "Yes" Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of August 27, 1962:

SIMPLIFIED GOVERNMENT?—WANTED: "YES" CONGRESSMEN

President Kennedy wants you to send him the Congressmen of his choice. The chief qualification for Presidential favor will be a willingness to vote "yes" upon request. This would simplify government and presumably restore the legislative leadership of a President who has found himself frustrated and humiliated.

A great deal has been made of the President's impulsive and angry remark, after the defeat of his medicare plan, of bringing about the election of friendly Congressmen, in that the coup de grace was delivered by deserting members of his own party. Is he going to purge his party?

To a liberal, party lines mean very little; a party is merely an instrument to be seized and operated on behalf of the ideological crusade. What the liberal wants in Congress is not a Democrat, as such, but a liberal, preferably a Democrat. It's the issue that counts.

Mr. Kennedy is a pragmatic liberal and while he probably will not openly seek to bring about the defeat of regular Democrats, he will enter the lists in an effort to recast the Congress in his own mold. He proceeds on the assumption that only the President can represent the national will, because he is elected by the people as a whole, on the larger issues, and in this, he and the other liberals have openly stated that an undeclared civil war between rural and urban voters now is underway.

The seat of the President's power lies within the big cities.

After the defeat of his plan for a new Department of Urban Affairs, Mr. Kennedy implied that 250 Members of Congress were indifferent to the problems of the cities.

Presumably these 250 Congressmen would have to go.

This argument, of course, is a twisted one, but one which liberals cherish and hold close to their political hearts. The truth is that while the President was elected by about 34 million votes, half of the 68 million votes cast in the presidential race, the men and women in the House of Representatives received a total of almost 41 million votes out of 64 million cast.

Ninety million Americans, almost half the population, live on farms or in towns with fewer than 25,000 inhabitants. This segment of the population has been dwindling, of course, and contrary to what Mr. Kennedy and the liberals like to believe, it has not shared in the general prosperity of the people of the large cities.

Most of the programs advocated by the liberals have the purpose of benefiting and concentrating large voting blocs in the cities, and forwarding a new order of socialism. To accomplish this Mr. Kennedy does not want Congressmen who represent their constituents but who represent his wishes. It seems strange that after the centuries the liberals fought to place political power within a parliament, they now seek to take it away.

Peace Officers Memorial Day and Police Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of legislation designed to authorize the President to proclaim May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week of each year during which such May 15 occurs as Police Week, I desire to insert in the RECORD "The Story Behind National Police Week."

The law enforcement associations throughout the Nation have been doing an outstanding job and directing activities designed to honor law enforcement officials for doing so much for the safety of life and property in our country.

Since the Committee on the Judiciary has favorably reported out House Joint Resolution 730 to accomplish the above purpose, I think it is appropriate that the story behind National Police Week be told:

THE STORY BEHIND NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The National Conference of Police Associations was formed in 1953 when 14 municipal and State police associatons representing all sections of the country gathered in Detroit and brought into existence this national organization of law enforcement officers. One of the main purposes of this national conference was to promote and stimulate the development of the police services of our Nation toward a truly professional status.

Early in the history of the National Conference of Police Associations, the idea and plan began to take shape for a National Police Week as an annual celebration to promote better understanding and cooperation between the public and the police. The first recorded discussion in the minutes of the National Conference of Police Associations is found during the 1955 annual conference in New York City. At that time, although the National Conference of Police Associations had grown rapidly in its 2 years of existence, the majority of the delegates felt that the organization was not large enough to handle a project of such magnitude and make it the nationwide event it should be.

By 1959 the National Conference of Police Associations had grown into the largest organization of police officers in the Nation and the public relations and planning committees were directed to begin definite work toward the creation of a National Police Week. The legislative representatives were directed to prepare a program and campaign but to await further orders before actually starting to work. The majority of the delegates felt that although the national conference by this time had almost 50 member associations, representing 187,000 police officers, it would be difficult to persuade the Congress of the United States to establish such a week, and difficult to be assured of the complete success in promoting the week on a truly national basis without the support and cooperation of the police chiefs of the country. It was therefore decided that although the tremendous task of planning for a National Police Week should get underway, efforts should be made to interest the International Association of Chiefs of Police in this project before any concerted action was taken in the legislative field. Accordingly, representatives of the National Conference of Police Associations were sent to the annual convention of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. When they reported that they were unable to arouse much interest in the proposal the legislative efforts of the national conference were shelved for that year.

In 1960 the annual conference of the national conference was held in Des Moines, Iowa. Its membership had been swelled by several more police associations and the total of police officers represented passed the 200,000 mark. Although many of the delegates still felt that assured cooperation and support by the International Association of Chiefs of Police was necessary to insure both success in the legislative efforts and in the actual promotion of the week, the majority of the representatives felt that should such support and cooperation not be forthcoming the national conference could and should go ahead on its own initiative. Accordingly, it was so decided and all plans were placed in high gear.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police's Convention was held later that year in Washington, D.C. Strong representation was made to its members by the National Conference of Police Associations of the need and value of a National Police Week, but despite the enthusiastic support of the president-elect, Chief Robert V. Murray, of Washington, D.C., the executive committee of the Chief's Association failed to approve a motion to endorse and support the proposal. Chief Murray, however, assured the national conference representatives that during his coming year as head of the I.A.C.P. he would do all in his power to convince his brother police chiefs of the importance of the national conference Police Week project.

Meanwhile the N.C.P.A. was going ahead with its plans and its legislative representatives were very busy on Capitol Hill. One of the most gratifying and rewarding aspects of this work was the warm and sincere interest our legislators have in any proposal which will benefit the police services and the policemen and women of our Nation. More than 50 Representatives and Senators offered to introduce legislation leading to the creation of a National Police Week but after the first is placed in the hopper, additional bills serve only to express the interest and approval of the legislator which can be demonstrated on the floor when the original bill is called up.

The Representatives who did introduce bills during the first session of the Congress in 1961 were: The Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; the Honorable WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York; the Honorable JEFFERY P. COHELAN, of California; the Honorable GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska; and the Honorable JOHN DOWDY, of Texas. In the Senate, the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, introduced a similar resolution.

When the legislative representatives of the national conference called on the Senate Judiciary Committee to ask its support, they were informed that Senator J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland, had also introduced a bill at the request of the Federation of Police, another prominent national police organization, designating May 15, 1961, as Peace Officers Memorial Day. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate requested that the NCPA, sponsoring a National Police Week, and the FOP, sponsoring a Peace Officers Memorial Day, arrange a conference to determine if these two organizations could agree upon a combined resolution which would include both their proposals. The Judiciary Committee was of the opinion that if such a combined resolution were possible and both organizations supported it, that it would stand a much better chance of passage through the Congress. The legislative representatives of these two police organizations met and agreed that they would work together for the passage of a joint resolution designating May 15th as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that day was included as National Police Week.

The Members of Congress who had introduced the original Police Week legislation were again contacted and asked to introduce substitute bills combining the NCPA and FOP proposals. At this time, in addition to the gentlemen already mentioned, two other Representatives introduced combined Police Week and Memorial Day Resolutions—the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, and the Honorable JOEL T. BROYHILL, of Virginia. Although no actual difficulty was encountered during all these procedures, it was time consuming and it soon became apparent, in spite of all the preliminary planning done by the National Conference of Police Associations, that there was insufficient time left to properly prepare for a Police Week in the month of May 1961. The NCPA thereupon requested that the date of the first week be changed from May of 1961 to May of 1962.

On April 27, 1961, Senate Joint Resolution 65 was reported out favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee and this resolution passed the Senate on May 1, 1961. On May 22, 1961, the House Judiciary Committee approved Senate Joint Resolution 65 in a slightly amended form, and on June 5, 1961, the House passed the resolution, as amended. On June 12, 1961, the Senate agreed to the House amendments and the resolution was sent to the White House. On June 21, 1961, President Kennedy signed Senate Joint Resolution 65 into law—Public Law 87–54. The pen used in signing this act was given to the National Conference of Police Associations and at the annual conference of the NCPA in Buffalo, N.Y., the following month, the legislative committee of the NCPA, presented it to their president, James J. Vigilante.

In October of 1961, the International Association of Chiefs of Police held their annual meeting in Montreal, Canada. At this time a resolution to support the officially established National Police Week was enthusiastically adopted. Since the Buffalo Annual Conference of the NCPA in July of 1961 had no definite assurance of support and cooperation from the IACP, the plans discussed there included only those cities and States represented by the NCPA, and the cooperation which had been pledged by the

FOP in the communities represented by that organization. The endorsement by and the pledge of assistance from the IACP was extremely gratifying, even though belated in nature. At the next meeting of the Board of Directors of the NCPA, in Los Angeles, Calif., in December of 1961, where final plans were approved for the celebration of Police Week, it was voted to send to all Police Chiefs of the United States, represented by the IACP, complete sets of the plans, suggested programs, advice and recommendations devised by the NCPA during its many months of planning. Brochures containing this information were also sent to many other police chiefs and to police associations not affiliated with the NCPA.

On April 10, 1962, President Kennedy implemented Public Law 87–54 by issuing a proclamation that May 13–19, 1962, be designated as National Police Week, and that May 14, 1962, be designated as Peace Officers Memorial Day. It will be noted that although the original intent was to have May 15, 1962, designated as Peace Officers Memorial Day, during the House-added amendments, which were approved by the Senate, this date was inadvertently changed to the 14th. Although this change was noted before the Senate acted upon the House amendments, the legislative represenatives of the NCPA and the FOP decided that it was not important enough to seek to have it changed during the hectic rush of business in the closing hours of that session of the Congress. The May 15 date will, however, be requested in legislation to be sought for future Police Weeks and Peace Officers Memorial Days, because it coincides with the date set for Peace Officers Memorial Day by several State legislatures.

The National Conference of Police Associations is extremely grateful to the Congress and to the President of the United States for the creation of National Police Week and Peace Officers Memorial Day. The NCPA wishes to express its thanks to all the individuals and organizations, both civic and police, who helped make this first National Police Week a wonderful success. One of the most gratifying aspects of the recent Police Week was the fact that this dream of the national conference has been made a reality, not only by the cities and States affiliated with the NCPA, but by many other communities. The national conference never wished nor desired that Police Week be celebrated only by members of the national conference. The NCPA made every effort to make Police Week truly a national event from coast to coast and from border to border. It is proud and happy that it succeeded to a degree that exceeded its fondest expectations. Although reports are not complete it seems that between 25 and 30 million citizens enjoyed and profited from the exhibits, programs, and events in the various cities. In one city of 600,000 more than 100,000 people visited the displays, attended the open house at all precincts, and the special programs showing actual police work. This is not a police estimate but the opinion of a local newspaper which was skeptical of the interest our citizens would evince in such a project.

The National Conference of Police Associations believes that the outstanding success of this first National Police Week demonstrates that this event should be a regular national celebration. It pledges itself to work to make this possible and in all other ways to strive to promote and encourage increased understanding and cooperation between the police of our Nation and the citizens they serve.

What About the Monroe Doctrine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, "What About the Monroe Doctrine?" is the title of an editorial in the August 26, 1962, Los Angeles Times commenting on the reports of recent landings of Soviet personnel and cargoes in Cuba.

I certainly am in full accord with the concern expressed by the Times with regard to this latest brazen and aggressive Red move.

In discussing the establishment and purpose of the Monroe Doctrine and the policy of the United States on various more recent occasions in taking firm, immediate steps to counteract Communist bluffs and threats, the Times commented on the administration's inaction on this matter by observing that Mr. Kennedy is inviting some obvious comparisons. In my view it is a very appropriate comment.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the Los Angeles Times editorial for inclusion in the Record.

What About the Monroe Doctrine?

In any other age the massive landings of Soviet personnel and cargoes in Cuba would have been viewed as a clear ,violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

This is a crisis as serious as that of Berlin. Some 5,000 to 7,000 personnel, plus large secret cargoes, some of them purely military, have been landed within 90 miles of Florida. There has been no more flagrant violation of the Monroe Doctrine since it was enunciated 123 years ago.

President Monroe set forth that any attempt by a European nation to establish a foothold in any country in this hemisphere not already colonized would be viewed by the United States as an act of aggression dangerous to our peace and safety.

The Russian operations fit the specifications.

Mr. Kennedy touched on the landings at his press conference. He said "we are examining" the implications of this Red move.

The President can be sure that the watching world is also "examining" American reaction to this bold Russian thrust into this hemisphere.

In the absence of positive action, chancelleries from Bonn to Tokyo could conclude that Russia has bluffed the United States; that we have lost the will to resist, even when our closest interests are threatened.

We are not handcuffed by any agreement with Latin America. The Organization of American States has concurred in the Monroe Doctrine as hemispheric policy. Moreover, Mr. Kennedy himself specifically reserved the U.S. right to take necessary unilateral action to enforce the doctrine.

Recent events justify a conclusion that Russia once again is probing the United States for weakness, testing our will.

We have indicated a willingness to go more than halfway to reach an accord with Russia on the nuclear test ban. Our Berlin policy has been conciliatory in extreme—we have been forbearing almost beyond patience lest we spoil "negotiations."

Khrushchev may have theorized from this that the United States is a reluctant dragon, whose whiskers can be plucked without reprisal. This could explain the present Berlin move and the expected new landing of convoys in Cuba. (Another 15 Soviet ships are nearing Cuban ports.)

Former President Harry Truman did not "examine" the situation overlong when Russia flouted our prestige and interests in Korea. He moved. Asia is not all Red today because he did move when the Kremlin tested our will.

John Foster Dulles likewise took fast and effective action whenever the Russians pushed too hard, and it was Khrushchev who gave ground. Witness his withdrawal of his "ultimatum" on Berlin 5 years ago.

Mr. Kennedy is inviting some obvious comparisons.

Trade Expansion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 13, 1962:

Off the Record

Suspicion grows: The administration's trade expansion bill, which President Kennedy calls the "most important piece of legislation before the country this year," has already been passed by the House and will shortly come up for consideration by the Senate. It is in trouble for a variety of reasons.

It represents the greatest delegation of congressional power over foreign commerce and trade ever requested by an administration. And this request comes at a time when the textile industry is discovering that agreements reached in Geneva for the control of imports of cotton goods are not what they seem.

Politically, the situation is dangerous for the trade expansion bill. President Kennedy needs the support of the Senators from the textile States if the bill is to squeeze by. In fact, some of the foot-dragging by the Tariff Commission and the Office of Emergency Planning on industry requests for relief have been attributed to the desire of the administration to put pressure on these Senators.

It has not worked out that way. On August 2 Senator Prescott Bush, of Connecticut, acting for himself and seven other Senators, offered 37 amendments to the trade expansion bill which he said were needed as guidelines and safeguards to protect domestic industries and employees in the event the bill was passed.

"The present administration's proposal to abandon the no-injury policy should be decisively rejected by the Senate," he said.

Senator Bush was followed the next day on the floor of the Senate by Senator Strom Thurmond who outlined the cotton textile agreements negotiated in Geneva in 1961 and 1962 by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball and pointed out that these agreements were not working out as Congress had been led to believe.

His implication was plain. If the administration could not be relied on to protect the cotton textile industry in its worldwide trade negotiations, Congress should not surrender control of future international trade negotiations as requested under the trade expansion bill.

Senator THURMOND noted that the short-term cotton textile agreement reached in Geneva, July 17, 1961, authorized this country to limit imports to the level of the 12 months ending June 30, 1961. The agreement expires September 30 of this year. The folowing day, October 1, the so-called long-term agreement becomes effective, if and when ratified by the 19 nations attending the Geneva conference.

Although the textile industry, Congress and, apparently President Kennedy, were led to believe that the long-term agreement preserved the same level of imports outlined in the short-term agreement, Senator THURMOND pointed out that was not true.

The level established in the long-term agreement is that a 12-month period terminating 3 months prior to the date of a protest and a request for consultation by the United States. In other words, if this country protested excessive shipments of cotton textiles from an offshore nation on the date the agreement becomes effective—October 1—the base period for figuring allowable imports would not be the 12 months ending June 30, 1961, but the 12 months ending June 30, 1962.

This is the gimmick in the long-term Geneva agreement which has upset the applecart. Realizing that a new base for calculating levels of imports could be established in the first 6 months of the present quota year, foreign producers have flooded the United States with shipments of goods in every category.

"The rate of these excessive imports during the term of the short-term cotton textile agreement," said Senator THURMOND, "has already ranged from 10 to 1,000 percent above the prescribed level. In one or more cases, countries exporting to the United States have shipped cotton textiles into the United States although the country had no record of previous shipments of the commodity which would establish a base level during 1961."

It was this realization which raised a storm in the domestic cotton textile industry last week. What appeared on its face a sensible regulation of cotton imports, is now being viewed as a disastrous trap if the long-term Geneva agreement becomes effective.

"In view of the ineffectiveness of the negotiations to control cotton textile imports by international trade agreements," warned Senator THURMOND, "there is a serious question as to the extent to which Congress should, in the Trade Expansion Act, authorize the President, acting through the State Department, to negotiate international trade agreements governing imports into the United States without clearly established criteria, guidelines, and safeguards for American industry."

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Revolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BREMERTON CAPTIVE
NATIONS COUNCIL,
Bremerton, Wash., July 29, 1962.

Representative DANIEL FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We are pleased to inform you that we have been able to place a plank in the Kitsap County Republic platform, supporting your resolution No. 211 concerning the establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations.

Supporting information is being mailed to other county delegation heads.

We need a hundred or more copies of your bill, to be distributed at the State convention in Yakima the 11th of August. I don't believe we can place such a plank in the State platform unless we have available copies of the bill which we are asking them to support.

We thank you for any help you are able to render in this instance.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES K. MORGAN,
Chairman.

CONNECTICUT COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

Whereas the third week of July 1962, marks the third anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution, recognizing the right of self-determination to Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Byelo-Russia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossakia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have resulted in the creation of a vast empire, which poses a threat to the security of the United States and all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the spirit of resistance of the captive nations should be steadfastly kept; and

Whereas the United States follows Moscow in attacking Portugal for her colonial policy in Angola, but failing to point a finger at the greatest colonial empire, the U.S.S.R.; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Connecticut Committee for Freedom of Captive Nations urge all patriotic Americans to support the resolution (H.R. 211) calling for the establishment of a Special Committee for Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. If we grant and actively support the right of independence to the Negroid peoples, then we cannot refuse it to the non-Russian captive nations of the U.S.S.R. We must have all the captive nations on our side, if we intend to fight the Communist threat successfully.

STEPHEN BOYCHUK,
Secretary.

Unanimously approved and accepted during the observance of the captive nations week which was held on July 20, 1962, at the Polish National Home, Hartford, Conn.

RED LION, PA.,
July 31, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I pledge my support in favor of the Captive Nations Committee and your proposed House Resolution 211. Several weeks ago I got a letter off to my Representative, GEORGE A. GOODLING, 19th Congressional District, of Pennsylvania, urging him to support you in the recognition of this committee.

I personally believe that House Resolution 211 would be a major step to thwart the Godless, Red butchers. I also believe it will be an aid in enlightening our people, citizens born in this country, of the Communists' atrocious activities in these captive nations while at the same time encouraging peace movements.

Perhaps if this committee would have been established earlier, we would have had a Nation, the United States of America, which would have been aware of the Communist moral code. Part of which states: "We shall use every ruse, dodge, trick, cunning, and unlawful method, concealment veiling of the truth. As long as capitalists and communism exist, we cannot live in peace. In the end a funeral dirge will be sung over one or the other. But until that takes place our principal role is to dodge and maneuver." Had we known of these tactics and methods perhaps we would have aided the nation that sent the following S O S:

"The civilized peoples of the world, listen and come to our aid.

"Not with declarations but with force, with soldiers, with arms. Do not forget there is no stopping the onslaught of Bolshevism. Your turn will also come, if we perish. Save our souls. Save our sols.

"Civilized peoples of the world, we implore you in the name of justice, freedom, and the binding principle of active solidarity to help us.

"Our ship is sinking, light is failing. The shadows grow darker every hour over the soil of Hungary.

"Listen to our cry, civilized peoples of the world, and act.

"Extend us your fraternal aid. S O S. S O S.

"May God be with you."

Needless to say we failed these people, their Nation, and ourselves. Yes, by failing to give them the help they requested, we failed ourselves. Did we not seek aid from France when we fought for our independence? Yes, we did. And had we not received French aid, we might not be a United States of America today.

We owe our aid to all the freedom seeking nations of the world, but not those that want to remain neutral: not those that want to remain under the Communist domain, such as, Red China, India, etc. However, we owe aid to countries such as, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuanians, etc. countries whose people desire to have their independence once again.

We should do all in our power to drive the Red monster from these nations, nations that we recognize as sovereign nations. What sovereignty do they have?

I did not mean for this letter to be so long, but God help us if we don't help these other freedom seeking nations.

Please send me several copies of H.R. 211, and several copies of Public Laws 86–90.

Yours for serving God first, then America,

GENE ENGLES.

RESOLUTION

Whereas in accordance with the congressional resolution designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week and the proclamation of President Kennedy proclaiming the week beginning July 15 as Captive Nations Week, the people of this country believe that the subjugation of any nation, state, or municapility under rule of dictatorship or tyranny is evil; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and agressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such people through appropriate means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Rochester representatives of the Ukrainian, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian ethnic groups assembled on July 15, 1962, at 292 Hudson Avenue, Rochester, N.Y., That the U.S. Government encourage the national independence movements of all subjugated people under the yoke of Russian imperialist communism; that the U.S. Government help these national independence movements behind the Iron Curtain in the direction of the text of the American Declaration of Independence: "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; that the establishment of a House of Representatives Committee on the Captive Nations be enacted; that the U.S. Government investigate Russian Communist imperialism and its genocidal policies in the non-Russian countries behind the Iron Curtain.

WILLIAM ANDRUSLIAN,
Ukrainian Representatie.
——— ———,
Hungarian Representative.
——— ———,
Lithuanian Representative.
——— ———,
Estonian Representative.
——— ———,
Latvian Representative.

Dated Rochester, N.Y., July 15, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am in complete support of your House Resolution 211. It is the best proposal today in the battle against colonial Moscow.

Sincerely yours,

KATERYNA LEXANDROWSKYS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1962.*

Ed Rogers at Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a well-deserved honor was bestowed upon Ed Rogers by the National County Attorneys Association. Mr. Rogers has well earned the first All-American County Attorney award. He has served Cass County well for 46 years. The editorial from the Cass County Independent is inserted at this point.

ED ROGERS AT PHILADELPHIA

What few people realized at the gathering of prosecuting attorneys in Philadelphia, on August 16, was when they were paying standing tribute to a great man, Ed Rogers, as most outstanding county attorney, they were also observing an individual whose lineage on this continent predates, by centuries, those who boast so heavy-handedly of their descendance from passengers on the *Mayflower*.

It was particularly fitting that his award should be made in Philadelphia, where the Constitution of the United States was formulated, which shaped a base for the Nation which now holds supremacy in the world.

Into the building of this Nation went an amalgam of all races. Each, in its particular way giving virility, strength and individuality to the blood strain which is now known as American. Among these are the Indian heritages. When the Constitution was signed, the wars were still frightful and uneasy over possession of a land which had been rightfully that of the Indians, and which was preempted by hordes of Europeans. Because of the battle at that time over ownership, awarding of such an honor as was received by County Attorney Ed Rogers, who is half Chippewa, would have been extremely unlikely.

But the event at Philadelphia showed by deed as nothing else could, the unity and success that have been arrived at in our vast mixture of nationalities, for the individual who puts forth the effort.

The following text of Mr. Roger's brief acceptance speech at this history making event speaks for itself of the wise simplicity and goodness of the man:

"I deeply appreciate this honor from the Association of which I have been a member for many more years than I had realized.

"Fifty years ago, when first elected to office, I had the ambition to be a judge. While mentioned several times, it has been my destiny for 46 years to be 'The Attorney for the State of Minnesota in Cass County.'

"In the 11 political contests I have survived, the charge was often made: 'Rogers is not a prosecutor.' This phrase, in my early days, irked, but, as I grew older, I learned to regard that charge as a compliment.

"I learned the hard way that the State, in these United States of America is interested in justice. I also learned that there are two sides to every question. A complaint is what the word indicates—'a complaint.' To be charged, does not mean that "the defendant is guilty.' I learned to investigate every case thoroughly, and to be satisfied of the guilt of the accused, before presenting the case for the State. If I believed the defendant innocent, I moved for dismissal.

"I learned that I occupy a public office, and that it is my duty to my employers, the public, to keep that office open, so the people, who have hired me, can consult me about their legal problems.

"In my many years of law practice, nothing gives me a greater thrill than to hear less and less emphasis placed on the term 'prosecuting attorney' and to hear more and more that better expression—'The Attorney for the State.'

"In America, the purpose of the law is orderly process. The State is and must always be interested, not in 'conviction,' but primarily in justice.

"I like to think that this honor today comes to me because of nearly a half-century of devotion to the principle of 'fairplay' in the office of 'Attorney for the State.'"

Cass County takes great pride in the national recognition being given the man who has served its people so admirably and loyally for close to half a century as county attorney.

Welcome to the Patriarch of Antioch and All the Orient of the Maronite Rite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, today I was honored and privileged to attend a luncheon with His Beatitude Paul Boutros Meouchi, Patriarch of Antioch and All the Orient of the Maronite Rite. I am proud the district which I represent in the Congress numbers among its outstanding citizens many who are of Syrian and Lebanese birth or descent. They have made a splendid contribution to the professions, the arts, trades, and skills and particularly to the spiritual heritage of our great borough. I was delighted to learn that the patriarch has a detailed and intimate knowledge not only of the development and dimension of the Syrian-Lebanese group in Brooklyn but was able to cite many leading personalities not only among the clergy but also in the laity of the Lebanese population.

The mutuality of warmth and understanding which exists between Lebanon and the United States is in no small measure due to the efficacy of the ministry of Patriarch Meouchi. His presence is most inspiring and his intellect truly enlightening. Though he has not been in the United States in some 28 years his ties of friendship in this Nation have remained firm and his affection for our people across the land is boundless.

His reputation as an accomplished multilinguist is well known but his eloquence in our language is almost incredible. This is because he speaks from the depths of a great humanitarian soul which is filled with zeal for freedom and love for mankind from Antioch to Alaska. During the coming month Patriarch Meouchi will be visiting many of the States and cities of our Nation. It is significant that at the same time our Vice President, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, is touring through Lebanon and the Middle East. This exchange of visits will most certainly produce even firmer alliances and broader understanding than we now enjoy. It is my understanding that the patriarch will visit New York City and Brooklyn near the conclusion of his stay in America. It is my earnest hope that not only the people of his devoted congregation but all of our official family and citizens will cooperate to extend him an enthusiastic welcome and an ovation worthy of his tremendous stature.

I note with particular pride that on the occasion of the dedication of the Church of Our Lady of Lebanon in Brooklyn, N.Y., 18 years ago my late predecessor, the Honorable John J. Delaney, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a speech which referred to our Lebanese neighbors as "The Irish of the East."

On the occasion of the visit of Patriarch Meouchi I am pleased to commend the attention of my colleagues the text of that insertion in the 78th Congress. It follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 11, 1944]

SERMON DELIVERED BY REV. DR. THOMAS J. MCMAHON, NATIONAL SECRETARY OF THE CATHOLIC NEAR EAST WELFARE ASSOCIATION, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE CHURCH OF OUR LADY OF LEBANON OF THE MARONITE RITE OF BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the Reverend Dr. Thomas J. McMahon, national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, on the occasion of the dedication of the Church of Our Lady of Lebanon of the Maronite Rite, of Brooklyn, N.Y.:

"Taking as his text the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah (35: 2) on the flourishing of Christ's kingdom: 'It shall bud forth and blossom, and shall rejoice with joy and praise; the glory of Lebanon is given to it: the beauty of Carmel and Sharon,' Dr. McMahon spoke, in part, as follows:

" 'History is stranger than prophecy. It may seem prosaic to find significance in our day of shifting scenes in an old church on Remsen and Henry Streets, Brooklyn, closed to the public for almost a decade, its former glory almost dissipated and its congregation only a remnant of its former greatness. Yet no lover of Brooklyn's history, no admirer of America's greatness, could walk into this beautiful building, now standing for nearly 70 years as a noble monument of piety, and not wish to turn back the pages of memory and give us yesteryear, to see in this Church of the Pilgrims, now become Our Lady of Lebanon, an epic poem of the land of the free.

" 'In 1609 groups of awe-struck Indians may have stood on these Brooklyn Heights, dear to them as Ihpetonga, and seen afar off Hudson's *Half Moon* sweeping up from the sea like a great white bird. Only 17 years later, one of their chiefs, Gouwane, sold to the Dutch their first Brooklyn settlement, Gowanus, and less than a decade later the same Indians saw a ferry begin operations from Peck's Slip in Manhattan to the foot of Fulton Street, destined to last to our day, 1924, 282 years. Soon came the need for a name, and it was with nostalgic yearning that the innkeeper at the crossroads above the ferry called this little settlement after his boyhood town in far away Holland, Breukelen.

" 'For decades still to come, these heights of Ihpetonga, crowned with massive growths of woodland, looked down serenely on the little Brooklyn town, as she struck deep her roots and prepared for the mighty growth to come. Finally, up this Clover Hill they came, the Pierreponts, the Remsens, the Henrys, the Hicks, and all the rest, to lay their waving fields of grain along the King's Highway, Fulton Street, and to make this into a fairyland of orchards, gardens, and berry patches. The village became the city in the 1830's, the infant city of homes and churches. Our own Roman Catholic Society had its little edifice on Jay Street, as early as 1822, but there would come greater days when immigrants from the Emerald Isle would come up into the mansions, to swell the parishes of the Assumption and St. Charles Borromeo. Meanwhile, the people on the heights were of other persuasions, and they set about to draw from this garden of delight stone forests for God.

" 'On this site, nearly 100 years ago, rose the first church of the Pilgrims, Dr. Storrs' church. For over 50 years, from the day of his youthful springtime when he adorned this pulpit for the first time and reminded his people: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it" to his last breath, these walls echoed with his oratory. In those days of the 1840's, Brooklyn's Blue Book mentioned a Catholic leader, one Cornelius Heeney, an Irish immigrant boy, the partner of John Jacob Astor. They were the days of John Hughes, intrepid archbishop of New York, whose vision led him to Hughes' Folly, the purchase of the present site of St. Patrick's Cathedral, then in the village of Elgin, far out of the city. Meanwhile Henry Ward Beecher was thundering his message from Plymouth Church to a congregation that poured up Fulton Street and over from the ferry.

" 'Then came the bridge, to overshadow the white trail left by the diminutive ferry, and to become a wonder of the world, greeting the new immigrants, pouring, this time, not so much from Ireland and the north as from eastern Europe and the mountains of western Asia. To the land of the free they swarmed as had the Pilgrim Fathers, on new Mayflowers they came in search of liberty. To these heights, as to every other State, they looked for earthly habitations, secure from tyranny and without the price of blood. They were poor; they could not live in mansions. Their faith and their religious customs were different; they must have new churches. They must add to the epic poem of the land of the free. Some of them came to Hicks Street in 1906—to Hicks Street still reminiscent of the Hicks brothers of the early 1800's. These newcomers were from other heights, the mountains of Syria and Lebanon; the Maronites, an ancient and an honorable people, whose blood had flown among their glorious cedars, nurturing them in liberty.' "

"THE IRISH OF THE EAST

" 'I like to call these people the Irish of the east. In the century of Patrick they had their St. Marto, who like Erin's apostle, dotted their island mountains with hermit cells, which remain today the symbol of their steadfastness in their faith and their loyalty to their religious leaders. As late as Versailles, their venerable patriarch fought for the freedom of his people, and in these awful days they are still wedded and dedicated to live without the shackles of tyranny. Here in America, their children have gone forth, in common fight, joined with Americans of every hue. Their boys lie on jungle wastes and on mountain tops, like broken flowers at freedom's shrine. Their bodies lie in strangers' graves to ransom the captives of tyranny. Their blood has crimsoned foreign soil to nurture new trees of liberty.

" 'Today this epic poem of the land of the free reaches its grand climax as the arches of this Church of the Pilgrims echoes with strains of an ancient liturgy and the language of Christ Himself. How true it is that history is stranger than prophecy. No one among those apostles—those Galilean fishermen, tax gatherers, and peasants, with their garbled dialects—could ever even have faintly dreamed that their church would someday be decked as a queen in the multiple splendor of its liturgical university. No one among the first worshipers in this venerable edifice, with its chip of Plymouth Rock, symbol of American freedom, could have had the thought that their descendants would rejoice with their Maronite neighbors on this day. Nor could the inhabitants of Syria and Lebanon of other days have dreamed that their brothers in America, Syrian Orthodox, Moslems, and Druses would feel a common pride in this new monument of the Maronite people.

" 'To a daughter and a Son of ancient Syria we all do honor. The 19th chapter of the Koran speaks of that Mary of whom was born Jesus. The Song of Solomon bids her come from Lebanon: "Come from Lebanon, my spouse!" The church describes her from the Book of Wisdom: "I was exalted as a cedar in Lebanon." In her language our priest has greeted her Son this morning. We have all gone back to the cenacle of the Last Supper and we have gazed, across time, with trembling reverence on the mystery of the upper room. In this shrine of Syria's most renowned daughter, Our Lady of Lebanon, we have prayed and rejoiced with Monsignor Stephen and his devoted flock, heirs of an ancient faith. In the days to come may the prophecy of Isaiah of old become more and more true: "It shall bud forth and blossom, and shall rejoice with joy and praise; the glory of Lebanon is given to it; the beauty of Carmel and Sharon." ' "

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Bottum, Joe H., *S. Dak*	
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*	
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hickey, J. J., *Wyo*	Room 1251, New Senate Ofc. Bldg.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y*	1233 31st St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*	4929 Hillbrook La.
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*	7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr. Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, Maurice J., Jr., *N.H.*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W.Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Benjamin A., *Mass*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Kerr (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, and Capehart.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan of North Carolina, Young of Ohio, Hart, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Bush, Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas. Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Tower, and Murphy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Butler, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Keating, and Prouty.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, Smith of Massachusetts, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore. Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Burdick, Metcalf, Hickey, Kuchel, Allott, Miller, Pearson, Bottum, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan of North Carolina, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Metcalf, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, Murphy, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan of North Carolina, Cannon, Hickey, Pell, Curtis, Dirksen, and Bottum.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.

Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.

Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.

Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd., NW.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire. Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10113) to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, this is a very interesting bill-rewriting procedure, but let me at the outset say—let no one be misled. This amendment does not help the bill. It does not involve the major issues discussed. As a matter of fact, I hardly discussed the question of coordinator because I knew this amendment was coming. It was pretty heatedly discussed in committee. The Republicans insisted on knocking it out. The majority members insisted on keeping it in. I am glad to see they are at least accepting one recommendation by the minority.

If you let this bill go back to committee and really clean it up, maybe you will get a good bill. I am going to make a motion to recommit that so send it back to committee. This is proof positive that that is exactly what should be done. Just look at what the amendment does. It cuts out 50 percent of this bill pagewise. It cuts out 50 percent of the bill according to the length of the bill and according to the discussion of it in the committee report. Look at it. Look at how many pages are devoted to convincing the Members of this legislative body that it is absolutely imperative on the merits to have this coordinator. What does that do to the rest of the report? There is just about as much merit to the arguments of the majority on the rest of the report as there is on the first half of the report which they are now willing to throw into the ashcan with this amendment.

Look at the pages they devote to the discussion of the necessity, the absolute necessity, in order to help unemployment, to have a coordinator and officer, a new bureau, a new agency in order to try to meet this problem. It starts on page 4 and goes on 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 pages discussing public works coordinator. Do you see what is being done? Sweetnesses are being applied. There is going to be another amendment offered to strike out schools. The majority in the report argue, "Oh, no, schools are not included." We said they were. The majority said they were not. Now they are going to strike it out and the argument is going to be—we do not think they were in in the first place but they are going to strike them out. Any question of them being in, any question about other projects being in, I am trying to indicate, are being treated the same—with an effort to cover up the fact that they are included—such as ski slides as well as swimming pools, golf courses, which I do not think the people of this great Nation would ever want Members of the Congress to vote 50 percent of the taxpayers' money to finance. Yet, it is being done in this bill. The remainder of the bill—the balance of the bill left will include that. So I say to you the bill is equally bad with this amendment as without it, so far as I am concerned. The motion to recommit should be passed so that we can take this bill back to the committee, and this is proof positive that the bill should go back to the committee. If they are willing to knock out 50 percent of it, it should go back to the committee. Let us reconsider the rest of the bill which is equally bad.

This $900 million boondoggle bill is still just as it was on the basis of giving the President and the executive branch unprecedented powers, the power to spend money on any public works and with a 50-percent grant authority. There is not any question about that. That delegation of authority remains in the bill; so do the other objectionable features.

This amendment has nothing to do with the spending of the $900 million; that is still in the bill. This amendment has nothing to do with the $300 million added at the last minute without being requested by the executive branch. I want to ask the majority now: Are you going to strike that out? That was not recommended by the President of the United States. The coordinator was not recommended by the President of the United States. You are knocking out the latter; now, are you going to knock out the former, the $300 million?

I will tell you what the strategy is—the same as it was on the agriculture bill. You want to get anything you possibly can left in this bill, so it can go to conference and accept the Senate version of $1,500 million—$750 million for public works now and $750 million standby authority; then our committee which has worked it out will go to conference and they will accept the 50-percent grant money and the Senate provision of 50-percent loan money for all these projects, and the taxpayers will be financing these swimming pools, ski slides, and golf courses to the tune of 100 percent.

Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, school dropouts and the training of young men for a useful and productive life in their mature years presents a challenging problem to our society. It cannot be solved by the Federal Government alone, and to take these youths temporarily out of circulation and without adequate retraining on a local level would not be helpful to either the individual or to the community in which he ultimately will become a citizen.

Mrs. Everett H. Randall, of Rocky River, Ohio, has written a very thoughtful letter on this subject. In order that others may have the benefit of Mrs. Randall's views, I ask unanimous consent that her letter, together with the attached résumé, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and résumé were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKY RIVER, OHIO,
August 10, 1962.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: I would like to share with you my judgment about a proposal for legislation which would set up a Youth Conservation Corps. I believe that this legislation is S. 404 introduced by Senator HUMPHREY. In my opinion this is not the kind of program which will provide the specialized kind of help which is needed now by the youth of our country. My judgment is based on professional experience in public schools and private youth serving agencies over the past 32 years. There is sufficient evidence to indicate that youth who drop out of school and a certain percentage of those who graduate from our public and private high schools are not adequately prepared to become workers in the current labor force. What is needed, therefore, is job orientation and sufficient and appropriate training for these persons. Experience in a work conservation camp cutting trees, digging ditches and clearing out forests has little or no related value for the industrial work world in which these young persons 18 to 22 will be having to compete throughout their lives. Money spent at the local level on appropriate industrial training (both manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industrial training) is the realistic job preparation urgently needed by our youth. According to the legislation now proposed, some $4,000 per boy would be spent annually in these conservation camps. This is more than twice as much as that spent on sending a young man to an average college in the United States. Inappropriate training at a campsite for youth who need practical experience is certainly not the way taxpayers' money should be spent if we wish to help our youth prepare to become satisfactory employees and producers in our 20th century industrial economy.

I am not inalterably opposed to conservation camps for youth. If these could be done at a local level, no larger than a State unit, I am certain that the funds expended could be done so in a more useful and appropriate method. We in Cleveland are now experimenting with work-study programs for youth 18 to 22 who have dropped out of school and are finding that private industry is cooperating along with public schools. Therefore, any Federal funds, it appears to us from our experience locally, could best be utilized through the local community channels.

I most sincerely hope that you will speak and work in opposition to the current proposals for Youth Conservation Corps programs federally sponsored as Federal operated programs.

Sincerely,

HELEN RANDALL
Mrs. Everett H. Randall.

HELEN H. RANDALL (MRS. EVERETT H.)

EXPERIENCE

Teacher: High school Latin, English, and physical education.

Vocational counselor: Cincinnati Board of Education.

Staff member of the retirement planning institutes: Purdue University; Hillyer College; Lake Chautauqua.

Conference leader: Retirement preparation programs, Republic Steel Corp. and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Consultant: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Services to Older Workers, 1961.

Director: Occupational Planning Department, Cleveland Welfare Federation, 1946.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

American Personnel & Guidance Association.

National Vocational Guidance Association.

Ohio Guidance Council.

Northeastern Ohio Personnel & Guidance Association.

Gerontological Society.

Pi Lambda Theta (educational honorary).

Eta Sigma Phi (Latin honorary).

"Who's Who of American Women."

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Cleveland Mayor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Cleveland Mayor's Committee on Manpower Retraining.

Business section vice chairman, United Appeal of Cleveland.

Vocational Advisory Committee, Cleveland Urban League.

Vocational Advisory Committee, Ohio State Employment Service.

Advisory committee, department of careers in social work.

Advisory committee, circle workshop.

Advisory committee, Cleveland hospital council practical nursing program.

Anti-Tuberculosis League of Cuyahoga County.

Rocky River Presbyterian Church.

Mortar Board Alumnae Association.

Kappa Kappa Gamma Alumnae Association.

ARTICLES CONTRIBUTED TO

Employment Security Review, 1958: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, "Older Women Measure Up."

The Physical Therapy Review, 1957: "Financial Planning for the Later Years," American Physical Therapy Association.

The Year Book of Education, 1955: "Guidance Within the Community."

Earning Opportunities for Older Workers, 1955: "Evaluation of Work Performance, the Employers' Viewpoint."

The School Guidance Worker, 1952: "Occupational Prestige."

Occupations, 1951: "What Students Think of Occupations."

Occupations, 1947: "A Community Counts Its Workers."

Ohio Schools, 1940: "So That's What She's Like."

Fight Back, Says Hoover, the FBI Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Fight Back, Says Hoover, the FBI Man" which appeared in the August 21 issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.:

FIGHT BACK, SAYS HOOVER, THE FBI MAN

According to that famous lawman, J. Edgar Hoover, Americans who want to keep their lives and skins intact had better fight back at the criminal, who is getting bolder and more arrogant every day.

Mr. Hoover, who heads the world-famed FBI, warned the other day that criminals—in particular, youthful criminals—have "loosed a massive avalanche of crime," and every community should be alerted to the danger.

In the big towns, where gangs and individuals who used to ply their criminal activities in the dark have boldly come into the sunlight, the situation admittedly is bad. And smaller towns have a way of mimicking larger towns, and some of the goings-on in the latter today become the goings-on in the former tomorrow.

Anyway, since there is admittedly a bad situation in the Nation, crimewise, people ought to listen to Mr. Hoover's admonition that there will be no abatement as long as there is wholesale disrespect for law and order; and, we will add, so long as people like Paul Crump in neighboring Illinois are saved from the consequences of their murderous crimes by the simple expedient of telling the courts that they have "seen the light," "had a rebirth," etc., etc.

Mr. Hoover in his statement enjoined community officials and civic leaders to lead the fight to halt the "lawless hordes who prey on society," and the FBI man was not exaggerating when he estimated the number of those who prey.

A contributing factor in the increase in crimes committed these days by persons under 18 is the attitude which professional do-gooders and compliant courts have taken—the sociological notion that any youngster who goes wrong is a victim of society, childhood trauma or bad housing—which doesn't account for the thousands of kids, of course, who go wrong despite good housing, doting parents and all that.

The poor, mixed-up people who rob and kill because they are "victims of society" do so with quite a lot of confidence that their tearful story of neglect and frustration will get them off light, or perhaps might result in their being sent to some cozy rest home.

The situation which has grown up in this respect was put pretty well by a smart fellow in Britain who allowed the other day: In another age, we treated all lunatics as criminals. Today we treat all criminals as lunatics.

Anyway, the offender today is protected by the widespread belief a fellow these days doesn't have to try to better his condition through hard work—like his neighbors do every day—neither does he have to try to live decently in spite of the environment in which he finds himself.

The Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. Warren, is one who holds that criminals must have the utmost safeguards thrown about them, and that their rights should be protected against all hazards. Well and good, up to a point, but there remains the fact (which Mr. Warren and some of his associates seem to overlook persistently) that the law-abiding fellow, the taxpaying fellow, the soldier-furnishing fellow and his family are entitled to protection, too.

In fact, we will go so far as to say that the rights of the law-abiding are superior to the rights of anybody else, particularly the rights of predators and murderers, and kidnapers and mobsters—either adult or juvenile.

It has been aptly pointed out that if this loose attitude toward responsibility which is upheld by our do-gooders and some of our citizens and some of our courts today had prevailed in the late 1700's, there would be no American Republic today. The United States, in other words, would never have been.

The hard life of the settlers and pioneers, come to think of it, would have justified almost any kind of anisocial behavior, if the do-gooders are correct in their thinking. The Founding Fathers didn't hold such unsound views, though, and neither did their immediate descendants. So we have a great and thriving country, though a lot of predators are trying to take it apart—and they all aren't in the big towns, either.

Need for Strengthening Food and Drug Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Miriam Ottenberg, staff writer of the Star, has written a factual, detailed report of the need for strengthening the Food and Drug Act, in which she particularly discussed what happened in connection with several drugs. I am sure everyone will find this of interest.

I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington(D.C.) Sunday Star, Aug. 26, 1962]

THE STORY OF MER/29: WAS THE PUBLIC PROTECTED?

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

In the present furor over drugs reaching the American people, the story of one drug illustrates what can happen with too little law, too much pressure and too much responsibility resting on a single doctor.

The drug is MER/29, an agent to lower the level of cholesterol, a fatty substance in the blood and a suspected, though unproven, cause of heart ailments.

A product of Richardson-Merrell, Inc.—the same company that tried and failed to introduce thalidomide in this country—MER/29 was forced off the market last April because of the risk of cataracts and other dangerous side effects.

MER/29 was cleared by the Food and Drug Administration for public use in April 1960.

In November 1961, increasing reports of harmful side effects from use of the drug caused Government scientists to conclude MER/29 should be taken off the market.

In April 1962, Richardson-Merrell withdrew the drug.

The company, it was learned, decided to take the drug off the market 2 days after an FDA medical officer paid a surprise visit to the company plant and reviewed its research records.

By then MER/29 had been available in drugstores by prescription for about 2 years.

It had been used by an estimated 300,000 patients who had paid $9.84 for each bottle of 30 capsules, a month's supply.

Over $1 million had been spent promoting the drug.

Richardson-Merrell described MER/29 as a major factor in an 18 percent increase in profits for the first year it was sold.

Earlier this month Deputy FDA Commissioner John L. Harvey said publicly MER/29 should never have gone on the market. The drug is now the subject of investigations by a Federal grand jury and a House subcommittee.

Except for trade journal reports and Mr. Harvey's speech to the American Bar Association, where he cited MER/29 in calling for new drug control laws, little has been said publicly about the drug.

CITE DANGER SIGNS

But a number of physicians and scientists interviewed by the Star feel strongly that enough danger signs were present to have alerted FDA against clearing MER/29 for public distribution. Failing that, these scientists feel both the company and FDA should have moved faster to get the drug off the market.

Mr. Harvey sketched the MER/29 story in arguing for a law to make it easier for FDA to act against suspect drugs. He said that when FDA concluded that the drug should not be on the market, it was unable to correct the situation "in the absence of new data and in the absence at that time of proof that the application contained untrue statements."

He did not enlarge on what he meant by "at that time."

After some independent investigation, the Star compiled a list of questions and invited the William S. Merrell Co., the Richardson-Merrell subdivision which introduced MER/29, to confirm or deny various allegations that had been made. Included among the questions were some inspired by the implications of Mr. Harvey's remarks to the bar convention.

In response to the questions, the Merrell firm issued this statement:

"We'd certainly like to cooperate with you, but I'm afraid we cannot answer these questions. As you know, many of our files on MER/29 have been subpenaed by the grand jury in Washington and some of our people have been called to testify. Under these circumstances our legal counsel believes it unwise for any Merrell representative to discuss these matters for publication."

HERE IS THE STORY

This is the story of MER/29 as pieced together from available information:

At the time MER/29 arrived on the scene, the public had already been made aware that cholesterol levels in the blood might have some connection with heart trouble. Cholesterol, the natural product of a body process, has been blamed for hardening and thickening of the arteries by its fatty deposits on the walls of blood vessels.

The theory of MER/29 was that it would block the formation of cholesterol by halting the last step in the body's manufacture of this substance.

Interest in the drug extended beyond medical men.

The vegetable oil industry, for example, was contending that the level of cholesterol could be lowered safely and effectively by using its polyunsaturated oils.

On the other hand, the dairy and meat industries—hurting because of publicity that their animal fats contributed to cholesterol—were urging the public not to change its eating habits.

The voluntary health associations were split. Some said cholesterol should be controlled by watching the diet. Some favored a cholesterol-inhibiting drug. And some pointed out that it was not yet proven that cholesterol had anything to do with heart disease.

APPLICATION FILED

It was in this atmosphere of assorted pressures and opinions that the Food and Drug Administration received a new drug application for MER/29 in July 1959.

The application went first to a doctor in the Division of New Drugs who resigned a short time later. It was then assigned to a doctor, then 32 years old, recently out of his internship and residency training in internal medicine.

Without naming the doctor, Mr. Harvey in his recent speech to the bar association specifically put the responsibility for clearing Mer/29 on one man by saying this new drug officer allowed the drug to go on the market.

The doctor, who shall be called Doctor X, has since left FDA to enter private practice and was interviewed without access to his records. On the basis of his recollections, he gave the Star this account of his role in the clearance of MER/29:

As soon as the application appeared on his desk, the company started contacting him about the drug. His most frequent contacts were with F. Joseph Murray, director of scientific relations of the Merrell Co. Mr. Murray also figured prominently among the 50 contacts made by the firm to Dr. Frances O. Kelsey and others in FDA's Bureau of Medicine in an effort to get thalidomide approved.

"There were many telephone calls and several meetings." Dr. X recalled. "It was obvious the company was extremely anxious to get the drug on the market. Some companies brought very little pressure but this company liked to keep the pressure on.

"The American Medical Association convention was coming up and they were anxious to promote the drug at the convention. I was getting daily telephone calls."

Drug industry pressures on Dr. X and other FDA medical officers were pinpointed later in 1960 by an outside team of experts who investigated FDA personnel and operations and recommended to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare "that a reasonable control be put upon the access of industry representatives to FDA personnel considering actions affecting industry."

But 2 years later nothing had been done to shield the medical officers. Assistant FDA Commissioner Winton B. Rankin was quoted in a June 1962, drug publication as reporting pressures by drug firms to get quicker action had become "pretty general."

Doctor X was also suffering from the pressure of time. Unless he could find something incomplete in the application—the method used by Dr. Kelsey in stalling on thalidomide—he faced a 60-day deadline.

At the time MER/29 was pending for clearance, Doctor X considered himself solely responsible for the decision on whether the controversial drug should be approved.

The resting on the shoulders of one man of so much responsibility for drugs affecting millions prompted a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council to recommend later in 1960 that an advisory organization of scientific and technical experts should be established to advise FDA on criteria, procedures, and policies.

Asked about the present status of this formal recommendation, Mr. Harvey said the recommended advisory board had not been established but added that "when we have a problem, we do try to get together a committee to advise us." He said that no such committee was asked for help on MER/29.

As far as Doctor X was concerned, he had a problem. Although company officials had intimated on their first visit to him that they were under the impression his predecessor had considered the drug ready for release, Doctor X found he had to start from scratch.

"I had no drug to compare it with," he said. "Nothing gave a clue as to where to look for toxicity (adverse effects). I recall talking with my supervisor, but he didn't advise on whether to pass it or not to pass it. He wasn't prone to do that.

"My thinking was that here was a drug purporting to lower cholesterol. We were dealing with a highly lethal disease state—arteriosclerosis. This drug might be helpful in dealing with the No. 1 killer of men."

He said he was aware that scientists at the National Institutes of Health were concerned that MER/29, in blocking the formation of cholesterol, caused a pileup of a related substance not normally found in man to any material extent. He said it didn't come out until later that this substance, desmosterol, was deposited in the blood vessels, much like cholesterol.

This would raise a question of efficacy—was the drug useful for its intended purpose—but that's a loophole in the law that the Senate-passed Kefauver bill and measures now pending on the House side are designed to plug. At present, FDA passes only on safety, not on efficacy.

SOME SIDE EFFECTS

Dr. X recalled there was a question about potential liver toxicity, but he does not remember any question about other side effects. He does recall, however, that the report of the FDA pharmacologists was more unfavorable than favorable.

"At that time," he said, "there was no question of cataracts in humans and I don't recall any question of cataracts in animals. There may have been clues but I don't recall it."

On the question of how much had shown up in animal tests, there is some difference of opinion. Scientists outside Food and Drug said there already was evidence at that time that the drug might interfere with reproduction and cause other adverse side effects.

Mr. Harvey, in his recent bar association speech, made it clear that the FDA pharmacologists did not clear the drug for safety. He quoted them as saying that MER/29's safety would have to be based on clinical evidence—that is, use on patients.

Dr. X, in recalling what happened in the spring of 1960, said that in his last letter rejecting the drug application as incomplete, he told the company that he wanted longer trials to eliminate further potential areas of toxicity. He does not recall how long it was after he wrote that letter that he cleared the drug. Reportedly, it was 3 weeks.

"I was in a state of indecision where little things would have influenced me a great deal," he said.

ATTENDED MEETING

It was then, he recalled, that he attended a meeting of the American College of Physicians in San Francisco where he heard discussions comparing various methods of lowering cholesterol.

"One paper impressed me," he said, "because the author reviewed various drugs and MER/29 came out in the No. 1 position. It was one of the things that swayed me toward passing the drug. I heard recently that the paper was never published and the author subsequently reviewed his data and questioned whether what he had said was completely valid."

While in San Francisco, he said, he was entertained at dinner by a doctor from the Merrell Co.

"We went to lunch or dinner with industry many times," he said. "I don't think anybody was ever bought by a dinner."

A short time later, he cleared the drug with the stipulation that the company was to continue tests and report the results as they became available.

'I released the drug," he said, "with the knowledge that things might appear later which were not obvious at that time."

The hitch was that lawyers and other laymen in the higher echelons of FDA—not doctors—would make the decision as to whether the law would allow them to force withdrawal of the drug.

Within 6 months after the drug was released Dr. X said, it became apparent that MER/29 was probably doing little good. Ominous reports of its side effects were trickling in.

By now, studies showed that desmosterol—the precursor of cholesterol—acted the same way as cholesterol.

Dr. X went to his superiors and asked if there was any way the drug could be taken off the market.

"I was told there was no way we could do it," he said.

Dr. X recalled that a Mayo Clinic bulletin reported use of MER/29 made hair fall out and skin peel. He said he called the company to ask them to revise the drug's labeling.

The last report Dr. X got before he left FDA, was from a professor who reported the drug was producing cataracts in rats. He said he called Mr. Murray at Merrell and got a report back that the company's pharmacologists would look into it, but that eye damage could occur in rats for other reasons.

Dr. X left Food and Drug in September 1961. He left behind a problem that was giving the doctors mounting concern. The company was advertising widely in medical journals. Stories were being written about the wonders of the drug in newspapers and magazines.

MISLEADING CLAIMS

When FDA doctors informally consulted with outside scientists, they were told the claims made for the drug were misleading.

There was accumulating evidence of danger. A Howard University doctor reported the drug appeared to inhibit ovulation in chickens. Other research men reported the drug might endanger persons in shock and under stress by interfering with the body's mechanism for meeting these conditions. There were also reports that the drug interfered with pregnancy in animals.

In mid-October, Mr. Murray proposed that the company issue a warning letter. The FDA doctor now in charge of the drug objected that the proposed warning only touched on a few relatively minor side effects and might give physicians a false sense of security about the drug.

He asked the company to provide all the information it had gathered about adverse side effects. The company was more in a position than FDA to know about these effects since doctors and researchers usually dealt directly with the company and, under existing law and regulations, were under no compulsion to notify FDA.

Before the company came in with its data, more light was shed on the effects of MER/29 at a meeting of heart specialists. Mayo Clinic doctors reported two cases of cataracts. Three authorities argued there was no need for drugs when the right type of diet would keep down cholesterol. The experts said the drug might prove dangerous and was unjustified except in unusual cases and where the patients were maintained under close supervision.

It was also proposed by some specialists that all doctors investigating drugs should send the FDA duplicates of their reports to the company, but there was no law or regulation to require it.

FDA WANTED ACTION

By the end of October, 1961, FDA doctors were convinced the drug should be pulled off the market.

They argued that there was no proof that the drug did any good in preventing or alleviating heart trouble, but there was proof that the drug produced serious reactions in both animals and humans.

Doctors and other scientists at FDA who fine-combed the original new drug application said much of the evidence of adverse effects could be spotted in the application, but much had been gathered since. They cited these effects:

Cataracts, loss of hair, skin peeling, reduced libido, diminished production of the hormones needed to resist stress and shock, possible liver damage, impotence, and other effects on the reproductive organs.

While the doctors were futilely struggling to get the drug off the market, a two-page company advertisement appeared in the weekly Journal of the American Medical Associal on November 4, 1961. The ad said at one point: "We know that, after use in more than 300,000 patients, few toxic or serious side effects have been reported, thus tending to reaffirm the safety margins previously established."

Elsewhere, the ads said that no one can yet be certain that lowering cholesterol would prevent or alter atherosclerosis (the type of hardening of the arteries at which the drug was particularly aimed). But, the ad continued, "the current evidence strongly supports this concept."

AN AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION WARNING

One week later, on November 11, 1961, the American Medical Association Journal carried a report from its council on drugs saying that clinical studies of the drug had not been pursued long enough to insure that "multifarious and serious alterations may not occur," especially on prolonged treatment.

The council expressed the opinion that patients receiving MER/29 should get it only under the carefully controlled conditions of clinical investigation and that the only occasions for its use should be in extreme conditions that did not respond to other treatment such as diet, nicotinic acid, and polyunsaturated oils. This recommendation would have had physicians use the drug in relatively few cases.

Mr. Harvey in his speech said that by mid-November, the Government scientists had recommended that the drug should be removed from the market.

When this recommendation was presented to the FDA Commissioner's office and to the HEW General Counsel's Office, Mr. Harvey said, "it became apparent that while there was substantial doubt as to the safety of the drug and reason to believe that upon further investigation it would be found that the drug was causing harm when administered in recommended dosage, at that time the FDA did not have sufficient evidence to satisfy the requirements set forth in the law for suspension of the (new drug) application."

He said the company had given strong assurance that it had ample evidence of safety with which to refute the Government's position. If an attempt were made to get MER/29 off the market.

VISIT BY MINTENER

Presumably, the company's position was conveyed to Mr. Harvey by Bradshaw Mintener, an Assistant Secretary of HEW in the Eisenhower administration. Mr. Mintener is a member of the second Citizens Advisory Committee now making a study of FDA, its adequacy and effectiveness for the HEW Secretary.

Mr. Harvey said Mr. Mintener, an attorney in private practice here, "appeared in my office with representatives of the Merrell Co."

On December 1, after the decision was made that the law would not allow FDA to pull the drug off the market in a hurry, a warning approved by FDA was mailed to doctors by the Merrell Co. calling attention to the side effects and cautioning them not to use the drug above the recommended dosage.

Asked why the warning was sent out by the drug company rather than FDA, Mr. Harvey pointed to the cost of a mailing to more than 200,000 physicians.

Early this year, when the drug investigation by Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, spotlighted drug advertising, the two-page November advertisement of "few toxic or serious side effects" was compared with the two-page December warning letter on side effects.

Senator KEFAUVER commented to advertising agency officials that from the number of side effects listed in the warning, it would seem "that you would not have found out all at once that there were side effects, but over a couse of time during which these side effects would have been reported."

After the December warning letter, according to Mr. Harvey, additional reports of side effects came in. In his bar association speech, he said simply that by mid-April, 1962, "the drug caused sufficient injuries, some at the recommended dosage, to permit FDA to require the manufacturer to withdraw the product from the market. The firm's withdrawal letter issued on April 17, 1962, and upon its request the new drug application was suspended."

It was learned, however, that there was more behind-the-scenes activity than Mr. Harvey related in his speech.

A CHANCE MEETING

Just as a chance look at a British medical journal alerted Dr. Kelsey to dig deeper into thalidomide, a chance meeting played a part in the ultimate withdrawal of MER/29.

A Food and Drug inspector in Cincinnati, where the Merrell firm is located, chanced to ride in a car pool with a man who commented on the warning letter issued by the Merrell Co. The man said his wife had worked for the company on its MER/29 animal research but quit.

An interview with the wife prompted FDA officials to become vitally interested in the company's reports on its MER/29 experiments with monkeys. In the research done by the company, monkeys were considered crucial because, as the company pointed out, they were closer to humans than rats and chickens. If monkeys showed no side effects from the drug, the company argued, humans could be considered safe.

After the woman told her story, FDA officials decided to pay a call on the company to discuss the firm's research data. Two days after this unannounced and almost unprecedented visit, the company told FDA it wanted to withdraw the drug.

There was one final fillip to the story of MER/29.

On April 16, the company issued a press statement which appeared in April 17 papers announcing its withdrawal of the drug. The statement said, however, that continuing research and clinical experience with the drug "has not established MER/29 is unsafe when used as recommended."

In at least one newspaper account, a Richardson-Merrell official was quoted as saying that "there is no particularly new evidence" since the December warning letter to motivate withdrawal of the drug.

A DIFFERENT ACCOUNT

The withdrawal letter approved by FDA on April 17 had no such statement. Instead, it told doctors that the decision to take the drug off the market "is based on additional reports of side effects of the kind reported to you in our letter of December 1, 1961, some of which occurred at usal dosage."

A drug which had grossed millions for the manufacturer was now off the market. Hospitals, pharmacies, and other possible outlets were asked by the company to return their total supply immediately.

As Mr. Harvey brought out in his speech, the action could have been taken sooner if the law had allowed it. The bill passed by the Senate Thursday would allow FDA to demand immediate withdrawal of a drug and give the company a chance to fight it out at a hearing later.

The legislation halfway through Congress would meet the problems shown by MER/29 on a number of grounds. Had it been on the books when the young doctor grappled with the drug, he would have had 180 days rather than 60 days to reach his decision, plus another 120 days if the new drug applicant sought a hearing on an adverse ruling.

In addition, the usefulness of the drug would have had to be established and the HEW Secretary would have been given indisputable authority at his discretion to regulate the animal testing and require that investigation of reactions in both animals and humans be reported simultaneously to the company and the FDA.

If the drug had gone on the market, the Kefauver bill provides that advertising must carry information on the drug's side effects and its effectiveness thus alerting doctors more thoroughly and the drug could have been withdrawn when the evidence of danger first appeared.

One-man decisions on drugs potentially affecting the health of millions of people have been a growing source of concern. A former secretary of the American Pharmaceutical Association advocated last week the establishment of a Supreme Court of Drug Evaluation to make final decisions on the safety and efficacy of new drugs.

The Kefauver bill makes an indirect attack on one-man decisions as well as the problem of pressures from industry.

At present, a new drug can be cleared by default.

If FDA does not act to block a drug it goes onto drugstore shelves. Under the Kefauver measure, positive action is required. Every decision to put a new drug on the market must be formally approved.

Since the actions would be taken in the name of the HEW Secretary, presumably he would require a chain of written endorsements from FDA officials that the drug will be effective as well as safe.

Then, FDA would be acting as a team and one young doctor would be neither subjected to a barrage of industry pressures nor pinpointed for blame in decisions potentially affecting the health of millions.

The Pursuit of Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. James Schramm, of Burlington, Iowa, is one of the most forward-looking, articulate, erudite, and charming ladies in my district. She has been effectively active in many worthwhile causes that add both to our culture and to the strengthening and improvement of our Government, both on the domestic and foreign fronts.

She has recently written an article under the title of "The Pursuit of Happiness." This is one of the finest contributions of its kind that I have ever read and because it has served a public interest in Burlington, Iowa, and has some interesting observations that all of us should think about and then do something about, I am taking this opportunity to have it placed in the Appendix of the RECORD where it may be seen and read by all who have a kindred interest with her in "The Pursuit of Happiness":

[From the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye, Aug. 16, 1962]

The Pursuit of Happiness

(By Mrs. James Schramm)

Eight people, the other day, sat around the long table in the Governor's office.

They included the Governor, who had called the meeting; the director of Iowa's largest art center; head of a university art department; editor of a well-known newspaper; a painter.

They were talking about the arts in Iowa: the early and the recent; literature and music; architecture and theater; that which should be preserved; the famous; the unknown.

Though each person at the table was highly knowledgeable in this field, there was not one present for whom the conversation did not hold a surprise. The number of symphony orchestras in our State; homes designed by the great architect, Frank Lloyd Wright; banks and freight houses by Louis Sullivan—gems of architecture known to only a few.

Iowa boasts the first municipally supported art museum in the United States and the site where Dvorák composed the New World Symphony.

But we need not dwell in the past. I write en route from Iowa City where an audience thrilled to the first performance outside New York of Robert Ward's opera, "The Crucible." Iowa's adopted son, Mauricio Lasansky, is among the most influential printmakers in the world.

Why did Governor Erbe call this meeting? Precisely because there is so much unsuspected material and creativity of esthetic significance in Iowa. Steps are being discussed to inform Iowans of the existence and whereabouts of their own State's cultural attributes. (The painter told many stories of art in Iowa well known in New York and in the great museums but little known here—of New York critics, for instance, referring to sculpture in Ft. Dodge as the greatest work by the modern master, Marino Marini.

(But how many Iowans have seen it?)

There is a deeper reason, however, for the chief executive of our State to concern himself with the arts. The pursuit of happiness is a goal expressed in the U.S. Constitution. This is the true reason for the arts. Since well before the written history of man, as we know by his cave paintings, the arts have brought him into harmony with his surroundings and the universe.

One painter explains it this way, "We make a map of our experience patterns, an inner model of the outer world, and we use this to organize our lives. Our natural 'environment'—whatever impinges on us from outside—becomes our human 'landscape'—a segment of nature fathomed by us and made our home."

We live in a 1962 environment which shifts at a rate of change faster than man has yet experienced. Much that is new and different to assimilate impinges on us from outside. Until it is fathomed and made our own we can not feel at home. Until that time we can not have a well adjusted—a happy society.

The men and women around the Governor's table were really discussing an age-old means toward our constitutional objective—the pursuit of happiness.

John Glowacki Praises Faith of Polish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article concerning a visit to Poland by Mr. and Mrs. John J. Glowacki, of Peabody, Mass., during which they were impressed with the gains which the Polish people have made in their efforts to become free of Soviet rule. The article appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Item on August 28, 1962:

Peabody Man Back From Europe—John Glowacki Praises Faith of Polish People

(By Peg O'Connell)

The deep, inspiring faith of the Polish people, coupled with their implacable patriotism, has enabled them to throw off at least partially the yoke of their Communist oppressors in the opinion of a Peabody man, John J. Glowacki, of 4 Driscoll Street, a member of the Peabody Industrial Commission and a supervisor in the General Electric Co. of Lynn.

Glowacki with his attractive wife, his mother, Mrs. Lucy Glowacki, of Dorchester, and two relatives of Mrs. Glowacki, Miss Wanda Pietrazek of 1 Highland Terrace, Peabody, and Stanley Zcubinski of Salem, recently returned to the United States after a visit to Poland and several Iron Curtain countries.

The senior Mrs. Glowacki saw her sisters for the first time in 52 years, and Zcubinski was reunited with his parents whom he had not seen since he was taken from them as a boy of 12 to Germany by the Nazi invaders.

The Glowacki party spent most of its time in the village of Krasnik with frequent visits of Lublin and to Warsaw where Glowacki, interested in every aspect of industry, had an opportunity to enhance his knowledge of Poland's working conditions.

Glowacki visited job shops, sheet metal shops, and other tool shops and found that many of the tools used are of prewar design. However, many of the larger shops do utilize the Caraboloy tools currently used in the United States. Employees in the shops, he explained, work at a moderate pace, and at the end of a year's employment, are entitled to a 4-week vacation. All are given an annual physical checkup.

To Glowacki's amazement, he found that the workers are free to move from shop to shop if they so desire. The only restrictions that he noted were those imposed in the larger factories where the men were not allowed coffee breaks.

The average factory worker in Poland earns from $8 a month to $20 a month, but commodities are reasonable with cigarettes selling at 4 cents a package; men's shoes of good quality leather are about $4 a pair; and hotel accommodations in a large Warsaw hotel were $1.50 a night for two with breakfast included.

On the farms there was no indication that Poland is not a free country. The farmers raised the vegetables which they preferred, mainly sugarbeet, and practically all kept livestock.

The Polish people are free to visit and to contribute to their churches about which their lives center.

Practically all the Polish people, with the exception of those who work in large factories, maintain productive farms, bordered with the colorful flowers for which the Poles are noted. These meticulously kept farms are the pride of the sincere, jovial natives, many of whom still till the soil as their grandfathers did. But, they now have electricity in their homes, and those who can afford them have a few modern conveniences.

Horse-drawn wagons and bicycles are the prime means of transportation, for there are few cars outside of Warsaw. The paved roads provide a cushion for the rubber-wheeled wagons as they wend along the quiet roads.

Physical fitness, which concerns Americans, will never be a problem in Poland where men and women alike, walk great distances, sometimes as much as 20 miles in a day. Even the elderly think nothing of walking 2 or 3 miles in a day to the nearby church.

Glowacki said that nearly everyone he met evidenced an interest in the United States and were eager to hear more about President John F. Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. They look upon the United States as a very friendly nation. Glowacki believes the extent of the freedom they now enjoy is the result of pressure by the United States and England.

Although he was pleased to see the Polish people emulate Americans in some things, he was nevertheless disappointed in their love of American music; instead of the gay Polish polkas which he had anticipated at dances, jazz was played, and the movies featured American films with Polish captions.

The desire of the Polish people to learn English is evidenced, Glowacki explained, in their use of dictionaries containing Polish and English words. They are delighted to receive American magazines which they try hard to understand.

The Glowackis were free to take as many pictures as they desired, although, like all the visitors in Iron Curtain countries, they were required to report to the American Embassy and also to the police station in each town. The police explained that this was for their own protection, and that the Polish police, as well as their host and hostess, were responsible for their safety.

Though they were impressed with Zurich, Paris, and London, the Glowacki party was most inspired by the stalwart Polish people who, despite oppression, assert their independence by flying two Polish flags to every one Soviet flag flying from government buildings, and who constantly pray that one day their nation will be as free as their immortalized patriots died to make it.

Two Hundredth Anniversary of Sandisfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the town of Sandisfield, Mass., is commemorating this year the 200th aniversary of its incorporation. Throughout these 200 years Sandisfield has made important contributions to the history and development of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Its people are typical of those who have, throughout the years, infused our great Nation with the pioneer spirit.

George Sokolsky, who, I am glad to note, spends his summers in Sandisfield, chose today to devote his column to the bicentennial celebration, and I ask unanimous consent that this article, which appeared in the Washington Post, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1962]

THESE DAYS: MY NEIGHBORS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Up in the Berkshires in Massachusetts, we have been celebrating during the past week, the 200th birthday of the founding of Sandisfield, in which my house and farm are actually situated.

Sandisfield was once the largest township in Berkshire County and was very prosperous, the farmers making here the famous yellow cheddar cheese, which has gone by the name of "York cheese," "store cheese," or "cartwheel." At one time, Sandisfield produced 300,000 pounds of cheese and 100,000 pounds of butter each season. Also maple sugar, hay, apples, cider, and a homemade rum. This area was famous for the independence of its farmers and although they fought well in the Indian wars and in the Revolution, they also took part in Shay's rebellion.

The reason that Sandisfield ceased to be agriculturally and industrially important is that the new means of communication, the railroad, passed to the west of it, going through Sheffield, Great Barrington, Lenox, Lee, and Pittsfield. However, this area is being restored by another form of transportation, the automobile and the bus, which bring the summer residents from New York, Hartford, and Springfield to these parts, which with the Tanglewood concerts, the Jacob's Pillow dances and the camps for boys and girls are witnessing a revival.

The bicentennial has been lots of fun. All the neighbors came to the dances and the speeches and the parades—the good, old-fashioned parades showing all the neighboring fire departments and interesting floats and old costumes and dances on the grass—and not to be omitted, hotdogs, popcorn, balloons, pink lemonade as well as the modern soft drinks.

Sandisfield is a Democratic town for some reason or other. Most of the other towns hereabout are Republican, also for some reason or other. But most of the local great men are Republicans and they came to the bicentennial. Governor John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, was there to make a speech and he developed quickly all the characteristics of local informality.

He interrupted his speech to tell his audience to watch the parachute jumps, which included a girl jumper from Texas who was very pretty. And that made the day for all the girls because it just showed that what a man could do, a woman could do.

Governor Volpe spoke about the homely virtues of such a town as Sandisfield, which has always maintained a pay-as-you-go policy that is truly wonderful in these days. As a matter of fact, Sandisfield meets its bills every month and does not get into debt, except to borrow occasionally from a bank, and it meets such an obligation as a sound businessman does.

Governor Volpe said that he wished other parts of Massachusetts could be so financially sound. Although the population of Sandisfield is no longer predominantly Anglo-Saxon and has long forgone the ways of Jonathan Edwards who hails from here, it nevertheless has maintained a tradition of thrift, both for the town and for individuals.

When I first came here, we had no electricity on our hill and there are still some houses which do without it. The little red schoolhouses are gone, too, and there is a central school which is well run by a Yale graduate, George Etzel, who prefers the simple life and lives it faithfully. The township, however, is so widespread, about 33,000 acres, that some of the children would do better in schools in other townships closer at hand. But sentiment and loyalty and rules send them to our school despite snow and ice.

The local Congressman also came to make a speech. He is SILVIO O. CONTE, a Republican. He has told Congress of the strong desire for self-government among these people. He said: "The first town meeting following incorporation was called by virtue of a warrant issued by Joseph Dwight, of Great Barrington, justice of the peace, and the original town proprietors, the majority of whom were citizens of Worcester. In a short time, however, the people of Sandisfield were clamoring for control of their own destinies, and, as it was to work out, their demands were quickly granted."

That is the way America grew. Little towns like Sandisfield built a great country and these little New England towns sent sons to develop the great States of the Middle West.

The speakers had their say and a good time was had by all.

Ode on the Ground Breaking for San Luis Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, Charles B. Garrigus is a member of the California Assembly and a very fine legislator. He is also a fine poet. His poetry has been heard at numerous State events and has served to set the tone and spirit of those occasions. On August 18 Mr. Garrigus delivered an ode to the San Luis Dam at the ground-breaking ceremonies in which President Kennedy participated. I heard Mr. Garrigus read his poem, and I take pleasure in asking unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the ode was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ODE ON THE GROUND BREAKING FOR SAN LUIS DAM

(By Charles B. Garrigus)

Each Spanish peer who ventured to these shores
Dreamed greedy dreams of empire's power and pride;
Each vainly sought to find the golden doors,
And never really knew for what he died.

Then patient padres passed across the land,
To toil with zealous courage for God's grace.
They taught the Indians husbandry by hand,

And Old World missions shaped the New
World's face.

When Sutter's golden gleam flashed round the
world,
The hot-eyed hordes poured in from every
clime;
But where the mining camp smoke slowly
curled,
Now ghost-town memories fade into time.

Yet priest, Hidalgo, Forty-niners too,
All dreamed their dreams far better than
they knew.

This day is but the dawning of a greater day
Whose rising had to be in years beyond their
sight.
Its twilight shall take place in times still
far away,
And no man living now shall stay to see its
night.

We reap the harvest which their pioneer
hopes have sown
And live their shining dreams to have a
better life.
Yet each day proves we cannot live by bread
alone,
But must have nourishment from faith to
bear our strife.

The food for factory, farm, and home these
hills shall hold
Can cause to thrive what otherwise could
never be.
The alchemy of time turns water into gold
And gives our natural heritage its future
guarantee.

Babes now unborn shall drink the drops
which hence shall flow
And unbuilt factories throb the rhythms of
their power.
Who can foresee the harvest from this seed
we sow?
A destiny is pregnant in the ground we break
this hour.

Oh land of promise blooming by the sea,
We dedicate this work to God for thee.
To make our State the greatest in the West
Can we do less than make the largest best?

Small Business Plight—Item of Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Knightstown, Ind., Banner deserves the thoughtful consideration of every Member of Congress:

SMALL BUSINESS PLIGHT, ITEM OF CONCERN

As everyone knows, many small businessmen today have their backs against the wall in the struggle for economic life, and Government officials are talking out of one corner of their mouths in sympathy for the small businessman while trying to ram bills through Congress that would be a bigger and bigger handicap.

Take the proposed medicare bill, for example. While doctors are concerned about this bill being a step toward socialized medicine, some of the Fair Deal orators are saying that well, after all, the wage earner pays for it. Let's correct this somewhat by pointing out that every small businessman (and big business, too) must pay an amount equal to the total which is paid by all the employees of the business in social security taxes. This, of course, is true with other social security taxes, and some of the Fair Dealers say, pay no attention, they used the same arguments against social security itself.

Just how many more taxes can small business absorb without reaching the point where no one will undertake a small business operation? Is this the America of opportunity?

Big buisness can usually absorb these extra taxes—at least much easier than their smaller competitors—because the Federal Government is taking 52 percent of the profits from big business. But the small buisness operator must dig down in his jeans for the extra money.

This is only the starter. There'll be new hospital additions to build under such a system of "free" medical care, which you know would be abused. And who will pay for these hospital additions? Every taxpayer, of course, but the small businessman, because of a large property assessment, will pay more than the average individual.

Then next January, an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour is coming, and what follows that on the politicians' menu?

For the small business industrial operation, foreign competition is playing havoc, along with the big business competitor at home.

We dislike bemoaning the problems of the small business so frequently, but we honestly believe that the public must become aware of this very pressing problem that promises to end many small business operations, discourage many persons from undertaking small business ventures, but, worst of all, from the total society standpoint, the loss of many potential jobs that would help solve the unemployment problem.

This, too, is why many businesses are installing automation to replace manual work.

Americans would do well to ponder for a good, long time this matter which the politicians gloss over with rosy promises for the gullible.

Security at NSA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial that appeared in the August 29 issue of the Washington Star.

SECURITY AT NSA

The National Security Agency has a better chance of living up to its name now that the House Un-American Activities Committee has plugged holes in the Agency's own security rules. As Chairman WALTER brought out in a painstaking investigation, some of the old employment practices were downright shabby, even by standards of less sensitive fields.

Personnel screening was so loose that, during the inquiry, 30 persons resigned or were dismissed, most of them suspected of sexual deviation. In addition, of course, were the two men whose flight to Russia touched off the investigation. It has been 26 months since these mathematicians took what secrets they possessed behind the Iron Curtain.

Although the committee led the way, NSA itself must be credited with seizing the initiative to—in the words of one expert—"tighten its screening procedures 100 percent." Before the Walter exposé, NSA had fallen flat in one vital aspect of screening. It failed to properly utilize the personnel evaluations of its investigators. Thus, known undesirables were permitted to stay on.

Since the investigation, NSA has adopted procedures of such agencies as FBI. It has put the burden of proof so squarely on the job applicant that, in cases of doubt, the decision is made in favor of the Government. In addition, the qualifications of all old employes have been reevaluated.

Twenty-two "corrective changes" have been made at NSA, long overdue in an agency dealing with our most sensitive military security matters. Now before an employee is hired, he must pass physical, mental, psychological, and lie detector tests. Then comes a probationary period of nonclassified work, while the candidate's background is thoroughly checked. After that, there still is close scrutiny under a newly created inspector general. Security at NSA has taken on a new meaning.

A Salute to Our Working Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, as the struggle between democracy and communism intensifies, the significance of Labor Day, the importance of paying tribute to the workers of America, becomes greater. This is true because our great national strength lies not alone in our massive Military Establishment, but, even more, in the great body of working men and women of America who produce and go on producing all that we need to maintain our military strength.

We read and hear so much about how our military might acts as a deterrent to global war; how it keeps Khrushchev from triggering such a war; and this is true. I am convinced, however, that Khrushchev harbors a wary respect also for the great body of working men and women of America who produce to make our military power a deterrent to all-out war. This in itself is a tribute to America's labor force, and to the freedom in which that great force works. Of course it is not for these things alone that we are grateful to our workers. We appreciate also the unprecedented abundance of all goods they have brought and all services they have rendered our country since its founding 186 years ago.

Labor Day has come to signal the wrap-up of the summer season, and has become traditionally a day of family fun, or part of that last weekend of vacationing or rest before the youngsters return to school and the autumn round of activities sets in. And why not? There's nothing wrong with having fun. It is my hope in these few minutes, however, to focus attention on the significance of Labor Day. Perhaps it would be well to mention at this point a little about the origin of this observance and why we set aside the first Monday in September to honor the working men and women of the United States.

A general holiday honoring the laboring people of America was first suggested in 1882 by Peter J. McGuire, founder of the Carpenters Union and cofounder of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. McGuire proposed the observance of a day every year which, in his words, "shall be labor's—an occasion devoted to the industrial spirit—the great vital force of every nation."

In fact, it was Mr. McGuire who recommended that it be called Labor Day and that it be established as the first Monday in September. His reason for choosing this date was, again in his own words, so that "it would come at the most pleasant season of the year, nearly midway between the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving."

Over the years the observance of Labor Day gradually spread across the country. First, in the traditionally American way, it was officially recognized through municipal observances. Next, State legislation was enacted recognizing the day. Then, in 1894 Congress passed an act setting aside the first Monday in September as a legal holiday in the District of Columbia and the territories. This official recognition gave the holiday the prestige it needed and deserved, and by 1900 most of the States had followed suit. By 1923, the last of the then 48 State legislatures enacted a Labor Day law.

In saluting our working men and women on their day, I recognize with a feeling of kinship their goals, and I pledge my continuing purpose to cooperate in seeking to attain the objectives which are in the best interest of all our people.

I recognize further not only the right of labor to organize but also the importance of effective, responsible, and representative unions in American economic life free from Government domination. I reaffirm my support of labor's claim to a fair share of the fruits of its production. And I applaud the working people for their indispensable contribution toward keeping our country strong and free and prosperous.

As we observe Labor Day, 1962, in the midst of international tension, I commend our working men and women for their vital role in helping to preserve the freedom we value so highly, and I rest secure in the knowledge that they provide America with the unequaled productive capacity, enabling us to meet any challenge the stress of the times may present.

Cuba: A Finger on Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article by one of our foremost writers, Marguerite Higgins, dealing specifically with the situation in Cuba and our position in Latin and South America. This also points up very clearly the fact that we can no longer depend upon negotiations or agreements. Positive action is absolutely necessary and the time is now, not in the future.

The article follows:

CUBA: A FINGER ON KENNEDY

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, charged last night that President Kennedy knows Soviet troops and military equipment are arriving in Cuba but is evading the issue.

The administration's position is that only Soviet military technicians—that is, not fighting soldiers in units but soldiers to teach and train—have landed in Cuba. President Kennedy said at his last press conference that the United States is examining the situation created by the arrival of some 3,000 to 5,000 Communist-bloc personnel.

Senator CAPEHART, however, contended in a speech prepared for delivery in Indiana that the Soviet forces constituted a potential military threat and a clear challenge to the Monroe Doctrine. He thus put himself on the side of the many Cuban refugees, some of them knowledgeable, who have insisted that the degree of Communist military intervention in Cuba has been underestimated by the administration.

Said Senator CAPEHART: "How long will the President 'examine the situation'? Until the hundreds of Russian troops grow into hundreds of thousands? Until the little Cuban military force grows into a big Russian force? It is time the American people demanded that President Kennedy start protecting the interests of the United States. The law which permits him to do it is plain.

CUBA AND CHARGES

From the standpoint of international law, the United States has every right to land troops, take possession of Havana and occupy the country, unless the Cuban Government answers satisfactorily the request of the U.S. Government that all Soviet military personnel be sent home and that no further shipments of military supplies be sanctioned by the Havana authorities.

The Soviet military intervention—whether of technicians or soldiers—faces Washington with all the usual agonizing decisions involving a confrontation, direct or indirect, with Moscow, which is Havana's military ally.

U.S. policy, prior to the recent massive Soviet move to prop up Castro, was to hope that the Cuban dictator would destroy himself with his own inefficiency and clumsy economies. The severe decline of Cuba's industrial and agricultural economy this spring and summer began to give a tinge of reality to these hopes. Then came the armada of Soviet ships this August bearing munitions and personnel.

Can the United States afford to ignore any massive Soviet presence in Cuba whether of technicians or soldiers in light of the Monroe Doctrine, the resolutions of Santiago de Chile, Costa Rica, and Punta del Este outlawing unchecked armed intervention in the Americas by an extra continental power?

If America chooses to be silent on a situation at its back door, what will Russia think of its will to use its great power in other areas of the world the United States is committed to defend? Is Cuba worth risking an encounter of any sort with Soviet power? And in any case, is Cuba such a dismal blot on the Communist international escutcheon that it remains of great value as a symbol of communism's failure in this hemisphere?

These are some of the tough questions that the policymarkers are threshing out right now as they decide what—if anything—to do about Moscow's latest Cuban moves.

Senator CAPEHART, according to his speech, is clearly on the side of action, as, not unexpectedly, are the Cuban refugee circles.

His facts and figures about recent developments in Cuba are closer to what Cuban intelligence agents have been reporting than to what the administration accept as accurate.

According to Senator CAPEHART: "A lot of people in Washington have known for weeks that the so-called technicians, or at least a good part of them, are actually Communist military personnel. The facts are that there were about 400 agricultural experts and technicians in the Soviet ships which arrived and the rest of the 3,000 to 5,000 total were Communist military personnel." Is Khrushchev testing the United States to see whether it is soft enough for him to continue such infiltration of other Latin American countries?

Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10113) to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have approached this legislation from what I believed was an impartial attitude and made my statement on the basis of what the bill does or does not do. I have not injected politics into this matter and certainly have not tried to belittle any Member or his district or the people of his district. I do not think the debate should sink to such levels as that. The characterization of me as an "economic royalist" is amusing although, I am sure not so intended. I can only interpret it to mean a loyal adherent to strict economy—or a believer in the principle that every man should be the royal or ruling or determining factor in his own economic destiny if it is intended to apply to my beliefs.

I say to the gentleman from West Virginia that the people of my district are proud of the fact that they clip coupons. They have had the intestinal fortitude and they are good and frugal enough Americans to be able to save their money and invest it and provide for themselves when they retire. What is wrong with that, I say to the gentleman from West Virginia? How else would private enterprise, how else would enterprise in the great State of West Virginia, or any other State get along if it were not for these people who saved their money and invested it in private enterprise through the stock market, and thus provided jobs for the millions of Americans who work in this Nation? How else would taxes be collected to pay for the many programs to help employment such as area development, which I supported, and manpower retraining, which I supported, as well as the $4.8 billion public works appropriation bill already passed, which I supported, as well as the biennial public works authorization bill which I have been trying to get our committee to consider this year to the extent of $5 billion in sound projects, which I would support if brought out? So I think this debate ought to be on the level of the merits, not attacks on a Member or his district or his people back home.

I am glad the gentleman had something to say about the people of my district being frugal. There are however 100,000 of them out of 455,000 on social security. If you call them rich, I would not agree with you. But they are good, frugal Americans and they are not asking for handouts or Federal Government grants to projects that are traditionally local with the Federal control that results.

Susan Anthony Led Women in Long Fight for Suffrage: Right Given 42 Years Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anthony Cama of Lynn, Mass., which appeared in a recent issue of the Lynn Sunday Post:

SUSAN ANTHONY LED WOMEN IN LONG FIGHT FOR SUFFRAGE: RIGHT GIVEN 42 YEARS TODAY

(By Anthony Cama, teacher, author, poet, and director of the Italian School, Lynn)

This is a salute to Susan Brownell Anthony, a most exceptional woman, who was born in Adams, Mass., in 1820, and who was a leader in the women's suffrage movement in the United States. Today marks the 42d anniversary of the final certification of the 19th amendment, which gives the women of America the right to use the ballot and hold public office.

She was a person whose powerful sense of social responsibility was insulted by the customs and the mores of her time placing insurmountable stumbling blocks in the path of woman's cry and surge for equal rights of dignity and honor. A teacher and reformer, she was an ardent flame in the era when most of the female world shrunk behind the overbearing, dominant facade of the lawmaking, superiority-conscious male. It was because of her patient, enduring convictions in the matter of the right of franchise as a symbol of equality between the sexes that a most audacious move was made. With distinctive pride and bearing, she gallantly and unequivocally submitted a bill for equal suffrage to Congress in 1886.

REBOUNDED

Undaunted, fearless, she was defeated but only to return again and again into the sneering masculine congressional arena for another attempt. I am sorry to say to the readers of the Lynn Sunday Post that Miss Anthony did not live long enough to see the 19th amendment become law August 26, 1920. But as long as women shall vote and work and have a claim to the control of their children and to the rights of holding their own money, Miss Anthony shall always be identified synonymously with the 19th amendment and women's right to vote.

With the indulgence and patience of the readers, I should like to present this dedicatory poem to womanhood in this writing:

LEFT IS THE HAND OF HEAVEN

The heart veins of the earth are splintered tears,
  And starlamps are but ashes in the sky,
When woman stoops to gather broken spears
  And droops her hair to mask her anguished eye.

The sea becomes a woman's mourning nest
  To blind the sunrise with her aching dream,
And from her lovely, life-rich breast,
  She gives her allness through its mother stream.

She walks—she falls—and sprawls within the dust
  Only to arise and grimly plod ahead.
For she, the left hand, knows the right hand must
  Be loved and helped to spin its strongest thread.

Left, is the hand of Heaven, mankind knows
  The ageless truth of woman's visioned face.
She is the seed from which the flower grows,
  She is the left hand in its rightful place.

Left, is the hand of Heaven; it will pray
  And bless the cradle where man's fate has trod,
For she will guide the right hand's mortal way
  And with her left hand reach the heart of God!

STRONG, COURAGEOUS

From time immemorial has not woman been the very essence of the lilting lyricals of poetry, music, painting, and sculpture? In her feminine fragility she has emerged the very bastion of strength, fortitude, and courageous faith. For ages she has waited within her home for her man to return from hunting or war, so that she would be ready to comfort, heal, and give of her love. She would be the warmth and the indivisible embrace wherein man—weary, wounded, and bleeding, victorious or defeated—would find that indefinable essence of power and determination time and time again. In the woman-wife, in the woman-mother, man would rise upward and upward, supported and held up by the measureless love and sacrifice of his mate.

It is with the greatest pleasure that this writer presents "Women of the Bible," by the renowned Michael Cardinal von Faulhaber. The cardinal explains: "The Hebrew expression (escheth chajil) means the courageous, energetic, thorough woman," a woman full of character, the valiant woman who shall render unto man "all good and not evil all the days of her life."

WOMEN IN GOSPEL

In the long and tortuous history of women's evolution let us mention Rachel, the wife of the patriarch, Jacob; Miriam, the sister of a prophet; and Anna, a prophets' mother; Debbora, judge and deliverer of her people; Dalila, the hostess in the valley of the vines, the woman of Samaria, the Chananite woman, Mary Magdalen, Martha, the mother of James and John; Veronica, and, in conclusion, to list these women in the Gospel, Mary, the mother of the Lord.

Let us also mention others, such as Queen Elizabeth of old Elizabethan England, Queen Victoria, Catherine the Great of old Russia, Florence Nightingale, Madam Curie of radium fame, and, of course, the thousands of heroic women long before Joan of Arc, and the pioneer American women, who were the indestructible backbone of the covered wagon era and the settling of this vast virgin and savage continent of ours.

Let us return to some important historic data of suffrage in our own Nation. After the Revolutionary War, when the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia to organize the States, the delicate question of suffrage caused such an uproar that it was omitted from the National Constitution and so left up to the decision of each State.

GREATER FORCE

Women were slowly acquiring more education and speaking out with greater force. By 1832 the antislavery question was a powder keg. Women had developed into excellent platform speakers, and their activity resulted in the division of the Antislavery Association, the Garrison-Phillips branch standing firm for Lucretia Mott and her followers. Among these were the Quakers, who had always worked for and given recognition to equal rights for women. Later on, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, of Revolutionary ancestry, joined the antislavery forces, and she and Lucretia Mott decided that the rights of women as well as those of the colored slave needed attention.

In July 1848, at a Friend's yearly meeting in western New York they cried forth in resonant tones for the first woman's rights convention in all history. It met in Seneca Falls, N.Y., Mrs. Stanton's home, on July 19, and after a 2-day session adjourned to Rochester, N.Y.

WORCESTER TALK

This may be regarded as the birth of the movement for women's suffrage not only in this country but all over the world. Tremendous publicity was given to this action by the New York Tribune under the astute and dynamic editorial leadership of Horace Greeley. This was followed in 1850 by a convention in Worcester, Mass., under the guidance of Lucy Stone and a very erudite and distinguished gathering of eastern suffragists.

This movement, however, still was feeble and lacked enough force to cause men to sit up and pay attention. With the entrance into this battlefield of dynamic Miss Susan B. Anthony, in cooperation with Mrs. Stanton, the entire Nation erupted into action by women everywhere. These two women, from their first encounter in 1851, welded a friendship which remained unbroken for 50 years. Miss Anthony attended her first woman's rights convention in Syracuse, N.Y., in 1852 and her last in Baltimore, Md., in 1906, a month before her death.

In 1917 New York was the first to yield the right to vote to its women citizens. By 1918 women had acquired equal suffrage with men in 15 States, offering the only instance in the world where the voters themselves gave the franchise to women. Now, during the demands of World War I, the value of women in all fields was demonstrated so well that all political parties were committed to their enfranchisement.

NO RIGHTS THEN

This writer cannot find enough words of gratitude and respect for the work and devotion contributed by women during World War II and the Korea conflict. It is truly a most happy labor to write this article and eulogize womanhood as well as to give our young female generation a history facet of how not so very far back, just in 1920, women had practically no rights at all. This cruel fact existed in our very own great democratic society, but it is consoling to know that America was mainly responsible for woman's enfranchisement all over the world.

In the great struggles of June 1919, when it appeared that perhaps women would fail again, the last ratification certificate was that of Tennessee. It was delivered to Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby at 4 a.m., August 26, 1920. At 9 a.m. he issued the official proclamation that the 19th amendment had been duly ratified by 36 State legislatures and "has become valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution of the United States." It read as follows: "The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

From that hour complete and universal women's suffrage was the law of the land.

Jobs Going Begging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, many of those in this body who supported the Manpower Development and Training Act have faced the question, where are these jobs which you plan to fill with the retrained workers? How can we hope to find places for the unemployed? I have said, and I say it again, that there are millions of jobs in our country going begging, jobs that are open with no one to fill them. Such a situation recently came to light. In U.S. News & World Report of September 3 there is a report on the testimony of the National Restaurant Association on the proposed new unemployment benefit program. In this testimony the association points out the number of jobs that are going begging in the restaurant industry. This is not an isolated example. By giving skills to those without them we can fill these jobs that are going begging and help solve the gnawing unemployment problem which still plagues our economy.

The report follows:

JOBS OPEN, MANY JOBLESS: WHY?

Workers who are highly choosy are being blamed for this trend in the restaurant industry: Unemployment remains high, but a wide variety of jobs is waiting for applicants.

That is the picture given to a congressional committee August 22 by Thomas W. Power, Washington counsel for the National Restaurant Association. He testified in opposition to a new program of Federal unemployment benefits.

Mr. Power reported that in Cleveland the State employment office failed for 6 months to fill 100 job openings for waitresses.

"Of 2,000 unemployed women interviewed," he said, "only 30 have been willing to take the jobs. In the same city, a private club has been trying to fill a job for a bus boy at $55 a week plus meals since February."

The reason according to Mr. Power "is not simply low wages." He continued: "Restaurant wages are rising over 5 percent each year. In Cambridge, Mass., restaurants now pay $65 to $80 a week for short-order cooks—up about 10 percent from a year ago—and still workers are not to be found."

Lack of qualifications also is not the reason jobs are waiting for workers, according to Mr. Power. He said: "The hardest-to-fill jobs—dishwashers—demand only minimum qualifications that most of the unemployed could meet. Yet they go unfilled mostly because even jobless workers refuse these jobs unless they have no other choice."

Mr. Power added: "We have reports of shortages of workers in Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, New York, Houston and Cleveland."

The Restaurant Association has taken a position against any extension of the Federal temporary benefits—given to workers whose State benefits have been exhausted—"unless there is clear evidence of sufficient need to justify it."

Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a heart-warming story about a constituent, Eugene Lenk, who now resides in Passaic, in the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey. Born in Budapest, Hungary, of noble birth, he held the title of baron which his family had held for almost four centuries. In 1949, after spending 2 years in a Hungarian jail, he and his wife, Gabriella, fled from Hungary with only the clothing they had on their backs. Eventually they came to the United States in 1957.

On August 29, 1962, Baron and Baroness Lenk became U.S. citizens, willingly renouncing their titles for the prouder title of Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen.

Mr. Lenk now is a painting and carpenter contractor under the free enterprise system in our great democracy. I am sure that Mr. and Mrs. Lenk realize that in America titles are unnecessary because every man and woman earns respect and dignity on their own merits.

Over 50,000 Returns Received as Rogers Announces Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, each year it has been my practice to send out a questionnaire to the people of the Sixth District of Florida asking their views on some of the important issues before the Congress.

At the cutoff date for tabulation this year, 50,213 returns had been received. This is the largest response I have seen to any similar poll. That so many people have taken the time to reply is most gratifying and indicates the great interest and concern of our citizens in the affairs of their Government.

It is my belief that these results give a good cross section of American public opinion. Every part of the country is represented in south Florida today, and these people tend to reflect opinions based on their past experiences and backgrounds elsewhere, as well as new outlooks they have assumed since moving to Florida. The native and long-time Florida resident is also well represented in this tabulation.

The questionnaire is distributed through district newspapers as a public service, and by direct mailing. The full range of citizenry is asked to respond, no mailings are done to any special group. The occupational classifications of those who answer indicate that complete diversification has been achieved.

Because of the importance of the views of so many of our citizens, I insert the results of this questionnaire at this point in the RECORD:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No answer
1. Should the United States reduce foreign aid?	87.0	10.8	2.2
2. Do you favor the Rogers bill to ban all trade with Castro's Cuba?	96.2	2.9	.9
3. Do you favor a reduction of transportation taxes?	74.3	21.5	4.2
4. Do you favor U.S. purchase of U.N. bonds?	29.9	63.8	6.3
5. Should a new Federal department of Cabinet rank be created for urban affairs?	20.1	72.7	7.2
6. Do you approve an increased social security tax to provide medical care for the aged?	47.2	50.4	2.4
7. Do you favor Federal aid for—			
A. School construction?	42.5	55.2	2.3
B. Teachers' salaries?	30.8	65.9	3.3
8. Should the United States lower tariffs to compete in the European Common Market?	60.5	31.8	7.7
9. Do you favor my proposal for systematic annual reduction of the national debt?	93.1	3.4	3.5

The Poll Tax and Hamilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with House action passing the resolution authorizing the antipoll tax amendment, this letter from Clarence K. Streit, of Washington, deserves attention. Mr. Streit, in my opinion one of America's clearest thinkers in foreign policy, is editor of Freedom and Union magazine.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 26, 1962.

Robert E. Baker's article in yesterday's Post said that "one nice touch" in the Senate's approval of the amendment abolishing the poll tax in Federal elections was the coupling of it with approval of a resolution making Alexander Hamilton's home a national monument. But the reason he gave for calling this a "nice touch" did a great man an injustice which, although I feel sure it was not intended, is nonetheless outrageous. He explained:

"Hamilton, certainly one of the Nation's greatest Founding Fathers, nevertheless opposed a broad electorate, distrusting the people's capacity to govern, and once in an argument with Thomas Jefferson said: 'Your people, sir, is nothing but a beast.'"

The coupling of this amendment with Hamilton was in fact a "nice touch" for a reason precisely the opposite of the ironical one Mr. Baker gives. Partisan sloganeering has made his view of Hamilton so widespread that it is high time to turn to the record.

The fact is that the first move in the Federal Convention in 1787 to broaden the electorate was made by Hamilton who on May 30 proposed that "the rights of suffrage in the National Legislature ought to be proportioned to the number of free inhabitants" only, instead of alternatively to "the quotas of contribution" made financially by the States. The next day he was among the majority that voted that the people instead of the State legislatures should elect the members of the Federal House.

On June 21, Madison noted that Hamilton spoke against a renewed effort "to transfer the election from the people to the State legislatures," and held this "would essentially vitiate" the Constitution; while Yates recorded Hamilton as saying, "It is essential to the democratic rights of the community, that this branch be directly elected by the people."

On August 13, he opposed requiring 7 years citizenship for Members of the House, moved to "require merely citizenship and inhabitancy," and was voted down. On September 8, according to Madison, Hamilton "expressed himself with great earnestness and anxiety in favor" of increasing the number of Representatives. He "avowed himself a friend to a vigorous Government, but would declare at the same time, that he held it essential that the popular branch of it should be on a broad foundation."

He developed this view further on June 21, 1788, in contending against a hostile majority in the New York State convention for ratification of the Federal Constitution. He said: "The true principle of a republic is that the people should choose whom they please to govern them. Representation is imperfect in proportion as the current of popular favor is checked. The great source of free government, popular election, should be perfectly pure, and the most unbounded liberty allowed."

As Richard Morris says in his biography, "Alexander Hamilton": "Antifederalist propaganda created an image of Hamilton as the arch-foe of democracy. Actually, Hamilton in the early portion of his career enthusiastically supported popular government * * *. Sharing as he did the pessimistic view of human nature with other Founding Fathers, Hamilton would be expected to temper his initial enthusiasm for mass action, to support representative rather than direct democracy. * * * Hamilton's real enemy was not the people but the State machines. He saw the people as a check upon unlimited State sovereignty, and he was ever zealous in tightening the bonds between the people and the Federal Government. * * * Despite the increasing conservatism of his later years he never abandoned these principles."

Let us bury the partisan propaganda of the past, instead of blindly accepting and spreading it now as if long-continued repetition had converted it into historic fact. Surely it is outrageous enough that our Federal Union, which owes its very existence so much in so many ways to the rare virtues of Alexander Hamilton has not yet raised a fitting memorial to him, and is proposing now only to preserve his home as a national monument.

One word more. To couple Hamilton thus with the amendment to abolish the poll tax is a nice touch indeed in still another nonironic sense. For it was Hamilton who, on September 10, 1787, made the motion and the argument in the Federal convention that extended to Congress the right to propose amendments which it is now exercising, but which the first draft of the Constitution limited exclusively to two-thirds of the States.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE STREIT,
President, Federal Union, Inc.

Tribute to State Senator Keith Short, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relative to the life, the accomplishments, and the splendid character of the late State Senator Keith Short, of Jackson, Tenn.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun, Aug. 25, 1962]

SENATOR KEITH SHORT

Tennessee has suffered a great loss in the sudden death of State Senator Keith Short.

An able lawyer, Senator Short's talents for leadership were being studied with the view of elevating him to the responsible position of speaker of the State senate in 1963.

His first term in office had shown him to such good advantage that he had no opposition in his bid for the Democratic nomination for reelection. His road to the second term seemed open.

Valuable as his services in the general assembly have been, Jacksonians will remember him better for many other services he has rendered his home community.

Quiet and calm under all circumstances, he demonstrated the ability to "get the job done" whether in his vocation of law or in his many other interests.

He was one of the group which founded the boosters club which has meant so much to the success of Jackon High School athletic teams year after year.

He was a leader in the Jackson Exchange Club, extending his influence throughout the State when elected to the presidency of the Tennessee Exchange Clubs.

He served as president of the Jackson-Madison County Bar Association, and was prominent in the affairs of the State and national organizations.

Through all of these and other activities, he carried the same spirit of service which was evident in his membership of the Episcopal Church.

As Dr. Frank N. Butler, rector of St. Luke's Episcopal Church, said, "Keith took his religion into all his life. Whether it was football, or law, or the completion of St. Luke's stained glass windows, he saw his efforts through the eyes of his religion."

May the memory of his many accomplishments serve to soften the loss felt by his family, his friends, and his community.

Russia Losing Out in Algeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following news article from the Washington Post of August 18, 1962:

HAS RUSSIA LOST OUT IN ALGERIA?

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

Communists, who proclaim themselves the leading exponents of national liberation, appear to be on the outside of the grandest national liberation movement in years—in Algeria. Experts hedge their claims about the future but now, they say, neither the Soviet Union nor the Algerian Communist Party has any appreciable influence on the politics or ideology of the world's newest ex-colony. Chinese influence is considered to be mainly a cold-war neurosis.

By Marxist theory, Algeria should have been a sitting duck. It had the imperial-colonial aspect of political and economic control by a foreign power, and a racial angle, too. But the Soviets barely took aim.

Before 1953, Stalin's obsession with two camps, Socialist and capitalist, inhibited Soviet interest in a land that did not fit well in either. Khrushchev quickened that interest but his dogma had its hindering contradictions.

For one, Algeria has a relatively puny proletariat, the supposed agent of revolution. It has a national bourgeoisie—including its current leaders—but most of it is or was French and where the national element pleases the Kremlin, the non-Socialist element does not.

Moscow may also have been slowed by a certain split vision of de Gaulle: The French President leads a capitalist state, a member of NATO at that; but he balances a resurgent Germany and unsettles the Western Alliance.

Paralysis induced by such conflicts as these, practical difficulties of language and logistics and the caution appropriate to a country whose fingers often have been burned in Africa have kept the Soviet Union at a distance. It talks loudly but carries a small stick.

It has feted a few Algerian visitors but it gave little known material aid to the rebels and did not recognize the Provisional Government before independence. Even now, it has withheld the bait of economic aid, sending only a token shipload of gift wheat. Like the United States, it has only a chargé d'affaires in Algiers.

The Algerian Communist Party, old and always small, had its own problems. The chief one was that it never won local confidence because it was largely French in composition and policy. Formerly the French party preached assimilation, a policy aimed at not imperiling the interests of French workers through loss of a profitable colony. With the revolution, French Communists took a generally French position.

President de Gaulle took the party off the imperialist hook by working for an Algerian settlement which, with belated honor, it could second. But the French orientation remains: L'Humanite, the French Communist paper, is the one cited today by the Soviet press in Algerian affairs.

Then, Algerian Communists were in double jeopardy with the French for being not only nationalists but Communists. The French suppressed the party in 1955, arrested or detained a number of its leaders, and instituted political repressions under which even straight nationalists could barely survive. One leader, Henri Alleg, managed to escape from jail and write a sensational and undenied books, "La Question," on the ideologically safe topic of his torture by Franch paratroopers. Alleg is again editing the party's newspaper, Algier Republicain, which resumed publication last month. It is currently complaining about censorship.

Like L'Humanite and Pravda, the Soviet Communist Party organ, Algier Republicain is repeating the standard Communist offer of an alliance of progressive forces. Ben Bella, strong man of the controlling Political Bureau, is following the lead of other nationalist leaders in brushing the offer off. The party is not expected to be represented in any strength, if at all, in the forthcoming Constituent Assembly. Understandably, it is not picking horses in the struggle for power in Algeria.

The unanswered question is what if any Communist leanings, incipient or suppressed, reside in the leading personalities or power groups of today's Algeria. On this the authorities here have too little information and too much discretion to speculate. The feeling in Washington seems to be that the new regime will be strongly nationalistic and distinctively Socialist. We may not be overjoyed with this but, the experts believe, the Communists won't be, either.

The U.S. Offer: An Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday this week I gave to my colleagues a report of my observations of events last week in Geneva, at the 18 Nation Disarmament Conference. I described the two draft treaties presented on Monday of this week to the Conference by the United States and Great Britain. I stated why I believed it was important for us to continue to try to negotiate.

On the same day that I spoke, two newspapers, one an important daily in my hometown of Newark, the other, a nationally distributed and respected daily, devoted editorials to the subject of disarmament, and the two treaties offered.

I believe their appraisals will prove most interesting to my colleagues, and under permission previously granted insert them into the RECORD at this point:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 28, 1962]

THE LATEST DISARMAMENT OFFER

Most people are weary or cynical about talk of arms control by now. They shouldn't be. The impossible may take a little longer but there are times when it still has to be done.

Say, if the critics will, that arms control does seem impossible. The Russians would have to agree to it and they evidently won't. Worse, the Chinese Communists are equally indispensable to any control agreement and they seem more adamant.

So the present Western offer at Geneva—a ban on all but underground testing—looks like a maneuver only. It fixes blame on the Russians who are again saying "No." But it doesn't get anywhere.

This is the standard interpretation. It is accurate as far as it goes.

But look at the same impasse from the other end. A world strewn with nuclear weapons, competitively urged by the big power blocs on the small. Ultimately a world bristling with homemade nuclear weapons brandished by men so impassioned with local quarrels that they want war, heedless of the larger consequences.

This is equally impossible.

So the Western plan is not merely a maneuver. It keeps the ball in play. Already the Russians had to retire from one position which looked not unreasonable—permitting inspection—to a position which is much harder for them to justify—no inspection at all. One day, with further work on apparatus which will distinguish earthquakes from underground nuclear tests, this rug will very likely be pulled out from under them, too. Internal inspection, in that event, would not be necessary for underground control any more than for control of tests in the atmosphere.

Or there may be another route into arms control which the Russians would find it to their advantage to accept tomorrow or the day after, and which might stir Peiping. Control of production and means of delivery of nuclear weapons presents even more stubborn problems than control of tests. But they are different problems, untarnished by the test-ban struggle.

It is hard to foresee how the break might come. But the way of ingenuity is to keep trying. This the Western Powers are doing and they are entitled to a lot better than "a dismal, universal hiss, the sound of public scorn."

Significantly, the quotation is from "Paradise Lost."

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Aug. 28, 1962]

FAIR OFFER

The United States and Britain have offered Russia a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underground—all without onsite inspections.

It isn't that the West trusts the Kremlin not to cheat. It's just that Washington and London are somewhat belatedly conceding what scientists have believed for some time—that such tests can be detected from remote points.

Underground tests, however, are excluded from this proposal because policing them still requires investigation on the spot. But the Western plan does cover all tests that produce widespread fallout. It would thus lift that nightmare from mankind. It would make it easier to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations. And it would slow down the arms race in an important area by curtailing development of evermore deadly nuclear weapons.

The offer goes very far in meeting the Communist phobia that inspection will be merely a cover for espionage. But the Kremlin apparently still wants all tests banned with no onsite inspection whatever. The excuse given is that the West will continue to gain military advantage by underground blasts. Obviously, this cuts both ways.

But the West, too, would prefer a ban on all tests, including those underground. The Kremlin can have it by agreeing to the very limited inspection asked by the democracies—a maximum of 12 annual onsite checkups. Surely, even through Red-colored glasses, this cannot be regarded as very extensive spying.

Eighty Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the year 1962 is the 80th since the founding of the Knights of Columbus, in New Haven, Conn. It was on January 16, 1862, that Father Michael J. McGivney met with nine men in New Haven to discuss the project of forming a fraternal and benevolent order that would work to foster both patriotism and religious principle among its members and as far as its influence might reach. After several meetings the name "Knights of Columbus" was decided upon, and the order, the first national fraternal organization to be incorporated in Connecticut, received its charter from the State on March 29, 1882.

From this modest beginning the order has grown, slowly at first, and then at increasing speed, until now it numbers more than a million and a quarter members in all States of the country, with representation also in Canada, Cuba, Mexico, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Panama. Throughout its history, the order has worked strenuously for the cultivation of the patriotic spirit among Catholics, particularly in the education of youth.

Mr. Speaker, from the beginning, the Knights of Columbus sought to preserve the stability of the homes of its members, by providing financial means to assist in the upkeep of the families and education of the children of deceased members. It early began a campaign that, through the years, has acquired increasing importance—to promote public dissemination of the truth about the faith to which they belong by forthright factual answers to calumny. The voice of the order has also been heard, frequently and consistently, in defense of the ideals of tolerance and freedom of religion. The education of American youth was an early and constant concern of the order, and many scholarships have been provided, at different academic levels, for the education of youth, always including such subjects as American history, American government, and American constitutional history. From the time of World War I the Knights of Columbus has been known for its work for the benefit of the Armed Forces, in peace and war, whether alone or in partnership with other organizations. It has also sponsored scholarships for the children of those who have given their lives in battle in the wars of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in its westward expansion, the order first reached the Pacific coast and the State of California with the establishment, in 1902, of San Francisco Council 615. Los Angeles and then other California cities quickly set up councils, and on May 13, 1903, the California State Council was organized, in Los Angeles, this being the first State council of the Knights of Columbus west of the Rockies. Los Angeles, too, was host to the second supreme convention to be held outside the order's birthplace, New Haven—the convention of 1905. The choice of California for this convention demonstrated in dramatic fashion the intention of the order to be truly national in scope and interests, and to use its national conventions as a means of stimulating interest in the order, in one geographical region of the country after another.

In 1921 the supreme convention was again held in California, this time in San Francisco—a convention that was heralded as the best attended, best publicized, and the most productive supreme convention in the history of the order up to that time. At this memorable convention the Knights of Columbus undertook to follow up their magnificent war work of World War I with a peacetime program comparable in scope and cost. More than $7 million was devoted to projects of hospitalization and educational work for disabled and other ex-service men, for the maintenance of college scholarships for some 400 veterans, and for other projects including a continuing educational drive against extreme radicalism, and the initiation of an antituberculosis campaign. It was at this convention, too, that John H. Reddin, supreme master, fourth degree, announced the initiation of one of the most worthwhile efforts of the Knights of Columbus, the Knights of Columbus fourth degree American history movement. It was at this convention that Edward F. McSweeney, chairman of the then newly established Knights of Columbus Historical Commission, gave an address setting forth the principles that were to inspire the educational and scholarly work of this commission. The keynote of his address, as of the work since done and sponsored by the commission, is in the spirit of the quotation from Daniel Webster:

> In America, a new era commences in human affairs, distinguished by free representative government, by entire religious liberty, by improved systems of national intercourse, by a newly awakened and unconquerable spirit of free inquiry, and by a diffusion of knowledge through the community, before altogether unknown and unheard of. America, our country, fellow citizens, our own dear and native land, is inseparably connected, fast bound up, in fortune and by fate, with these great interests. If they fall, we fall with them: if they stand, it will be because we have sustained them. Let us contemplate then, this connection which binds the prosperity of others to our own; and let us manfully discharge all the duties which it imposes. If we cherish the virtues and principles of our fathers, Heaven will assist us to carry on the work of human liberty and human happiness.

Mr. McSweeney chose the occasion of the San Francisco convention to issue a ringing statement of permanent renunciation, in domestic matters, of the narrow sectional interests of New England and the Eastern States, and repudiation, in foreign relations, of exclusive attachment to European alliances and the partnership with the British Commonwealth. Mr. McSweeney expressed, for the Knights of Columbus, the broad westward vision, eminently suited to the name of Columbus, an organization in which patriotic fervor and historical scope took in the whole continental United States, and whose prophetic vision looked toward trade, friendship, and alliances with the people of those eastern lands that lie westward of our Pacific coast.

Mr. Speaker, San Francisco is also inseparably linked with the inauguration of the great tradition of humanitarian service by the Knights of Columbus, the San Francisco disaster of 1906 having inspired the members of the then small order to heroic efforts on behalf of the injured, the homeless, the orphaned, and destitute. Within a very few months, a relief fund of $100,000 had been collected, and a committee of local Knights undertook the vital task of distributing this money for the best advantage of the city and its stricken people. It is worthy of mention, for the honor of San Francisco and of the San Francisco Council of the Knights of Columbus, that within 2 years the San Francisco Knights had repaid to the supreme secretary $65,000 of the money that had been freely given for the relief of San Francisco's disaster victims.

The precedent of generous and prompt relief, set in San Francisco, was soon followed on the occasion of the floods that struck Ohio and Indiana in 1913, of the Illinois cyclone of 1917, the Corpus Christi storm of 1919, and on many another occasion of major disaster, whether within the United States or in foreign lands. Many who know nothing else of the Knights of Columbus, know it as the organization which brought immediate and generous aid when the need was the greatest.

Many Californians remember the supreme convention of 1952, held in Los Angeles. That year marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of the founder of the order, Father Michael J. McGivney, the 70th anniversary of the founding of the order itself, and the 50th anniversary of the extension of the order to the west coast, with the inauguration of San Francisco's council 615. To San Franciscos, and to all Californians, who cherish the tradition of the Spanish missions that first established European culture and Christian faith on the shores of the Pacific, the view of American history taken by the Knights of Columbus is most welcome and congenial. Their emphasis is on the various streams of culture, religious and national, that entered into the makeup of America; on the explorers and missionaries, as well as the settlers; on the French, Spanish, and Dutch, as well as the English; on the south, west, and north, as well as the east. We deeply appreciate a religious patriotism that transcends the boundaries of denomination, and dissociates itself from national jealousies and selfishness. It is the measure of the quality of this organization and its work that it has received the wholehearted commendation of men of all creeds. I know that the Knights of Columbus will carry on, through the years to come, their noble tradition of devotion and service to God and country.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to your attention the names of a number of individuals who are carrying on the vital work of the Knights in San Francisco. They are to be congratulated for their devoted efforts in making the Knights a viable instrument for good They are:

The Honorable Edward Molkenbuhr, P.S.D., past State deputy; the Honorable William T. Sweigert, P.S.D.; F. Everett Cahill, P.S.D.; Hon. C. Harold Caulfield; Tom O'Connor; Joseph M. Cummins; Charles F. Schroth; John F. Schroth; Charles Pons; James E. Fields; Alvin J. Lambert; Tom Dolin; Joseph J. Peterson; Paul Gysels; George B. Gillis; Mark Bentley; John P. Bacigalupi; William G. Reynolds; Fred Augustini; Cosmo Antista; John Bohach; Francis Brennan; J. Francis Shirley; Charles Gallagher; the Honorable Thomas P. White, P.S.D.; Fidel J. Martinez; Ambrose Kerwin; Thomas F. Duffy, P.S.D.; John J. Enright; Sergio A. Scarpa; Sylvester Andriano; Joseph I. McNamara; Everett B. Livermore; Joseph A. Kiernan; John A. Brucato; Harold F. Roesch; Thomas J. Melon; Emmet P. Lucey; Frank R. Pitts; John P. Figone; Maurice T. Murphy; Spencer B. Lane; Dion Holm; Paul M. Hupf; Hon. Edward M. Gaffney; Hon. Charles W. Meyers, Martin C. McDonough; Joseph Barrett; Raymond D. Williamson; Dominic Bozzanella; John F. Henning; Chris McKeon, Dr. Joseph G. Mayerle; and Raymond J. Rath.

The John Birch Society in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, what is the appeal in the John Birch Society for a young, successful, well-educated businessman? In this third of a series of six, Detroit Free Press Staff Writer Barbara Holliday, who joined the society without identifying herself as a reporter and who became an active member for many months to make these reports, puts one John Birch member in candid focus:

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY IN MICHIGAN

If there is a single reason for the growth of the John Birch Society, it is grassroots action.

Robert Welch is an efficient organizer. He is also a pretty astute observer of human nature.

And he hit the jackpot when he dreamed up a do-it-yourself way to fight communism.

His monthly projects are just the right size for every member to bite off and chew—from the little old lady in white tennis shoes to the retired self-made businessman.

Every time he asks someone to send off a post card on one project or another, he prefaces it with a buildup that makes that post card a flaming sword and its sender a modern-city crusader.

For the more ambitious of his recruits there are meater things to get their teeth into.

This promise of action is attracting new young blood to the society—those in the 30-to-40 age group and college-age conservatives.

Without exception they are angry and frustrated over Communist advances in the cold war.

Without exception they want to strike back.

And almost to a man they are eager and anxious to get into politics.

Said one young coed: "I think grownups had better learn about these student groups. They dismiss us as beatniks. The beats do not engage in politics. We're dying to jump in with both feet."

If the Welch solutions are too simple, they still offer a quick and ready answer.

And the far right is more than cordial to a recruit with political fervor.

Les Crane is a good example of the younger Detroiters who are becoming active in the society.

It was later in my Birch membership that I met with him at his Huntington Woods home to discuss reactivating chapter 290, which had fallen on evil days.

He showed me into the living room, a welcome change from the cloak-and-daggerish basement setting I had come to expect.

The only indication of official business was the American flag standing discreetly against the gold and black print draperies, and a copy of American Opinion on the lamp table.

A long, low, modern couch stood against one wall. Planters, lamps, and books lent an air of warmth and coziness.

An unusual mosaic tile coffee table stood in front of the couch and there was good modern art on the walls—with a striking abstract plaque over the fireplace.

Les Crane is a graduate of Wayne State University. He is tall, dark-haired, in his midthirties.

He has large inquistive eyes that sparkle when he talks and a rather round boyish-looking face. He is an inveterate pipe smoker.

Crane is in the car business and prospering. His house is up for sale because he is in the process of building a home in Grosse Pointe.

His wife is attractive, young, and has a new baby. I saw two other children, a boy of 11 or 12, and a small daughter.

Crane explained that he had just taken over this chapter—he formerly belonged to the Berkley chapter—that he had not been too dutiful about attending meetings and had not yet gathered up all the machinery.

REPORTS CONSERVATIVE TREND IS GROWING

I asked if any of his prospective members were active in the "freedom in action" group in Birmingham. He said they were, though he had not been attending himself.

"There are more conservatives around than you would suspect," he said.

"The trend is growing all the time. I run into people every day who are good conservatives but haven't found a way to make contact.

"A friend told me the other day: 'I am in my thirties and have never yet voted in a national election because I couldn't find a candidate honest enough to vote for'."

"You know," Crane added, biting down on his pipestem, "that's what I'd really like to do—get into politics. If I could figure out how to live and do that too, I would.

"I have 20 Blue Books (the Birch manual) and I pass them out regularly. It was after reading the Blue Book that I became convinced there would never be a war with Russia, because it won't be necessary.

"This same friend of mine has been with CID. He says the list of Communist agents active right in our Military Establishment is unbelievable.

"That is what they hope for, you know, a military coup. And what can civilians do? Once we get them alerted and they take to the streets—it will be too late. The tanks will be coming."

VOICES HIS VIEWS ON TEXAS POLITICS

I asked Crane if he had seen Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, on a Sunday TV show.

"No," he said. "How did he do?"

"Pretty good."

"You know," Crane observed, "it's getting so a man doesn't dare say what he thinks in this country any more. Even Columnist George Sokolsky turned on Gen. Edwin A. Walker today and said he's lost the election.

"But they don't know Texans. They're Democrats but they're solid conservatives. They're going to have to have an awfully strong Democratic candidate to beat Walker."

Walker later ran sixth in the field of candidates.

"I know Texas," Crane continued. "We lived there for a while. It's a shame, you know. The South is conservative—but it's also Democratic. And they're controlling legislation.

"I got into real trouble one time at the home of a friend down there. His father was what you might call an industrialist.

"We were talking about the Negroes and the really more benevolent way they treat them in the South.

"I said, not expressing a personal viewpoint, but trying to be analytical: In the North, they're trying to mix 'em up.

"The old man thought I was a radical and I was never invited back."

I commented that a friend who had worked in the underground in Europe during the war had told me that the American Negro was one of the biggest frustrations the Communists had encountered.

"They expected them to be ready for the picking—a perfect target for the Communist ideology but the American Negro by and large hasn't fallen for it," I explained.

"Some of their leaders have," said Crane. "The rest of them just aren't politically sophisticated enough for communism."

TALK OF ALGIERS, FRANCE AND SOVIET

We talked about Algiers and France.

"Naturally, FLN (the Algerian independence movement) is going to be leftists," Crane said, "because their arms have come from Russia and the East—and we provided the guns for the losing side.

"Kennedy is not ineffective—not at all.

"You know the missile gap has been downgraded 95 percent. Before the election we were told how far we were behind—now they're telling us we're ahead. The whole thing was a fraud.

"Russia ahead of us?

"Do you know, I went into an Army equipment store the other day. It was packed with computers, beautiful things of precision, but already out of date—selling for $2 or $3.

"Do you realize the base an economy has to have to operate like that?"

"They don't even have side roads in Russia—just the main highways. You'd have to travel off the main road in a jeep, if at all.

"They only have one railroad from the Pacific across Siberia. And we are crisscrossed with over 200 lines.

"And we call them a highly developed country.

"The French have diagrams of the way the Russians launch their rockets. It sounds like something out of science fiction (I used to be quite a bug).

"They seem to have a big track built down the side of a mountain, curved up at the end.

"They apparently get their rockets up to about 1,000 miles an hour before they ever leave the ground. About as primitive as you can get.

"But there's never been a thing about that printed in this country.

"VICTORY, NOT PEACE, SET AS U.S. GOAL

"Do you know how the next war is going to be fought—if we are fighting Russia?" Crane asked.

"We will land paratroops right in the heart of Russia, encircle the country with atom bombs ready to fire and they'll be paralyzed. There is no way in the world they could reach us or get us out.

"What we need to work for is victory * * * not peace.

"This is the one thing Senator BARRY GOLDWATER keeps coming back to 'let's work for victory.' And it's what the American people really want. Victory."

He picked up the magazine U.S.S.R. published from the Soviet Embassy in Washington. (We distribute Amerika in the Soviet by reciprocal agreement.)

"Pretty handsome, isn't it?" Crane commented. "Almost as good as Life, if not better.

"What I like to do is look beyond the articles at the pictures. Look at this one—this is supposed to be a town that is an industrial hub of activity in Siberia. Notice anything?

"There's not a single automobile on the street—one bus—that's all. Do you suppose they got all the horse-drawn carts out of the way so the picture could be taken?

"Can you imagine any city or small town in this country where you could take a picture in the daytime with no cars in evidence?"

BLAMES BACKGROUND FOR LIBERAL IDEAS

Crane's wife brought in tea and left.

He spoke of a professor at Wayne State.

"He's a liberal—pretty far left—but he has a good mind—a very good mind."

He fell silent for a moment.

"I wonder," he said, "how a man that intelligent can be so fooled. It must be something in his background, poverty as a child perhaps, that makes him resent society—say, 'This is society's fault.'

"And yet, he's a professor at a university. Pretty good progress for a poor boy—and society let him get there."

There was some wonder and a good deal of contempt in his voice.

Crane doesn't need a stump. All he needs is an audience—even if it's just an audience of one. He also wants action.

And he won't sit still long unless he finds that "something" to get his teeth into. Chances are he'll find it when he moves to Grosse Pointe and into the heart of the 14th District—where Birchism has been the most virulent.

The Gold Flow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress, and other persons interested in our national financial situation and gold outflow problem, an article written by Mr. B. Barret Griffith entitled "The Gold Flow."

Mr. Griffith has included with his statements a table of our gold reserves since 1860 as follows:

THE GOLD FLOW

(By B. Barret Griffith)

(NOTE.—B. Barret Griffith writes the Griffith Letter and is associated with Wood, Walker & Co., representing them in Colorado Springs. He also is author of the book "Investing Is Adventure.")

(AUTHOR'S NOTE.—In my opinion we are on the threshold of what could be an excitingly constructive and bullish era—if we take the right steps to expand trade, profitably sell our so-called surpluses, and forget Economist Keynes. After all, we don't have to be hurt by honorably discharging our obligations in a realistic fashion.)

The unexpected rapidity with which expected events are occurring in the gold situation call for several brief fololwup comments to those expressed in the gold flow article published in last September-October's Financial Analysts Journal. Most encouraging is the growing public recognition of burdensome taxes, depreciating currencies, and heavy debts, and that this situation is worldwide. Washington has heard of the public's apprehension of the approaching dollar crisis. There is real encouragement in the widespread recognition of today's most formidable problem.

Although unhappily the current Washington administration still seems to be continuing to look to intergovernmental international banking institutions, gold pools, and international monetary agreements to solve the basic insolvency problem indicated by the gold outflow, the writer feels that there are beginning to appear a few of the most bullish signs we have seen in many years. Government seems to be studying trade as a solution to our financial plight at least as seriously as it seems to be regarding the weakness of other currencies as somehow able to solve the weakness of the dollar.

Even though the managers in Washington appear to have the thing "hindside before" because they talk of larger imports when we so desperately need to export goods and services in much greater amount to those countries to whom we owe so much gold, it is nevertheless very bullish, in the writer's opinion, to have the Government looking to expanding trade as the only solution to our unhappy financial situation and the gold outflow. Great hope lies in the real possibility that it may be only a small step to convince Washington that expanding trade demands a good hard currency available to all individuals; that the exchange of goods, after all, is a continuous thing with the only question being as to whether it is carried on peacefully, or by force; and that as debtors the United States of America can well afford to offer to finance under easy terms all our exports to those countries to whom we owe so much gold, in order to tempt them to buy our produce.

All the facilities of Wall Street would help in such financing because after all the obligations would surely be as good as anything now available to the world's investors.

The accompanying table showing the relationship of our gold reserves to the claims upon them emphasizes that something has to be done promptly about our loss of gold reserves. Because the problem is finally recognized and it looks like we may be heading back to work to produce to sell, in order realistically to solve our "free lunch" financial set-back, the writer dares to predict that the most bullish era for our country and her people lies ahead.

U.S. gold reserves versus requirements and potential claims, 1922–61

[In millions of dollars]

End of year	U.S. gold reserve	A	B	Total of A and B	Percent of claims to gold
		U.S. required gold reserves	Foreign short-term dollar balances		
1922	$3,506	$1,686	$1,009	$2,695	76.9
1923	3,834	1,652	990	2,649	69.0
1924	4,090	1,599	1,237	2,836	69.3
1925	3,985	1,558	1,193	2,751	69.0
1926	4,083	1,564	1,639	3,203	78.4
1927	3,977	1,624	2,591	4,215	106.0
1928	3,746	1,621	2,673	4,102	109.5
1929	3,900	1,611	2,673	4,284	109.8
1930	4,225	1,562	2,336	3,897	92.2
1931	4,052	1,781	1,304	3,085	76.1
1932	4,405	1,967	746	2,713	61.6
1933	4,012	2,166	392	2,558	63.8
1934	8,259	2,729	670	3,399	41.2
1935	10,124	3,610	1,301	4,911	48.5
1936	11,422	4,101	1,623	5,724	50.1
1937	12,790	4,170	1,893	6,063	47.4
1938	14,591	5,099	2,158	7,257	49.7
1939	17,800	6,354	3,221	9,575	53.8
1940	22,042	7,897	3,938	11,835	53.7
1941	22,761	8,310	3,679	11,989	52.7
1942	22,739	9,977	4,205	14,202	62.5
1943	21,981	11,902	5,375	17,277	78.6
1944	20,631	14,350	5,820	21,170	102.6
1945	21,083	10,868	7,074	17,942	85.1
1946	21,706	10,731	6,481	18,429	84.9
1947	22,868	11,294	7,135	17,212	75.3
1948	24,399	11,894	7,756	19,650	80.5
1949	24,563	10,753	7,623	18,376	74.8
1950	22,820	11,055	9,222	20,227	88.6
1951	22,873	11,720	9,302	21,022	91.9
1952	23,252	12,055	10,731	22,786	98.0
1953	22,090	12,151	11,771	23,922	108.3
1954	21,793	11,812	12,923	24,735	113.5
1955	21,752	11,975	13,580	25,555	117.5
1956	22,058	12,120	16,428	28,548	129.4
1957	22,857	12,101	16,580	28,681	125.5
1958	20,582	12,036	17,637	29,673	144.2
1959	19,507	12,182	21,472	33,654	173.0
1960	17,804	11,882	23,665	35,547	199.7
1961	16,947	12,095	[1] 25,384	37,479	221.2

[1] Includes $2,826,000,000 foreign holdings of Government bonds and $800,000,000 of debt to IMF which we must repay in gold at the $35 price, regardless of price of gold on repayment date.

Looking Backward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Chattanooga Times, Chattanooga, Tenn., on August 26, 1962:

LOOKING BACKWARD

It is sometimes impossible to fathom the official Washington mind. For instance, a directive came down from Washington that the iron plaques in the national cemetery here quoting stanzas of the poem "The Bivouac of the Dead" should be removed. It is understood that these plaques were used in other national cemeteries and the order applied to all of them.

Col. Creed F. Bates certainly expressed the sentiment of many people of this community when he recently sent the following letter:

CHIEF,
Office of Support Services,
Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.
(Attention of Memorial Division.)

DEAR SIR: I wish to protest the removal of the "Bivouac of the Dead" plaques from the national cemetery at Chattanooga, Tenn.

Since the days of my early youth these plaques have elicited my attention with touching appeal.

Many of us feel that in a unique way these plaques accentuate the picture, enhanced the atmosphere, and poignantly and fittingly verbalized our sentiments about this final resting place of our heroic dead.

It is hoped that these plaques may again be placed in this cemetery.

Sincerely,

CREED F. BATES.

Theodore O'Hara, author of the poem, served in the Mexican War, enlisted as a private and reaching the rank of major. Later he was editor of the Mobile Register.

No one could possibly conceive a more appriate poem for a national cemetery.

The opening stanza is familiar to all:

> "The muffled drum's sad roll has beat
> The soldier's last tatto;
> No more on life's parade shall meet
> That brave and fallen few.
> On fame's eternal camping ground
> Their silent tents are spread
> And glory guards with solemn round,
> The bivouac of the dead."

O'Hara wrote the poem to commemorate the Kentuckians who fell in the Battle of Buena Vista. It was in a way an appeal for the return of the fallen heroes to their native soil, and they were brought back home:

> "Sons of the dark and bloody ground
> Ye must not slumber there,
> Where stranger steps and tongues resound
> Along the heedless air.
> Your own proud land's heroic soil
> Shall be your fitter grave;
> She claims from war his richest spoil,
> The ashes of her brave."

The poem is in 12 stanzas of similar length. Only the appropriate lines were included on the plaques long resting in the national cemetery here and in some other national cemeteries.

Theodore O'Hara died in Alabama in 1867. The Legislature of Kentucky paid him a fitting tribute by having his body removed to Frankfort and placed by the side of the heroes he so worthily commemorated in his famous poem.

As Colonel Bates so truly stated in his letter, the quotations from the poem enhanced the atmosphere and poignantly verbalized the sentiments which fill the heart of anyone who visits the national cemetery. One cannot understand the official mind which thinks such noble sentiment out of place in the last resting place of heroes.

Word from the officials is anxiously awaited. Surely many Chattanoogans will regret the removal of the plaques. Why cannot they be replaced?

Oil: Economic Weapon To Win the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Monday's edition of the Washington Post accents on its editorial page a problem of menacing potential to the free world in our continuing effort to win the cold war. This is the problem caused by the Soviet Union dumping cheap oil on the markets of the free world.

Soviet Russia's ruthless use of petroleum as a weapon in the cold war is a problem of serious proportions, a problem which cannot be overrated. This Soviet economic weapon is powerful. It can destroy or badly disrupt the unity necessary among the free nations. It also causes damaging effects to Western oil interests which cannot reasonably compete.

The latest attempt by the Soviets to drive a wedge into free world unity is pointed out in the Post editorial. This is Premier Khrushchev's offer to the Japanese to extend an oil pipeline from Irkutsk to oil-hungry Japan.

This is but one example in the continuing Communist effort to destroy petroleum price stability and long-standing market relationsips while creating rifts in the economic solidarity of the free peoples of the world. Perhaps the most dramatic example is in Italy where an increasing trade in cut-rate Russian oil has posed many new problems in European-American relations.

By agreements and contracts which increase their dependence upon below-cost shipments of Communist oil, the people of Italy play directly into Russian hands, and do serious injury to the course of European-American cooperation.

The Russians are able to undercut Western oil producers by placing inflated prices on petroleum behind the Iron Curtain and dumping it at ridiculously low prices on the free side of the Curtain.

It is now urgent that every American recognize the seriousness of this problem. Furthermore, we must come up with some constructive new approaches to the use of oil as an effective weapon of the free world in the continuing economic conflict with the Communist world.

Some interesting suggestions were made recently in an editorial in the Tulsa, Okla., Tribune. The Tribune article recommended four possible solutions:

First. Uniform oil policies for the entire NATO community comparable to current weapons programs, with curbs on imports of Soviet oil to each country.

Second. Common policies with regard to preventing Western supplies to the Communists of oil transportation, pipeline, extracting or refinery equipment.

Third. A determined effort, with or without Government assistance, to increase oil exploration or reserves in other areas of the world, more removed from the Soviet pressures.

Fourth. Continued public disclosure of Soviet price-cutting tactics designed to hurt not just the West but also the oil-producing countries dependent on oil revenues.

The Washington Post editorial entitled "Soviet Oil Challenge," succinctly points out the problem. The complete text of the Post editorial follows:

SOVIET OIL CHALLENGE

Premier Khrushchev has thrust a devilishly tempting oil pipeline offer before the oil-hungry Japanese. Seconding Mr. Mikoyan's motion of last August, he offered to extend a Soviet pipeline from Irkutsk to the Pacific if Japan would provide the materials to build it. Japan now takes about 3 percent of its oil from the Soviet Union. A pipeline could bring in 10 times as much at prices perhaps 30 percent lower than existing levels. Jogged by the United States and their own apprehensions, the Japanese have reacted warily toward Soviet oil in the past. Whether the country's growing economic restiveness will make it more hospitable to the pipeline proposal remains to be seen.

The proposal is merely the latest gambit in the increasingly aggressive and effective "Soviet oil offensive." With politics determining prices and repayment and marketing terms, Russian oil exports have climbed at the rate of 6 billion or more metric tons a year since 1958. They now go to nine Western European countries; in Italy the Western oil position has been particularly undermined. The Soviet Government is also stimulating the oil ambitions of a number of key underdeveloped nations, which regard a national oil capability as a matter of independence and status as well as development. The twin goals of Soviet oil policy, to disrupt if not to displace non-Communist oil operations and to apply political leverage in the neutral world, have gained a measure of success which makes Western oil men and statesmen shudder at what may come.

The very real and well-documented prospect of economic and political hardship has so far led to much sounding of alarms in the West but to precious little action. Hobbled by Italian objections, the Common Market nations have sat on a proposal to apply voluntary restrictions to Soviet oil imports. Middle Eastern producers have been inclined to pass the brunt of the Soviet challenge to the West. Western producers have made no substantial changes in pricing and other policies to meet their Communist competition.

A forthcoming administration-requested report from the National Petroleum Council promises to spur official activity. But meanwhile, specific suggestions from congressional and industry quarters on how to arm the United States for imminent oil combat have not been treated with any urgency. Soviet oil indeed represents a stinging neetle to the free world. It must be firmly grasped.

The World Needs the Truth About America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed reading a most thought-provoking and inspirational book by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, "Just Friends and Brave Enemies," realistically outlining the problems facing this Nation in opposing the insidious and skillful Communist effort to win the battle for the minds of young people in many countries around the world.

The Attorney General has written an interesting and lively report on his energetic trip around the world last February to 14 countries, including Japan, Indonesia, and Germany.

The accounts of the Attorney General's spirited discussions with students, labor leaders, officials, and businessmen are worth reading by anyone who intends to travel overseas. His candid answers to questions about the United States and the American people demonstrate what one person can do to help get the truth abroad.

The Attorney General found an appalling amount of misinformation about the United States, our people and our

system of government. He states that the Communists have gained the initiative in the fight for the minds of the men and women who will be the leaders of their countries 5, 10, and 15 years from now. So, it is in the last chapter in which he poses the problem and makes worthwhile suggestions for meeting the Communist challenge, that the book is particularly notable.

The Attorney General's recommendations to get the facts about us and our way of life to the peoples in foreign countries and the need for an imaginative, tough, and self-sacrificing effort on our part, are contained in an article which appears in the most recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post. Under unanimous consent I insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE WORLD NEEDS THE TRUTH ABOUT AMERICA—WRITING FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF HIS RECENT WORLD TOUR, THE PRESIDENT'S BROTHER PROPOSES A PLAN TO SELL U.S. IDEALS ON AN OPEN MARKET

(By Robert F. Kennedy)

Last February in Indonesia an aggressive young Communist student insisted that the United States supports colonialism because we do not stand with Indonesia in its dispute with the Netherlands over West New Guinea. I was interested in learning if he and his vocal companions, who were loud in their criticism of colonialism, were sincere or just propagandizing. Did they opopse the Chinese in Tibet, or the Russians in Hungary, I asked them. They responded that these were not examples of colonialism as the people in those countries supported the regime and had asked for the help of the Chinese and Russian armies. What about East Berlin, I asked. If the people supported the regime, how did they explain the wall?

"Let's talk about West New Guinea. We don't want to discuss details. We want to talk about West New Guiena," the young Communists replied.

I received no support from any other member of the audience of 30 or 35 youth leaders. After the meeting four or five students came to see me, however. They said I was absolutely correct about Communist colonialism. I asked why they didn't say so at the meeting. They explained that they could not speak up because it just was not done. No one criticizes communism, they said.

This incident illustrates one side of a paradox—that the Communists have taken the initiative in seeking to win the allegiance of young people in foreign lands, particularly the new countries, and in some areas have absolutely no opposition. The other side is that despite this, but because of other things we have done throughout our history, there is a tremendous reservoir of good will toward the United States. On our trip to Japan, Indonesia, Germany and 11 other countries we encountered some anti-American demonstrations, but these represented a minority point of view. In these countries and all around the world—among students, intellectuals, officials, businessmen, and labor leaders—there is a profound unspoken admiration for America and the American people. We encountered it over and over again in kind words, the enthusiasm of students, the faces of children and the laughter of grownups. But this reservoir is as yet untapped, and this is the meaning of the failure of the Indonesian students who sided with me to participate in the meeting. This is a tragedy of the past, but it is also the challenge of the future.

CRUCIAL QUESTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

I returned home convinced more than ever that what we do here in the United States will have a major effect on how we meet this challenge and whether we retain our position in the world. We must first keep ourselves prepared militarily, but we must also build our strength in such domestic areas as civil rights, economic productivity, and social security. The struggle we face will take all our effort over the next two or three decades. It will exact a tremendous price. But it is a price we must pay, for if we do not succeed, we lose all.

Particularly in the field of civil rights we must put our own house in order. In every country we visited, at every stop we made, we were asked about the violation of civil rights in the United States. In Japan, in Indonesia, I sensed the hurt and the hostility in many of the questioners. To them I honestly admitted our weaknesses, but I also pointed out the gains we have made and the efforts of the administration and the American people. I told them of the progress we are making in voting, transportation, Federal employment, employment by Government contractors, and also in other fields not directly related to civil rights which nonetheless have a major economic effect on Negroes, such as the minimum wage law, housing, and the extension of social security.

We must realize, however, that as long as major inequities exist anywhere in our country, we will have problems abroad. We have to move ahead here in the United States not only because it is right but also more selfishly because our freedom and our strength overseas depend upon our progress. We cannot successfully portray ourselves as believing in the Constitution and freedom if at home we treat a portion of our population as inferiors.

It may appear incongruous to say that our foreign position will be determined by what we do to find employment for the miners of West Virginia, for the unemployed of the iron range of Minnesota, or for the 26 million young people who will join the labor market in the next 10 years. But it is true. Our democratic, free enterprise system in competing with Marxism in a worldwide arena. America's position throughout the world, as well as the general cause of freedom, will be affected by the way we handle these problems, as well as our treatment of freedom riders or sit-ins or any others who are struggling for equality. If major progress is not made in these purely domestic areas now and in the next decade, our world position will be seriously shaken.

The leaders of the nations of Asia, Africa, South America, and the Middle East during the sixties, seventies, and the eighties will be the intellectuals, the college students, the labor leaders of today. We cannot change their minds and interest them in democratic principles unless we are successfully practicing them at home.

When I visited Bonn, the first question asked by a group of German students was, "Why is the United States so unpopular with intellectuals and university groups, especially in Asia?"

That conclusion is widely accepted here in the United States as well as abroad. Certainly that was my understanding before taking this trip. It is a verdict which I now believe to be completely unwarranted. However, unless we take major steps immediately, 10 years from now it will be true. We must begin now to answer the cries that are raised against us.

An analysis of the worldwide impression that our system is unpopular can reveal the source of our difficulties, our problems, and some possible solutions. First, we must recognize that in many countries, as we saw on our trip, there is a strong and vocal Communist opposition to the United States and to our way of life. This opposition is well organized. Highly disciplined cadres concentrate their activities in universities, labor organizations, and intellectual groups. Most frequently the leaders are energetic, courageous, and articulate. They have a party line they follow rigidly. They know exactly what they think. They know where they are going, and they are willing to use any means to achieve their ends.

Within each of their countries, these groups exploit, frequently with devastating effect, the areas of differences between their country and the United States. In those countries which were formerly colonial possessions, the local inhabitants are apt to have an anti-European bias, and the Communists are frequently successful in their efforts to associate us with that antagonism. Beyond that, they take advantage of their nation's policy differences with the United States.

Communists vocally and actively back Indonesia's claim to West New Guinea. They assert that our failure to support Indonesia's position indicates that we support the Dutch and therefore, favor colonialism.

In Japan the Communists call for us to return Okinawa. Why, they contend, should we be occupying the Ryukyu Islands so long after the war? Again local sentiment is aroused against the United States.

Added to all this is the Communists' dedication. I think back to the young man who stood 10 feet from me at the University of Indonesia in Jakarta and hit me across the face with a piece of hard fruit. He was willing to risk prison to demonstrate his hatred for a representative of the United States.

Against this, as I saw repeatedly, there is no one to question the Communist positions, their facts. There is no pro-democracy organization. There is no disciplined and calculated effort to present another side.

And so it is that a small, able and well-trained unit can take over a meeting or an organization, or even a government.

That was the important lesson of my visit to Waseda University in Tokyo. Approximately 100 students, a small fraction of the 3,000 present, were able to cause near chaos at this meeting. The disrupters, located strategically in twos and threes throughout the jammed auditorium, began to shout and jeer as I started to speak. Bedlam spread. The Communists were yelling, "Kennedy, go home." The anti-Communists were yelling back, and the others were yelling for everyone to keep quiet. Once, when I began to answer the extended argument of a particularly loud-voiced young Communist, every light in the house went out, and the microphone went dead. The power had failed—I could not believe by accident. It was 15 minutes before I was able to resume.

STUDENT HUNGER FOR FACTS ABOUT UNITED STATES

Those devoted young Communists did not want to hear a representative of the United States, and they did all they could to see that no one else could hear. They knew that, if they succeeded, they would seize the newspaper headlines, and the impression would be created once again that university students are antagonistic to the United States. The incident would be further evidence to the rest of the world that intellectuals in Asia are pro-Communist and opposed to America.

Of course, I do not claim that the rest of the students in the hall or outside in the courtyard supported the United States. Nor does the fact that there were no disturbances at Tokyo's Nihon University, or on the campuses at Bandung or Jogjakarta, indicate an acceptance by students at these universities of the American way of life.

But such students are not Communists, they don't accept communism, and they have open minds. That is what is important. They asked many questions about the policies and programs of the United States. Some of the points they raised implied fundamental criticisms of our role in foreign policy and of what we are doing in the United States. By and large they were looking for facts. They were hungry for knowledge, as were the vast majority in every student group to whom I spoke. The student bodies before whom I appeared were as friendly as any other group I had ever addressed, including any in the United States. They are puzzled about many things in the United States, and they want explanations. They hope the answers will give them the truth. But what they have been searching for we have not made available. True, we have given generously of economic aid, but the ideas and philosophies for which they hunger have not been forthcoming. They need—and want—more; it must be made available.

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION AT WORK

The amount of misinformation, as well as the lack of information, about the United States and our system of government in these countries is appalling. Many of the students and intellectuals think of the United States as it was 50 or even a 100 years ago. When I met with a group of labor leaders in Tokyo, Mr. Akira Iwai, representing Sohyo, Japan's largest union, asked me in all apparent innocence, "The basic character of your nation is capitalism, isn't that true? With Morgan, Rockefeller, and all of these in control?" Even men such as Mr. Iwai, of great influence among their countrymen, know nothing of our social gains and little of the aims and aspirations of our people and our Government. The Communists' propaganda machine constantly spews out its facts and figures and its version of how to solve the problems of the world. They broadcast the line that the Soviet Union and Communist China hold the correct philosophy and that the United States is always in error. The United States, on the other hand, is to them a system of "capitalistic imperialism," and everyone from Marx to Khrushchev knows just how cruel and aggressive that system is.

Colonialism is an evil and, as I learned from repeated exposure to student groups, colonialism and capitalism, even imperialism, are interchangeable terms in the minds of many. Because the United States has a capitalistic system, the Communists can charge that, given the opportunity, this country will seek to continue a system of exploitation. The Communists, being opposed to capitalism, are therefore automatically opposed to colonialism. These arguments obviously strike a responsive chord.

No one comes forward with an explanation of the modern-day United States; no one counters with the fact that modern-day colonialism is tied to communism, not capitalism. No one is there to talk about Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Tibet, or East Germany, and East Berlin.

No one is prepared to counter the Communists' arguments with facts and figures. Further, if a representative of the United States arrives in a country to explain the American point of view, a small minority causes a riot, disturbs the performance or disrupts the speech. The incident makes headlines across the world and creates exactly the impression the Communists wish to create—that students oppose Americans. On the other hand, a Communist comes to speak. Those who truly believe in the free system realize that opposition viewpoints should be aired. The Communist speaks, the audience listens, and there is no display. Because of the contrast, the student body is thus pictured as disliking the United States and supporting communism.

We are victims of a smart, articulate, well-organized minority which has kept us continuously on the defensive. We have permitted it to happen; we have allowed it to continue. If we do not meet the problem head on, if we are not ourselves imaginative, tough, dedicated, willing and self-sacrificing, the struggle with the enemy will not be won by them, but lost by us.

In Japan today there are more than 700,000 college students; in Indonesia there are 75,000, where before the war there were only a few hundred; the same situation is true in countries all over the world. These are the people who will be making the decisions in the next decade.

There is a great deal we can do to make available to them the facts about us; to impress upon them that our system of government has made progress in the last 50 years; to let them know that our way of life is far different from what Marx described a hundred years ago; that this progress has been made under the banner of freedom. Fortunately we still have time to take the necessary steps to win the fight for the minds of these young people.

TAKING THE PROPAGANDA OFFENSIVE

These are some of the basic things that we can do:

To all these nations I would send groups of men and women to lecture, not just about the United States and our form of government or about democracy generally, but also about history and philosophy and literature and even more practical matters.

I would have people talk about some of the successes that we've had in the United States and the problems we have had to overcome. I would tell them more about what we have been able to accomplish. I would tell, for instance, about our farms and farm production. This area has largely been ignored. It is the backbone of any society. The failures of the Communist system are apparent while the successes that are being enjoyed in the United States and under the free system are extraordinary. In the free world we recognize the dignity and the worth of every individual and the aspirations he has to improve the living conditions of himself, his family, and his community. The individual is not just a cog in the state machine, as he is when he lives under Communist control. History has recorded the deaths and the heartbreaks in the Soviet Union in the 1930's, during the efforts to impose the Communist system. The newspapers have reported that hundreds of thousands of Chinese have been slowly starving under the collectivization program in the past few years. Certainly comparisons can be made of the relative successes of the two systems.

In the United States a single farmer can cultivate more than three times as much acreage as a farmer on a collective or state farm in the Soviet Union. Furthermore, there is a tremendous contrast in the output per acre. The Soviet Union farm averages 21 bushels of corn per acre to our 55 bushels; 11 bushels of wheat per acre to our more than 26. Most importantly, 48 percent of the labor force in the Soviet Union works on the farms, and they are afflicted with many shortages. In the United States 8 percent of our labor force works on our farms and produces tremendous surpluses.

Compare what has happened in Germany since she was partitioned—West Germany living in freedom and recognizing human rights, and East Germany existing under communism with the individual reduced to a tool of the state. East German farms are now 20 percent below prewar production while West Germany is 41 percent above. In virtually every commodity—wheat, rye, barley, oats, potatoes, to mention a few—West Germany outproduces East Germany in units per acre. Those are only examples of what can be done and what has been done by men under a free system. We have not made sufficient effort to tell this story. And this is only part of it. For the history of America—and, in fact, America today—is full of ideas that are far more exciting and revolutionary than the systematic, pushbutton answers of Communist doctrine. I would like to see more Americans making this point. By not doing so, we are leaving most of the world with the illusion that the only modern philosophy belongs to Marx. Mere anticommunism is not a philosophy; it is no substitute for really knowing what this country is about. Its history, its philosophy, its political thought are all available. They just need to be used.

Most importantly, those we send abroad should go to learn, to listen and ultimately to report to the American people on the aims and problems of the people with whom they meet. They should go to as many universities as possible and should confer with labor leaders, farm and cooperative heads and government officials. The people sent should have a thorough knowledge of the history of the United States and the philosophy of our Government and our people.

Many people more than qualify: FRANK CHURCH, EUGENE MCCARTHY, HUBERT HUMPHREY, PAUL DOUGLAS and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER in the Senate, to mention a few; Cabinet members such as Stewart Udall and Orville Freeman; and many Members of the House of Representatives and of our State governments, both Republican and Democrat.

Outside the auspices of the Government I would also like to see private citizens, such as some of our university professors, playwrights and poets, as well as articulate businessmen and labor leaders, travel under the same kind of program. I would like to see men like Walter Lippmann or David Brinkley tour the Far East for a month, giving talks and answering the questions of students and intellectuals. They, like their Government counterparts, in question periods and at appropriate times, should discuss the United States frankly, admitting our shortcomings, stating our efforts to overcome them and pointing out this country's successes and accomplishments. We need people who have done their homework and who are not afraid to speak out.

HARNESSING THE FREE WORLD'S YOUTH

I would have our Government information agencies and services talk to other peoples more about fundamentals in the United States. I would have them explain the social progress being made in this country, what people are doing for one another, what contributions altruistic organizations such as the United Funds, March of Dimes, and the Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations are making to the American way of life.

I would encourage other free countries of the world to set up their own "peace corps" with the understanding that our organization would cooperate closely with them. There is much, for instance, that young Japanese could do in Southeast Asia, and I am convinced that they would be willing to do it. Many of the young people that I saw in Germany, France and the Netherlands are as eager as young Americans to help their fellowmen in countries less economically fortunate. In all of the students with whom I talked, I found an idealism and a thirst to make the world a better place in which to live. This is a tremendous potential, and it must be harnessed.

To make this kind of program effective or to give any of our efforts real meaning, I repeat that we must live up to our ideals within the United States. We will have a difficult time in selling students in Jogjakarta or Abidjan or Montevideo on our economic system if they read about coal miners in West Virginia being chronically unemployed. It will be impossible to establish our way of life as the one being the most nearly perfect if the crime rate continues to rise four times as fast as our population increases.

And finally we must, despite the tragic disappointments of history and the agonizing betrayals of the past 30 years, constantly seek peace through controlled disarmament, while living with the bitter irony of the need for present military strength in order to maintain our freedom and that of other countries. This is a matter that is recognized by all. A high official of Indonesia, a country frequently critical of the United States, said that his country would lose its independence if the 7th Fleet, with all that it implies, were ever removed from the Far East.

HONEST TALK ABOUT DISARMAMENT

We have taken major steps to keep ourselves prepared. But all of us look and plan toward the day when the major powers of the world will sign a treaty to insure general and complete disarmament. The United States has established an Arms Control Disarmament Agency dedicated to pursue that goal. All this Agency's efforts and all its energies are trained in the direction of disarmament success.

If nations of the world are to find any solution to the challenge of disarmament, it will have to be based on honest discussions and negotiations on specific points. If disarmament is to be feasible, it must be submitted to the authority of international control under a rule of law agreed upon by the various countries. Disarmament cannot be successful if provisions are not made to prevent any state from gaining a substantial military advantage over other states. To be meaningful or effective, a system for international inspection and control must be devised and adhered to.

President Kennedy has presented to the United Nations a specific, detailed, three-stage program to reduce existing armaments and stockpiles and establish a system of inspection and control. It is the most thorough and far-reaching plan that has been suggested by any country.

Unfortunately, until now the Communist system has shown no inclination to accept adequate and necessary safeguards. And the turmoil of the world, from Berlin to Laos to Vietnam to Cuba, dims the prospects for the future.

However, we feel we must continue to make the effort; that if we do not try, no progress will ever be possible.

In the meantime, we know that nothing can be accomplished if we let down our guard—if we are weak. We learned that in the Second World War, and the lesson has been relearned many times. We must remain strong, because only through strength can there be a chance for peace.

Quite aside from the need for military strength in the absence of controlled disarmament, we must endeavor to lead in scientific exploration. The courageous flight of John Glenn, which took place while we were in Rome, did more to establish our prestige and our position throughout the world than almost any other single incident. It was something that was needed by all of us here in the United States. But even more than that, it was the one single event that gave our friends around the globe heart and courage.

Other countries also must realize their responsibilities. As I told an audience of Germans at Bonn, the countries of Europe through their own efforts and ingenuity but also through generous aid from the American people, have been able to rebuild their devastated lands. These countries which are thriving economically have responsibilities now to the more backward countries of Asia and Africa. Some of them have moral responsibilities to former colonial areas, which in many instances in the past were outrageously exploited. Now that people in the new nations have gained their independence, they are entitled to help from all of us in this period of transition.

The Communists obviously have been working for years at sowing seeds which are now budding in many places. They now have fixed in the minds of the intellectuals in many countries inaccurate and false impressions about democracy.

We have made mistakes; we have faults. We can admit them, tell of our progress and talk of our accomplishments, material and spiritual. We have truth on our side. But this is not enough. We must sell the truth. We must make very clear the basic distinction between communism and the free world: that we are the heirs of the true revolution that will not accept the status quo and recognizes that the state exists for the individual and that the individual is not the servant of the state; that we live by the rule of law, with all its fundamental guarantees, that the truth will be known and that citizens will be protected from injustice and tyranny.

BANKRUPTCY OF THE COMMUNIST SYSTEM

Every American knows in his heart the truth of the democratic way of life. But a nice warm feeling in the heart doesn't take the place of knowing what he's talking about.

The Berlin wall has demonstrated, in the most dramatic fashion possible, the bankruptcy of the Communist system. The workers' paradise has had to wall in its people. Communism is a system that will not, despite the height of the walls, be accepted by human beings. West Berlin students rescuing East Berliners from Communist control have demonstrated that to be true. The Chinese refugees fleeing to Hong Kong have demonstrated it; the Vietnamese paratroopers demonstrate it. The Special Service units of the U.S. Army serving in southeast Asia demonstrate it. Gen. Lucius Clay demonstrated it in Berlin, his son in Vietnam.

The challenge is whether we as a people and a nation can demonstrate it. This struggle will be long, costly and will require dedication and hard, unglamorous work. It has already taken many lives and will take more. It can be won—but it also can be lost. The decision is ours.

Historic Celebration at Salisbury, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and privilege of participating yesterday in a celebration commemorating the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of Salisbury, Pa. Walter D. Weise, president of Salisbury Centennial, Inc., gave 2 years of his time and services to the preparation of the historic program now being presented in this community that was first settled in 1753. The remarks I made at this commemorative ceremony follow:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE SALISBURY CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION ON AUGUST 29, 1962, SALISBURY, PA.

It is a pleasure to participate in this centennial program, and to extend my sincere greetings on this occasion, which commemorates the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of Salisbury, Pa.

The success of centennial week is due to the hard-working chairmen and members of the various committees.

Yet without the wholehearted cooperation of businessmen and residents of the community the various committees would have toiled in vain. Therefore, I extend my heartiest congratulations to all of you.

I believe this centennial celebration provides us with a twofold opportunity. First, to commemorate the centennial of Salisbury, and second, to rededicate ourselves to the ideals on which our communities, our States, and our Nation have been founded.

As we review the history of Pennsylvania, we are reminded that before the coming of the white man Somerset County was largely a land of forests.

Nevertheless, there were many glades or natural meadows about the headwaters of nearly all the streams in the central part of the county.

These were so numerous and extensive—it has been said that the name "The Glades" was applied to the entire county.

It was certainly a land of promise. It is not difficult to visualize the beauty of this area in its primitive state. Standing on the summit of either the Laurel Hill or the Allegheny Mountain, other mountain ranges stood out in outline for many miles. Intervening were the hills and valleys—forests and glades.

Historians tell us that several years before any settlements were made in Somerset County, bold and daring hunters from Maryland and Virginia followed the old Indian trails North—and invaded the region in pursuit of wild animals for furs and food.

A few adventurous fur traders also wandered from place to place to trade with the Indians.

One of the most noted of these early fur traders was John Fraser, who erected a storehouse on the Allegheny River, 13 miles above the forks of the Ohio River in August 1753.

It is revealed that John Harris erected a storehouse on the Juniata River in 1753.

It is recorded that he buried Tanacharison, chief of the Iroquois, referred to as "the famous half-king."

The fur trader Harris cared for the old chief's family, but afterwards requested pay from the Province of Pennsylvania for his services.

There were also Indian traders who went with General Braddock's Army as interpreters and some served the Armed Forces of the time as guides.

It is said that neither the hunters nor the fur traders ever "occupied or cultivated the land" and the Indians were left in possession of it until the white settlers arrived.

It would appear that Somerset County never was the permanent home of any considerable number of Indians but the large forests afforded an excellent hunting ground.

The swiftly flowing streams of fresh water provided food fishing for the roving bands. The first settlers of what is now Somerset County were not wealthy. These pioneers traveled over rudely constructed roads and Indian trails. They brought very little of the world's goods with them.

Yet they had brave hearts, strong arms, and full determination to find new homes in the wilds beyond the Allegheny Mountains. Most of them, it is thought, arrived in the springtime.

After erecting a temporary shelter, they set to work clearing away the underbrush, girdling the trees, burning over the new ground, and breaking up the soil as best they could with their rude, homemade implements which consisted of wooden plows, harrows, picks, mattocks, and forks.

Fortunately the site of a cabin-to-be-home was near a never-failing spring which furnished a good supply of cold water.

The inhabitants of the western part of early Bedford County, in their petitions to the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, set forth the great hardships under which they labored by being so remote from the seats of justice and public office. Bedford was the county seat at the time.

In reply to these petitions, the General Assembly of Pennsylvania passed an act on April 17, 1795. It provided that a new county be organized from that part of Bedford County lying west of the Allegheny Mountain, known as Brothersvalley, Turkeyfoot, Quemahoning, Milford, Elk Lick, and Stonycreek townships.

The new county was called Somerset—after the shire of Somerset in England.

Nine years later the place called Elk Lick, in memory of the famous hunting grounds for elk, became Salisbury.

Thus in 1794, Salisbury was founded.

Elijah Wagner was the first burgess of the new borough.

All too often we take our communities for granted and spend little or no time to express our appreciation. This 100th anniversary of Salisbury gives us an opportunity to stop for a moment to reflect and to appreciate. On such an occasion as this we recall the courage of the pioneer. Many had come to live in a new world and to face the necessity of adjusting to new ways of life.

A Civil War had come to our Nation the year before Salisbury was incorporated, in 1861. When this community was officially born, Abraham Lincoln was President and struggles of the war were flanking a relatively new nation. The pages of history in the year 1862 are crowded with accounts of a "Confederacy" and a "Union."

Within our own commonwealth the War Between the States is immortalized by the Gettysburg battlefield, where the turning point of that war cost the lives of so many Union and Confederate soldiers.

We can, however, be eternally grateful that the outcome of that bewildering and bloody period brought peace. It also restored a common purpose to the annals of America. Once again the fundamental principles of freedom were safe in our land.

It was on July 4, 1861, in a message to Congress that Abraham Lincoln spoke of free institutions in the following terms. He stated—and I quote: "It may be affirmed without extravagance, that the free institutions we enjoy have developed the powers and improved the condition of our whole people beyond any example in the world."

Freedom is the most cherished possession found in our American heritage. But when one thinks of freedom—just what comes to mind? Do we think of unlicensed liberty or do we think of freedom containing the elements of self-control? Freedom for the individual implies—as it did 100 years ago—an obligation to self and an obligation to others.

There can be no such thing as unlicensed liberty. Mere obedience to law is not enough to preserve freedom. It is not enough to preserve Americanism. There must be the "spirit"—as well as the "letter" of the law in its observance.

Nowhere else in these United States do the flames of our glorious national history burn brighter than in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania was a haven and home for many Europeans who came to this country seeking refuge.

Many communities, which were formed as experiments in living, thrived briefly and passed into history, but others gained in strength and vigor. In Pennsylvania one can follow the paths of the early pioneers. There are numerous sites of historic forts, frontier outposts, and historic structures.

There are monuments to great leaders and important peacetime events.

From one end of the Commonwealth to the other, one can find the birthplaces of men and women who have had and important part in the development of this Nation.

The early history of the formation of our Nation is, or should be common knowledge. We know our illustrious forefathers, dissatisfied with the colonial rule of the tyrant George III, met in General Congress in Carpenters Hall, Philadelphia, 188 years ago. A total of 55 delegates attended that First Continental Congress, representing all the Colonies except Georgia. Georgia did promise, however, to concur with "her sister Colonies" in their effort to maintain their rights.

The first Congress, as did the Second Continental Congress, which met in the statehouse, known as Independence Hall, petitioned the king asking redress of wrongs. The Congress specifically denied any intention of separating from Great Britain and earnestly expressed a desire for the peaceful settlement of all differences.

The king, by proclamation declared the Colonies to be in rebellion and sent troops to force them to submit to taxation without representation and other equally unjust measures.

On June 7, 1776, Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, moved and I quote: "That these united Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

Lee's motion was seconded by John Adams, of Massachusetts. A committee of five was appointed to draft the Declaration of Independence. Less than 1 month later that historic document was adopted on July 4, 1776. It was signed by John Hancock, president of the Congress and Charles Thompson, secretary. The remaining members signed on August 2, 1776.

From July 4, 1776, until March 1, 1781, the United States of America was governed by a Continental or General Congress. On this latter date the States adopted a constitution called the "articles of confederation and perpetual union between the States."

On May 14, 1787, a convention of 55 delegates met in Philadelphia "to form a more perfect union." Every Colony was represented except Rhode Island.

The Articles of Confederation had been made by the States only—but the opening words of the new Constitution signed on September 17, 1787, declared the form of our present Government: "We, the people of the United States."

At that time our new Nation was the world's youngest. Today, through the benefits guaranteed by the document our eminent forefathers drafted, we are governed by the oldest written form of government in the world.

About this document that was signed on the soil of our own Commonwealth, the great British statesman Gladstone said:

"The American Constitution is, so far as I can see, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

My friends, this is the instrument that was finally adopted by the Constitutional Convention on September 17, 1787, and under which this Nation has been governed since March 4, 1789.

I remind you that next month, on September 17, we will observe Constitution Day. It is appropriate that as we gather to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Salisbury, Pa., we recall the principles involved in the U.S. Constitution.

It is a sacred document that provides the atmosphere of freedom for an occasion such as this. It is our heritage.

Our freedom is not, nor ever has been, a thing to take for granted. It is not a gift from the Government to the people. It is part of our Republic. It represents a faith, a conviction, a belief, a heritage. Our forefathers left us these elements as a treasure.

We have the assurance and the proof that a nation composed of many States, many races, of all colors and creeds, can be governed justly by representation of all those many States, races, colors, and creeds.

It is a heritage of which we should be eternally aware. It is a heritage of which we should be eternally proud. Above all, let us never forget our obligation as American citizens to protect and to defend our precious heritage—the Constitution of the United States.

Penalty for Downhill Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of inserting herewith an article by Henry J. Taylor in the New York World-Telegram Monday, August 27, 1962. This article was sent to me by one of my constituents who, like many of the American people, is terribly concerned about the conditions in the world, and particularly those in Cuba at the present time.

I must say, in all fairness, that this article conveys the feelings of a great bulk of the citizens in my district. And, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I want to make my position very clear, that I agree with this presentation of Mr. Taylor's and that I would be willing to back the President of the United States in any strong and positive action on his part. The time for speeches and words is long since past and we can no longer tolerate the infiltration of countries of the free world; nor can we permit the situation in Cuba to continue, for it is self-evident, no matter how many billions we pour into Latin and South America, that we will inevitably lose unless we take stern and immediate action.

Action I will support, but further meetings and compromises cannot be tolerated. Time is on the side of the Communist world but is running our for the free world and the United States.

The article follows:

PENALTY FOR DOWNHILL DIPLOMACY

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Our President must awaken to the perils of being a downhill negotiator. Surely he will awaken—soon, soon. There are tragic penalties in the affliction. We are paying the latest penalty at the Berlin wall.

The barbarians of this militant world are always sniffing for a kill. They quickly recognize a downhill negotiator. They're quick to see that the high and proper defiances we initially proclaim are followed by quiet concessions that slide their defiances further and further downhill.

They listen. Then they grin and wait. And wait and wait—and win. No first-class power can survive this process. None ever has, including Rome.

We cannot be a nation that first shakes its fist, then its finger, and then shakes its head. The handling of Cuba compounded this suspicion enormously and early. When Mr. Kennedy's powerful TV warning to Castro slid downward into the ignominy of the Bay of Pigs and the pullback of the air strike in the middle of this, aggressors everywhere asked, "Is this gap between America's word and their deed a single, incredible slip? Or is it a pattern we can cash in on?"

Only one thing could save us. Never again to talk big and perform small. Berlin soon provided the test.

Cuba was the ghost that had to be slain when President Kennedy defied Khrushchev in his July 25, 1961, TV warning about our rights. Our President met the bill perfectly. And he swept the country with him. He flashed across the screens a map of Berlin, and another showing Berlin's sectors. He went on from there sternly and clearly but without truculence or forensics.

But on Sunday, August 13, the wall went up across Berlin and we did not knock it down. And now barbed wire is being put up on the west side of the wall as the Berlin crisis heats up again.

Will the wall ever be knocked down? Certainly Khrushchev does not think so. East Germans do not think so. Now the West Germans do not think so. They're right. The whole world is right. The fundamental preservation of the principles that our President denounced after Cuba has been abandoned. Some of the appearance remains. The substance is gone. That's all that interests Khrushchev. Berlin has been negotiated downhill.

Laos was negotiated downhill. The President, again on TV, warned our Nation and all Communists how vital a free and independent Laos was to us. We must draw a line against Red encroachment, Mr. Kennedy said. And he laid it on the line—Laos.

These stern, clear warnings went out the window in subsequent Geneva negotiations. And they were formally abandoned when we signed the 14-power treaty "guaranteeing Laos" independence and neutrality, knowing full well that it does nothing of the sort.

The Alliance for Progress was negotiated downhill. President Kennedy's original stern demand for Latin-American self-help (on the strength of which the appropriations were voted) proved merely words. (They're getting the money anyway.) Latin America notices this with mixed feelings, even though they benefit from the toboggan slide.

U.S.S.R. atomic inspection is being negotiated downhill. When Khrushchev broke the test ban, he blew all phases on atomic agreements higher than a kite. Nevertheless, the inspection provisions President Kennedy announced as indispensable are now getting the toboggan treatment. Better scientific technique (widely disputed) makes it not so necessary, we say, for us to stand up to the Kremlin's objections after all.

Even if this dubious contention is a fact, and even if the Russians accept it, can we afford it? Somehow, somewhere the momentum must be stopped, the career reversed.

Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world as this gap between America's words and the deed. It is our President's most grievous challenge. Surely he must see this—soon, soon—and meet it.

This is the stuff of which history will be made—his history and the history of our mighty Nation. For the integrity of the United States is at stake, and thus the peace of the world.

Space Effort Idled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 12792, to outlaw strikes in vital defense projects is urgently needed.

The following story appeared throughout the country a few days ago:

U.S. Space Effort Idled by Pickets

Huntsville, Ala.—Pickets held the Marshall Space Flight Center, heart of the Nation's space effort, in idleness for the third straight day Thursday amid indications the Government would seek a Federal court order sending them back to work.

The picket lines set up by 150 members of the electricians union, protesting the employment of a few nonunion electricians, kept more than 1,200 building trades workers from going to their jobs.

Construction work was at a standstill on a number of space projects, including the vital Saturn booster.

In Washington, Government officials met in urgent session to consider applying for a Federal court injunction to end the picketing.

There also were indications in Washington that the Government, citing this critical time in the Nation's space exploration program, might seek a Taft-Hartley injunction to force the strikers back to work.

A four-man investigating crew from the National Labor Relations Board arrived at Redstone Arsenal, home of the space center, to check into the possibility that Federal labor laws are being violated by the strike.

Carlton Bryan, head of the team of investigators, said, "There is no indication how long we will be here. I can't predict a time target."

The actual effect of the strike so far on the Nation's space program was difficult to measure.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, director of the Marshall Space Flight Center, said only that the strike must be settled and that it is regrettable the United States should lose ground at the same time the Russians score a success with a twin-orbit mission.

Another Tribute to the Honorable Clare E. Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Record at this point another excellent and well-deserved tribute to our colleague, the Honorable Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan.

Seldom does a day pass but what one or more Members of the House of Representatives does not express regret that Clare Hoffman is unable to take his place on the floor of the House. He made a contribution and an impression that will long be remembered in the legislative Chamber in which he served long and faithfully.

The following editorial from the Allegan, Mich., News Gazette is eloquent testimony to the esteem in which our colleague is held in his home city and district:

Clare E. Hoffman

(By John R. Axe)

For the first time since 1932 the Republicans in the Fourth Congressional District will miss a familiar name on the November election ballot. For the first time since that bleak depression year, Clare E. Hoffman will not be running for the U.S. House of Representatives. In his place there will be a most able replacement, Edward Hutchinson, a man who already has an enviable and honorable record of public service of his own, but without Mr. Hoffman, the ballot, the party and indeed the House of Representatives will not be the same.

Clare E. Hoffman was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1934. For that and the next 13 terms he remained there, a diligent, hard-working Congressman who was ever vigilant and always wary of the proposals of the "giveaway boys," as he called them. He was usually outnumbered, often unsuccessful, but never outfought in the 28-year battle against big government, big spending, big deficits, and big labor which he often waged alone. Sometimes his would be the only voice raised in opposition, but if against the proposal, raise it he did.

Something of the magnitude of his records, which might not seem so great to the casual observer because he served in a party that was usually in the minority and fought for legislation which was often defeated by his enemies, can be seen by comparison with terms of service of his fellow Congressmen. He was, of course, the dean of the Michigan delegation in Congress, but he was far more than that. Only two Republicans, John Tabor, of New York, and Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts have served more than Clare Hoffman's 14 terms, and only one other Republican served in Congress as long as the venerable Michigan statesman. He was the top-ranking Republican on the House Government Operations Committee and second-ranking Republican on Education and Labor and had served as chairman of the former committee when the Republicans controlled the House of Representatives. Only 12 men in the present House of Representatives and 3 in the U.S. Senate have held their offices longer than Clare Hoffman.

The test of a good Congressman is not, however, just in his ability to be reelected or the period of his service, but his standing in the eyes of his fellow Congressmen as well. Here too, Clare Hoffman finds ringing praise from Republicans and Democrats alike. The recent rally honoring Mr. Hoffman on his retirement was the occasion of both written and oral salutes by fellow Congressmen and Senators from both parties. All were well deserved.

To dwell longer on this man's illustrious career in public life which spans more than a half century, having begun as prosecuting attorney in Allegan County in 1909, is unnecessary. His record is well known, for he never hesitated to speak his mind on any issue he saw to be of importance, and his courage and perserverence even against overwhelming odds will not soon be forgotten in the Halls of Congress. He has been styled, of late, the "voice of the Fourth District in Washington," and that he was, never forgetting his home constituents. But, he, as all truly great Congressmen exerted influence far beyond the Fourth District and Michigan. Clare E. Hoffman served the whole United States, and served it loyally and well. The country will miss him too.

Growing Export Trade Helps Expansion of Battery and Ceramic Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the progress, expansion, and success of the General Battery & Ceramic Corp., a very prominent firm which is making a substantial contribution to the Reading and surrounding area in my congressional district.

The firm was formerly known as the Bowers Battery & Spark Plug Co. It was founded by Mr. Clarence P. Bowers, a highly respected and prominent businessman in my home community. Mr. Bowers, who retired as president of the Bowers Co., is presently a member of the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board and chairman of the Reading Airport Authority.

The General Battery & Ceramic Corp. is producing products that are being sold in 82 countries of the free world. The rapid expansion in this firm's export trade has given employment to hundreds of Berks County people. A good many employees live in adjoining Schuylkill County.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to meet and greet Mr. Richard H. Miller, export manager of this firm who visited with me at my office this morning. He came to the Capital to testify before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in support of H.R. 12533. This bill, which was introduced by my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Congressman Herbert C. Bonner, would promote foreign commerce through the use of mobile fairs. Mr. Miller's testimony in support of this measure clearly points out the value, usefulness, and need of trade fairs as a stimulant to export trade.

This legislation means a lot to the economy of my district, but it is equally important for other areas in bringing additional employment opportunities to our citizens. This is meritorious legislation and deserves favorable consideration by Members of the Congress.

To acquaint my colleagues in the Congress with this important bill and what it means in creating employment, I am including Mr. Miller's interesting testimony with my remarks:

Statement of Richard H. Miller, Export Manager, General Battery & Ceramic Corp., Before Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, in Support of H.R. 12533

My name is Richard H. Miller and I reside at 3533 East Kent Road, Laureldale, Pa., which is a suburb of Reading, Berks County, Pa.

I am appearing here today in support of bill H.R. 12533 dealing with the promotion of foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs.

I was first employed in 1947 by Bowers Battery & Spark Plug Co. and held various positions until 1953 at which time I became export manager. At the present time, our main plant, located at Reading, Pa., is staffed by personnel numbering approximately 500. The products we manufacture are lead-acid storage batteries used in many different applications; unassembled batteries in kit form; component parts for batteries, and automotive, marine, and commercial spark plugs.

Our total battery production for the past year was approximately 1½ million units, while spark plug production was approximately 5 million.

In August of 1959, Bowers Battery & Spark Plug Co., acquired the Frenchtown Porcelain Co. in Frenchtown, N.J., which became a wholly owned subsidiary operating as a separate division.

In November 1960, our company name was changed to General Battery & Ceramic Corp. and was incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania.

In December 1961, General Battery & Ceramic Corp. acquired two additional firms, Filtors, Inc., and Shoup Voting Machine Corp. and incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. Both of these firms are operating as separate divisions of General Battery & Ceramic Corp.

In my capacity as export manager, I control the exports of only the batteries and spark plugs and related component parts produced by General Battery. All of the other divisions export independently of one another. Our batteries and spark plugs have been sold in 82 countries throughout the free world.

In September of 1960, General Battery was invited to participate in the initial section of the Isbrandtsen Mobile Trade Fair. The subject of this first presentation was automotive parts and service equipment. In planning, design, construction, furnishing, and transporting our display to Brooklyn, N.Y., and installing our unit in the Isbrandtsen mobile van, we spent a total of less than $500.

Within a few weeks after the departure of the mobile trade fair, inquiries began to arrive. To date, approximately 37 inquiries have been received. Of this total, we have received 5 new accounts who have placed a total of 11 orders which have been shipped. One of the accounts has not given us a repeat order to date. Another has given us one repeat order, another two repeat orders, and the last one three repeat orders. The total dollar volume of orders shipped to date is $35,081.67. Two additional repeat orders are in production at the present time and will add $10,400 to the total mentioned previously.

In addition to the foregoing, samples of our products have been sent to many other prospects which could develop into firm orders at any time.

Additional value of the Isbrandtsen Mobile Trade Fair can be accounted for by the following: The largest account that we can directly attribute to the Isbrandtsen Mobile Trade Fair is located in Izmir, Turkey, at which port the fair did not call. A friend of the Turkish firm, who was located in Alexandria, United Arab Republic, visited the fair in Alexandria and immediately informed the Turkish firm that our company was looking for distributors. He wrote to us and after we quoted prices, placed a firm order covered by a letter of credit in the amount of $2,500. Immediately upon receipt of the initial shipment, another order was placed, also covered by a letter of credit in the amount of $4,500. This firm has since placed two additional orders. These new firms with whom we are doing business are located in Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq, and Singapore. Therefore, it can be seen that not only are exports increased by a display at various ports but from areas where people are informed, either intentionally or accidentally, of a possibility of doing business with an American firm.

Incidents like this have helped the 1961 exports of our firm to show an increase of 59 percent over 1960. Our exports for the first half of 1962 show a gain of 48.8 percent over the same period last year. This, in part, is a direct result of our participation in the Isbrandtsen Mobile Trade Fair.

We wholeheartedly recommend that passage of this bill be expedited, in order that the opportunity can be given to our company and others to expand their exports to other areas of the world where we are not represented. Companies of our comparable size, cannot afford to invest heavily in the many phases of advertising or missionary work necessary to introduce their products in foreign countries. The means for providing this opportunity rests in your hands.

Real Issue in the Poll Tax Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, following the House vote on the poll tax amendment, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a paper noted for its devotion to the cause of civil rights, made an editorial analysis of this measure in which it noted with great accuracy that this is a synthetic victory for civil rights, a sop in a field in which real action is needed. The editorial notes that this same effect could be gained by the passage of a normal legislative enactment. A constitutional amendment is unnecessary legally to accomplish this end. Further, the poll tax is no longer the instrument for widespread discrimination in the voting field. These facts, the lack of need for action in this civil rights area as compared with many others and the failure of legal necessity for a constitutional amendment to accomplish the end sought, were the subjects of the remarks which I made in debate on the bill and of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay]. This was indeed a synthetic civil rights victory and should not be the basis for proud claims of advances in this field at the expense of dulling the effort for real civil rights progress.

The Post-Dispatch editorial follows:

Synthetic Rights Victory

Final congressional approval of the proposed constitutional amendment to outlaw poll taxes in Federal elections is no more than a synthetic victory for civil rights. President Kennedy claims far too much when he terms it a "significant action." The House vote of 294 to 86, following the Senate vote of 77 to 16, provides a spurious image of Congress leaping to the battlements for the sacred right of the free ballot.

The fact is that the poll tax measure, while usually included in recent civil rights platforms and programs, was about the least important rights measure. Only five Southern States still levy such taxes, and only in Mississippi and Alabama do these taxes constitute much of a bar to Negro voting.

The fact is that the bill to regulate use of literacy tests, which are widely used to bar access to the polls, was a far more important measure. Yet the Senate dropped it rather than stop a threatened filibuster.

The fact is that Congress could have outlawed poll taxes in Federal elections by legislation, without passing the issue to the States in the form of a constitutional amendment. The House tried to do this five times but the Senate usually blocked the move. This year nobody even tried.

Moreover, the slow process of ratification by three-fourths of the States may provide Congress with an excuse to avoid major civil rights issues for some time, when those issues involve a legislative struggle, as they usually do. But the poll tax amendment is a poor excuse for avoiding further action. It is even a poor excuse for a civil rights record in this Congress.

Soviet Twist on Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the reading of my colleagues an excellent editorial entitled "Soviet Twist on Anti-Semitism," which appeared recently in the Malden Evening News and Medford Mercury, whose well-known editor and publisher is David Brickman. These papers are performing a great public service in keeping American and world opinion informed of the shocking violation of rights of Jews in Soviet Russia. The world should know that the Soviet Union has as its ultimate goal the eradication of all religions. The name of Cardinal Mindszenty is now a symbol of Russian atrocities committed against the Catholic Church. No religious group is immune from the Soviet plan of enslaving the world under godless communism. The editorial follows:

SOVIET TWIST ON ANTI-SEMITISM

No fewer than 28 of 46 citizens of the Soviet Union sentenced to death up to the end of last June in a series of cases involving economic offenses were Jews. Since then, four more Jews have been given the death penalty, and others have been sentenced to long prison terms, for convictions involving property, not persons.

Offenses of this kind are believed to be common in Russia today, but current efforts to wipe them out appear to be so contrived as to throw the chief onus on the Jews. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, suggested in the Senate, July 19, that Moscow was attempting "to link historic Russian anti-Semitism to its economic campaign."

Other signs of a new wave of hostility toward the 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union abound. A campaign of vilification against them in the Soviet press, restriction of Jewish religious practices, an apparent policy of holding down Jewish representation in the professions and in the government, and petty harassments of various kinds indicate a general worsening of the conditions of life for Russian Jews.

Official and semiofficial denials of anti-Semitic acts or policies have been made to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights and through other channels. But both Jewish and non-Jewish groups and individuals in this country who have kept tabs on the question have not been reassured.

Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton in a letter to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, last May cited as increasing evidence of interference with the Jewish religion in Russia "desecration of cemeteries, closing of synagogues, dispersing of prayer meetings, arrests of lay leaders, prohibition of certain Jewish religious practices, etc." He referred also to "clear evidence of the resort by the regime to discriminatory measures against Jews in access to higher education."

The most thoroughly documented of Jewish grievances is the campaign of vilification in the Soviet press, primarily the provincial newspapers. They repeatedly carry moralistic narratives or essays linking avarice, treason, loose morals and bad manners with attendance at the synagogue; and they depict the synagogue frequently as the setting for conspiracy, haggling over illicit profits, and drinking bouts.

Communist antireligious campaigns have fallen with particular severity on the Jews. Only 60 to 70 synagogues are left in Soviet Russia; many cities with large Jewish populations have none. No new printings of the Hebrew Bible and only one edition of Hebrew prayerbooks have been authorized since 1917. The single Jewish theological seminary—established in Moscow in 1957—has only a handful of students and faces an uncertain future.

Although the proportion of Jews in the professions is larger than the proportion of Jews in the population, it has been declining for a number of years. Furthermore, the quota system that appears to be operating in admissions to institutions of higher education promises to accelerate the decline. Since 1935 the ratio of Jews to non-Jews in student ranks has dropped from 13.5 to 3.1 percent. The proportion of Jews in public office has likewise been falling.

Jews were denied equal participation in Russian life under the Czars, but they were free to develop fully their own social and cultural institutions. Under the Soviets the Jews have had their ups and downs. The Bolsheviks at first courted mass Jewish support. They made anti-Semitism a crime and set up a number of Jewish agencies within the government. But after absorbing existing Jewish political and social organizations, these government agencies were dissolved. Since 1930 no organization representing the Jewish minority as a distinct national or ethnic group has been allowed.

In the late 1930's, Yiddish schools were closed, Jewish collective farms were shut down, and the only national Yiddish newspaper was discontinued. Zionism was denounced. And with the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact in 1939, any expression of Jewish consciousness became suspect.

After the Nazis attacked Russia in 1941, the position of the Jews improved, but a fresh outbreak of anti-Semitism after the war was marked by wholesale purges of prominent Jews. These so-called black years ended with Stalin's death in 1953. Since then, however, scant opportunity has been given for restoration of a separate Jewish culture. Now, a spreading and deepening of the old anti-Semitism is feared again.

Dollar Gap Must Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there are a few reflections and views concerning the dollar gap that Congress, as well as the executive department, would be well advised to have in mind these days.

First, the basic reason for the gap is that we have been, and are, spending much more money abroad than we are earning abroad. As a consequence, having piled up over a period of years huge claims against our diminishing gold stocks, the impressive disbalance in our accounts hangs over our heads like the sword of Damocles.

The able, economic writer, Sylvia Porter, recently set forth some statistics in one of here columns that would seem worth repeating.

Last year, for example, we sold more than $19.9 billion of goods to foreign buyers, bought back over $14.5 billion. That gave us a fat merchandise export surplus of almost $5.4 billion.

In the same period, U.S. residents received as income on foreign investments over $3.6 billion, while foreigners received an income on investments here of $871 million, which gave us another substantial favorable balance in our payments accounts.

U.S. residents spent for tourism, transportation, and insurance abroad over $4.7 billion, while for similar services here, foreigners spent almost $4.4 billion, resulting in an unfavorable balance of about $400 million.

So far, so good, we can agree; but there is another side to the story. We spent abroad for military expenditures over $2.9 billion, while our military receipts here were only $406 million for this particular item, representing an unfavorable balance of more than $2.5 billion.

Our net private investments abroad—ranging from an extension of credits to other areas for purchase of foreign physical properties—came to more than $3.9 billion, while net private investments here in the United States came to $577 million, thus showing another unfavorable balance of $3.4 billion.

In addition, there is a very large sum of $2.1 billion which the U.S. Government transferred to foreign countries for economic aid and defense support aid, for which we got nothing in direct return although, of course, most of us are satisfied that a large part of this amount represents security insurance, so to speak, and vital strengthening of our free world allies.

There is another item of $954 million, which our Government invested abroad, not in outright gifts, but in loans—direct loans to the governments themselves, loans through the Export-Import Bank, subscriptions to the Inter-American Development Bank. All repayments on these loans were subtracted, so it is a net unfavorable balance of $954 million.

Another item was the $634 million which private U.S. sources sent to foreigners—money orders sent by Americans to relatives abroad, the so-called errors and omissions category coming to an impressive minus total of $616 million.

The principal point of the above figures is that when added up, the credits come to almost $28.9 billion for 1961, whereas the debits leave a deficit of nearly $2.5 billion.

Miss Porter is of the opinion that at this particular time—and I take it that she means after the huge sums we have sent overseas since World War II—the other nations of the free world could take over a much bigger share of the $5 billion burden we are carrying for military defense and economic aid.

She suggests that we might hike our earnings from tourism spending within the United States by a major amount and increase our income by exports of goods far beyond where it is, although it is not clear how this can be done.

The situation outlined would appear to add up to some conclusions which I have previously presented to the House concerning the dollar gap.

The two principal areas by which we can eliminate, or further reduce, the gap is to cut the fat out of foreign and spending without, of course, impairing the essential purposes of foreign defenses and aid, and stepping up our export-import ratio.

At this time, I will not repeat my previous analysis of this ratio, but I would like once again to stress the fact that we cannot increase interest rates for the sake solely of keeping foreign capital here in this country, and we cannot tolerate augmenting imports without jeopardizing the integrity and strength of our own great, free, economic productive machine and inducing dangerous industrial depression and extensive unemployment in the country.

Admittedly, these are tough and complex questions to solve. Yet we must find the answers without further delay, if we are to avoid further serious impairment of the value of the dollar, lower social standards and rising unemployment here.

Clearly, this is a job for tough-minded economists and realistic financiers, who will not allow purely altruistic values, however commendable, to impair practical judgments as to what is best for the United States.

The dollar gap does not stand by itself as an individual question. It is tied in inextricably with other political, economic, social problems—international and domestic—in a puzzling package that will continue to challenge and endanger our economic situation at home and abroad, unless we come up with early answers putting these components in a better, more practical perspective.

Feed Grain Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the August 23 issue of the Chicago Tribune carried this analysis of the feed grain scandal, and I commend it to colleagues who may be wondering whether to give the program another year's lease:

THE FEED GRAIN SCANDAL

Last year taxpayers paid $782 million to farmers for taking 26.5 million acres of corn and grain sorghums out of production in accordance with the Kennedy administration's feed grain program. This year taxpayers are paying $896 million to retire 32.6 million acres of corn, sorghums, and barley, an increase of 23 percent in the acreage signed up for the program.

Congress was fooled into authorizing the feed grain program early last year after the administration's farm planners pleaded that the way to make the surplus disappear was to raise price supports and pay farmers for retiring acreage. The Government's August crop report shows how phony this plea was.

Although farmers signed up to retire 23 percent more acres, feed grain production now is expected to go up an estimated 6 percent. Total production of corn, sorghums, barley, and oats as of August 1 is estimated at 139,500,000 tons, compared with 131,132,000 tons on the same date a year ago. It's the same old story of farmers finding a way to beat the program by taking their poorest land out of production for Government payments, while planting more thickly and pouring more fertilizer on their more fertile acres to take advantage of high price supports.

This is the situation which Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, rightly calls scandalous. He points out that the feed grain program has proved to be an expensive and dismal failure for the second successive year. The annual cost comes to well over a billion dollars when acreage payments, salaries of thousands of new administrative employees, and Commodity Credit Corporation losses on taking over surplus grain are added together.

A Tribute to Justices Goldberg and Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, two Presidents have paid fitting tribute to two distinguished citizens of this great country, Felix Frankfurter and Arthur J. Goldberg, by nominating them as Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. There is added significance in this fact—and a happy commentary on the American way of life—that both men are of immigrant stock. Justice Frankfurter was an Austrian immigrant and Secretary Goldberg, the son of Russian immigrants.

Justice Frankfurter, born in Vienna in 1882, arrived in the United States at the age of 12, unable to speak a word of English. After working his way through Harvard Law School, he taught there for a quarter of a century, helping to shape the New Deal. He then spent 23 years on the highest court of the land. In the words of President Kennedy at his press conference announcing the appointment:

> Few judges have made as significant and lasting an impression upon the law. Few persons have made so important a contribution to our legal traditions and literature.

I join the President and all Americans in offering to Justice Frankfurter my "gratitude for the character, courage, learning and judicial dedication" with which he has served his country.

To Justice Frankfurter's designated successor, Arthur J. Goldberg, I extend my best wishes for a long continuation of an already distinguished career. The son of Jewish immigrants from Russia, the future Secretary of Labor and Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, first entered the business world as a delivery boy at the age of 8. In 1929 he graduated from Northwestern University Law School ranking first in his class. In later years as counsel for the CIO, Goldberg was active in the organization's drive against unorthodox union practices. He wrote the merger constitution of the new AFL–CIO, which is regarded as his greatest accomplishment in the labor field. Since Mr. Goldberg became Secretary of Labor, it has been my privilege on numerous occasions to be present when he spoke before congressional committees and public gatherings. I have never failed to be impressed by his knowledge, his logic, and his grasp of legal questions. Undoubtedly, his long carrer and experience as a member of the bar can only forbode just as excellent service as a member of the bench.

The editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post on Secretary Goldberg's nomination to the Supreme Court is such an excellent one that I am inserting it below:

MR. JUSTICE GOLDBERG

The most surprising fact about the President's nomination of Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg to succeed Justice Felix Frankfurter on the Supreme Court of the United States is the willingness of the President to lose Mr. Goldberg as a member of the Cabinet. As head of the Department of Labor, Mr. Goldberg has been a dynamo of enormous usefulness to the President and to the country. Many of his efforts to settle labor-management disputes have been successful. While he has functioned as a champion of labor in the Cabinet, he has done his job with a keen sense of obligation to the country as a whole.

For many years Mr. Goldberg was counsel for the United Steelworkers and the CIO. He came to be recognized as one of the country's ablest lawyers. In 1959 he represented the Steelworkers in their fight against the Taft-Hartley injunction which ended the 116-day steel strike. Though he lost the case, his oral argument before the Supreme Court earned him high respect from its members and a sincere compliment from the Justices for his efforts.

Mr. Goldberg has made a practice of knowing everything about any case with which he has associated himself, and he has an extraordinary capacity to convey his views to others in an impressive way. On the Supreme Bench it may be taken for granted that he will be one of its most energetic and conscientious members. Mr. Goldberg has also shown a remarkable capacity for adjustment to new situations. When he became Secretary of Labor, for example, he considered his career as a labor lawyer to be closed forever. He addressed himself to his new job with a measure of objectivity that was greatly to his credit. Instead of acting as a partisan of organized labor, he has functioned as a dedicated public servant with a keen interest in the success of industry and Government in general as well as in the welfare of labor.

Another index to his type of public service may be found in his renunciation of a $25,000 steel union pension when he became Secretary of Labor. He did not want anyone to suppose that his judgment might be swayed by a pension in his favor. On the bench we surmise that he will perform in the traditional spirit of objectvity, without any relinquishment of his keen interest in human problems.

From the long-range viewpoint, therefore, the appointment of Mr. Goldberg will doubtless merit high praise. From the short-range view, the loss of his dynamism in the Department of Labor will be keenly regretted.

But this is the way of Government. It is especially important that the successor to Justice Frankfurter be a man of great energy, capacity in the law and force of personality, for the retiring Justice has been for many years a powerful influence on American law. We shall devote a later editorial to his notable career on the bench. At the moment it is sufficient to say that if Mr. Goldberg succeeds in following the Frankfurter footsteps, his name will be written large in the future legal annals of the United States.

A School Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest editorials on the Supreme Court's recent school prayer decision appeared in the August 23 edition of the Westbury Times. It makes a great deal of sense.

I hope that Chairman CELLER, of the Committee on the Judiciary, will reverse his stand against hearings to consider a constitutional amendment to allow nonsectarian, noncompulsory prayers to be said in our public schools.

The editorial follows:

A NEED FOR GRASSROOTS ACTION

Tuesday night's fine turnout at the Westbury School Board's hearing on the Supreme Court's controversial school prayer decision proves that this issue is of burning importance to residents.

Summer meetings traditionally are dull, poorly attended affairs but we're proud to note that folks spoke up resolutely, with considerable prior thought and study showing through each speaker's comments.

We base our own viewpoint on two opinions. First, we believe that a nonsectarian prayer seeking guidance from a divine presence has a place in our schools. Second, we believe that no cute legal maneuvering should be used to circumvent the Supreme Court ruling. The law of the land is just that, until it is changed.

We do not agree with the sagacity of the Supreme Court decision, but we feel that a constitutional amendment—arising from a grassroots-motivated congressional movement—is the answer.

In this way, the people will speak within the fabric of the law. If Americans let this issue slide into obscurity, the Court's decision will stand—finally, absolutely, and without question.

We feel that such indecision by Americans will lead to further lawsuits seeking to remove every reference to divinity from the public scene. And this, as we have noted several weeks ago, is alien to the spirit in which our Nation was founded.

Locally, the Westbury School Board is urged to await a directive from State Education Commissioner James Allen. Dr. Allen, as School Board President Donal Mahoney noted Tuesday night, is passing the buck very neatly.

He should have had something definitive to say to New York school boards more than a month ago. His deputies have been quoted widely on the High Court's decision, but Allen's personal silence has prompted local boards to act independently.

The chaotic situation around the island where 10 different boards have 10 different solutions to the school prayer problem is no credit to the State education department's leadership.

We hope that on September 18, when all the members of the Westbury Board tackle this thorny issue again, Dr. Allen will have spoken.

Transportation Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the August issue of the Railway Employees Journal includes a forthright article on the importance of passage of the proposed Transportation Act of 1962. This legislation was endorsed by both major political parties in their 1960 platforms.

I think all Members of Congress will find the article worthwhile reading and I am including it with my remarks:

DON'T LET THEM SIDETRACK THE TRANSPORTATION ACT

(The country needs action by Congress—now—to establish new transportation policies in line with today's needs.)

Pressure for passage of measures President Kennedy has included in the proposed Transportation Act of 1962 should not be relaxed until Congress acts on them. Most Members are anxious to get home to look after their campaigns for reelection. It therefore is likely that Congress will adjourn some time in September. Adjournment without passage of measures revising ratemaking regulations would result in indefinite postponement of legislation needed to check the dangerous drift toward a crisis in the country's common carrier system.

Such legislation was promised in the platforms of both major political parties 2 years ago. It was urged as immediately important in President Kennedy's recent special message on transportation subjects. Delays in consideration of the measures President Kennedy has proposed, by both Senate and House committees, has endangered their passage this year. Their fate depends on the interest all Members of Congress, and particularly congressional leaders, take in seeing to it that these measures are not lost in the confused muddle that usually develops as the legislative bodies approach adjournment.

It is consequently important that citizens generally, and railroaders particularly, keep their representatives in Washington aware of the fact that Congress alone is responsible if the drift toward crisis that is affecting the country's vital interest in adequate and self-supporting transportation services is allowed to continue.

ACTION NEEDED NOW

President Kennedy recognized in his special message on transportation subjects that out-of-date regulations are mainly responsible for most of the difficulties that now are distressing the railroad industry. He also recognized that new policies, adjusted to fit radically changed conditions, are needed now. Establishment of sound new policies is not possible without treating all types of public carriers alike. The measures President Kennedy has proposed with respect to ratemaking are aimed directly at that objective. There is no reason, from either public or railroader standpoints, why they should be sidetracked. There is every reason why they should be passed before Congress adjourns.

Railroad results so far this year are making it clear that business and industrial recovery alone will not reverse trends that have been running dangerously against the railroads. The decline in the railroad share in the country's total freight traffic will continue as long as railroads are restricted in their efforts by regulations that do not apply to other carriers. Two-thirds of the freight tonnage being transported over the highways and nine-tenths of that transported on inland waterways now are free from restrictions with which railroads must comply. Delay in correcting that situation will certainly bring the country perilously close to a transportation crisis it can't afford.

NEED NEW RATE POLICIES

Several special study groups, one of them created by the Senate, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and President Kennedy, all have recommended further changes in the rate regulations since 1958, when Congress took its first step toward establishing modern policies.

Technological advance has encouraged development of new types of equipment designed to fit the special needs of various commodities in volumes and at lower rates. Piggyback growth illustrates what is practicable in this field. There still are unsettled rate problems under present laws that interfere with its further growth and the extension of container services. Piggyback car loadings this year promise to be many times greater than they were 4 years ago. They are encouraging coordination of rail and highway services that will reduce highway congestions, improve transport services and lower shipping costs.

Installation of the new types of equipment involves additional investments by railroads that are not encouraged by policies that restrict rail freedom in establishing rates that their use warrants. Failure of the ICC to permit reduced rates on grains by the Southern Railway through the use of lighter weight freight cars with doubled capacity is a sample of the frustrations that railroads are encountering in their efforts to take full advantage of technological progress in reducing operating costs and lowering shipping expenses.

In most instances railroad efforts to establish incentive contract and volume rates, comparable to those being found practicable and in the public interests in Canada and European countries, are being delayed or disapproved. These conditions prompted President Kennedy's proposal that revised regulations should permit new and experimental rate policies adjusted to fit changing conditions.

THE NATIONAL POLICY

The law now declares it to be national policy to encourage all types of transport to provide transportation services at as low costs as their natural advantages warrant. But that policy is not being applied to railroads, although their competitors continue free from comparable restrictions.

Citizens generally and railroaders particularly must let their representatives in Washington know of their opposition to further delay in establishing the new transportation policies President Kennedy has recommended. The more they do this, the less likely it is that Congress will adjourn before enacting a Transportation Act of 1962.

The Summer of Sabin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the great progress made in conquering the crippling disease, polio. The discovery of the two vaccines marked a milestone in medical research.

This summer, all across the country, entire communities are receiving the Sabin oral vaccine. Right here in the Capitol, employees and Members have received their doses of this easily administered drug.

The Palm Beach Post Times in an editorial dated August 15, calls attention to the program in a typical American city. The editor suggests that this may well be the "summer of Sabin," recognizing the discoverer whose research has meant so much to the program of eliminating polio once and for all.

A similar program is being scheduled in other communities around the Nation. Palm Beach County will soon conduct one also.

Knowing this editorial will be of interest to all Members, I ask that it be placed at this point in the RECORD:

THE "SUMMER OF SABIN"

The summer of 1962 may go down as the "summer of Sabin."

In cities across the Nation, hundreds of thousands of people of all ages are trekking to distribution stations in schools and other places to receive their cubes of sugar impregnated with the life-protecting polio vaccine.

The nationwide drive to knock out polio, once and for all, got its big start in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, on May 27 when 882,609 persons from Cleveland and surrounding cities were given the first of three types of vaccine. It was the largest 1-day mass inoculation in history.

There were some jam-ups in places, some centers ran out of vaccine, but on the whole it was an overwhelming success.

A second SOS (Sabin Oral Sunday) was held the following week for the same type I vaccine. The total of persons receiving this type was raised to nearly one and a half million. Types II and III were given on subsequent Sundays, completing the series.

Cleveland's amazing record of May 27 was short lived, however. On July 23, nearly 919,000 residents of Harris County (Houston), Tex., turned out in their first SOS. This was nearly 75 percent of the population of the county. Companion efforts were begun the next week in Dallas and Fort Worth.

The vaccine in these cities was free to anyone who wanted it, as it is in all other communities conducting similar drives. Doctors, nurses, druggists, and laymen in charge of the distribution centers contributed their services voluntarily.

In Cuyahoga County, a donation of 25 cents was suggested to help defray the expenses (the vaccine alone cost $700,000). Containers were placed at the exits, but no one watched to see who contributed and who did not.

More dollar bills than coins were tossed in, for even before the end of the county's 6-week campaign, more than $900,000 had been collected, putting the program well over the top financially as well as statistically.

After all bills are paid, the surplus will probably be used to finance annual follow-up studies of polio antibody levels in the blood of children who had all three types of vaccine.

Thus went the summer of Sabin in one populous area of the country.

Palm Beach County's opportunity comes this fall.

Stockpile Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, recently, I inserted three editorials in the RECORD from the St. Louis papers regarding the investigation being conducted by a subcommittee of the other body into the Federal mineral stockpiling program. Today I would like to insert an editorial from the Cleveland Press that is equally objective with regard to the seriousness of the issues raised by it both to the Congress and to the citizens at large.

The efforts of the Cleveland Press to narrow the controversy to the real issues involved is a greatly needed service that is too often overlooked by public commentators who tend to classify issues as black and white, without a consideration of the intricacies involved.

The investigatory function of the Congress is so important at this time that the Congress should always be concerned lest emotionalism and partisanship cloud the issues. The Cleveland Press editorial goes a long way toward dispelling misconceptions that have enjoyed great credence to date:

HUMPHREY, SENATORS, AND ETHICS

The merits and demerits of the Hanna Mining nickel contract with the Government which are being brought out in Washington this week are certainly involved and hard to determine. The investigators' allegations sound scandalous; George Humphrey's defense sounds businesslike and reasonable.

The underlying issue, though, as Humphrey testified before the Senate committee, was the former Treasury Secretary's personal involvement.

Was he within the limits of propriety in holding his interests in Hanna while he served in the Eisenhower Cabinet?

The Senate Finance Committee in 1953 must have thought so. Even though the Senate Armed Services Committee at the time required Charles E. Wilson to divest himself of all General Motors holdings before it would approve him as Secretary of Defense.

There was a difference: The Defense Department had contracts with General Motors; the Treasury had none with the Hanna interests.

But now comes the stockpile investigation and at least the suggestion of a link between George Humphrey's official position and his private business. If Humphrey had been wholly divested of these interests, the question could not have been raised, even by the most partisan sharpshooters.

Such a rule would make it more difficult to persuade topflight businessmen to join the Government—but it would be safe insurance against the situation in which Humphrey is now starring.

Similar safeguards should be set up against the investigators themselves—in this case Members of the Senate. Many of them are wealthy men, still connected with legal firms, oil firms, or defense industries. And they are undoubtedly in a powerful position when it comes to swaying Government contracts. Yet there is no protection against their possible conflict of interests. There should be.

What Is a Liberal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News entitled "What Is a Liberal," sets forth very effectively the grassroots analysis of a recent congressional problem:

WHAT IS A LIBERAL?

Just what is a liberal nowadays? And just what does a liberal want?

That question is given potency by the filibuster against the President's bill for further development and financing of communications satellites, of which Telstar was the pioneer.

The bill provides for rigid Government regulation of this amazing project. Ownership is evenly divided between private enterprise and the public. The bill passed by the House recently by a vote of 354 to 9—a margin rarely equaled in our legislative history. But a small group, claiming giveaway, prevented the Senate from expressing its desire for a prolonged period of time, and, also, brought Senate business to a standstill.

If this is liberalism, in any recognizable sense of an old and honorable word, the world is upside down. What is liberal about attempting to make the views of a tiny, bitter minority take precedence over those of the vast majority? What is liberal about an effort to socialize a venture which, in all likelihood, will revolutionize world communications? Give this unprecedented power and precedent to a bureacuracy, and we would have laid the foundation of dictatorship, in fact if not in name.

Another point enters in here. The bill's filibustering opponents charged that Government could not adequately regulate the use of the satellites in a manner which would advance the public interest. Therefore, they went on, Government must develop and operate them. But if Government is so incompetent or so corrupt in the relatively simple and well-charted field of regulation, what reason is there for believing it is capable of conducting the infinitely complex job of developing and operating such a communications system?

Finally, the filibustering liberals said, in effect, that the President and the Congress have a cynical disregard of the public interest, and want only to fatten private coffers. One need not fear that the American citizen will be taken in by the outrageous implication.

Federal Employees Take Another Look at the Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of Government Employees is meeting in Seattle this week. In preparation for that meeting the Veterans' Administration Lodge 1151 has prepared a memorandum concerning the Hatch Act which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

The Hatch Act was enacted during a turbulent period when a large segment of the population looked at Government employees as parasites holding sinecures and feasting at the public trough. At that time (the depression era), the public press was taken with all sorts of ideas and clamors that were intended to and, in fact, did reduce the image of public employment from that of an honorable vocation of which the public servant could be proud, to a vocation which exposed him to suspicion, scorn and ill will. As a result of this campaign, few Federal employees could find employment in private industry subsequent to their separation from public employment except with the greatest of effort. The favorable salary position which was previously held by public employees deteriorated rapidly and thereafter continued to remain in a deteriorated state. The social status of public servants suffered as did their working conditions. Only the limitation of space prevents our citing the very many other adverse results that obtained.

A careful review of the circumstances surrounding the downgrading of Government employment shows that the sharpest decline occurred after and as a result of the enactment of the Hatch Act. Those of us who have studied the history of that statute can testify to the change of attitudes and of the conditions of employment; of the failure to give public employees necessary support in critical areas and of the failure to respond to the needs of employees, even where indicated by undisputable facts. Public servants, who had previously occupied positions of great dignity now became the whipping boys of a hysterical public outcry and of any political appointee who had the urge to flex his muscles.

We cannot pass without noting the circumstances under which the Hatch Act was rammed through into enactment. Neither Federal employees nor their representatives were consulted. Theories that were neither validated nor documented were hailed as the great liberalizing force that would free the public employees from the shackles of politics. Madison Avenue techniques were employed—and the Federal employee became a second-class citizen.

Some of the high sounding reasons urged at the time the statute was under consideration included allegations that this proposal would keep politics out of the civil service; that this proposal would keep politics out of Government and that this proposal would protect Federal employees from politics and politicians. We now know that nothing was further from the truth. The Hatch Act was intended to, and in fact did, render the Federal employee impotent and incapable of action consistent with his experience, his abilities and his needs. We have but to look at today's situation to ascertain the accomplishments of the Hatch Act.

At the time of the enactment of the Hatch Act, there were more than ample laws that could have fully protected the Federal employee and the Government from exploitation by politicians and from politics. All that had to be done was to make a vigorous demand for the enforcement of these laws. But, such a demand for enforcement or a call for an inquiry to determine the reasons for nonenforcement was not made. In the absence of a thoroughgoing effort to use the vehicles of law and of law enforcement, it would appear questionable, at best, as to whether the Hatch Act was an honest-to-goodness attempt to protect the Federal employee and the Government and to keep politics out of Government and out of the civil service. It would rather appear that the intent was to saddle the Federal employee with a statute that would restrict their civic activities and political expressions. Were the effort made, at the time, to secure the enforcement of these laws or to ascertain the reason for nonenforcement, there is no doubt but that the nonnecessity or undesirability of the Hatch Act would have been established.

Let us examine the Hatch Act, and incidently, these facts may be verified at any public library that boasts a copy of the United States Code. The Hatch Act merely forbids Federal employees (and some local public servants, as well), (1) from active participation in elections; (2) from urging the defeat of candidates who do not represent their interests; (3) from urging the election of candidates who do represent their interest; (4) from stating their positions in the area of civic and political affairs, openly, honestly and above board and under the same conditions that would apply to any other employees whether they be in private industry, local government or otherwise—this is not to be confused with an employee making specific comments in the area of his employment contrary to regulations or under circumstances that would discredit his agency. We have remedies available to treat with such events. The comment that we make reference pertains to one of a general character covering the broad spectrum of government policy which the government employee, as a citizen, should join in molding; (5) from participating in the affairs of their community and country; (6) from exercising the rights of a free citizen in a great democracy with the dignity and respect that flow to public servants the world over.

From the examination of the facts, it is obvious that the Hatch Act did not add one scintilla of protection that was not already provided by law and, as a matter of fact, addressed itself solely to limiting the civil rights of Federal employees.

Our civil rights have so depreciated that the election day privileges that are available to all employees in private industry and to the employees of State and local governments are no longer extended to us.

If we, as public employees are to recapture our lost stature, recover the dignity and respect that once accrued to Federal employees and secure for ourselves and our families, fair consideration in things material and decent treatment in other areas, we must take affirmative action to sweep aside the road blocks that impede our achievement of these reasonable objectives. In seeking to unfetter the Federal employees, we do not propose to take quick or unconsidered action. The resolution, under consideration, proposes that the situation be carefully examined; that we ascertain the attitude of our members; that we determine whether the Hatch Act has injured the Federal employee, and if so, the extent of such injury. We propose to encourage full discussion and education as to the meaning and effect of the Hatch Act. When these goals have been achieved, we propose that the national executive committee and our national officers present our views and findings to the Congress for corrective action.

Although we refer to a presentation to the Congress for corrective action, that is not the only recourse that is, and will be available to us. The constitutionality of the Hatch Act was tested some years ago, long before the composition of the Supreme Court changed. The presentation made to the Court, at that time, did not enter many phases and questions that were subsequently found to be of the utmost of importance by the present Court in civil rights cases. While the earlier case addressed itself to the civil rights questions, the case presented was one in a vacuum and on a theoretical basis. No statistics were presented; no injury or loss was demonstrated; no findings of any survey was presented to show the effect of the Hatch Act on Federal employees; no effort was made to establish the desires, the wishes or the needs of the majority of the public servants. No attempt was made to prescribe limitations on Federal paternalism nor was any exploration made to show the adverse effect of the withdrawal of civil rights on things material.

Our resolution proposes to make up the existing deficit and furnish us with sufficient data upon which the Hatch Act may be attacked in the courts should the Congress fail to give us the relief our members indicate.

We have the obligation to raise the image of the public servant to its merited pedestal. If we are remiss in this duty, we can only blame ourselves for the unhappy status of Government employees. Government employees must now change from a whining position to one of strength tempered by reason. We must demand for ourselves the same civil rights that are available to employees in private industry and the same political rights that accrue to Government workers the world over. Private industry not only urges its employees to participate in civic affairs, but encourages them, most vigorously, to full engagement in political affairs as well. Shall the Government employee ask for less—shall he abdicate his search for improvement, for fair play, for dignity, for recognitions?

The question is placed in your laps. If the resolution will be adopted, we will take the first step in the direction of improvement by asserting ourselves. We won't be stepping over anyone, nor will we be rushing off blindly into the great unknown. We will approach the subject cautiously and carefully, step by step, toward the direction that will be consistent with the sense of the membership and will promote the best being of Federal employees. We will approach the subject with facts, with statistics and with knowledge. We do not intend to be groping in the dark for some distant vague panacea. We will have direction, force, and intelligence—but all of this is dependent upon your adoption of this resolution. Remember, the Hatch Act never protected the Federal employee. Remember that whether the Hatch Act is repealed or invalidated in the courts, the spoils system will never return. Remember our resolution cannot do harm; it can only promote the well being of all of us.

Over 30 lodges that have studied and considered this resolution have endorsed it. We urge your concurrence.

PEARL J. ALPERN,
President.
HARRY H. ZUCKER,
Vice President.
VIRGINIA RODRIGUEZ,
Secretary.
RALPH V. TROPEANO,
Treasurer.

Cuba's People and a Little Raid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, judging from the outcry by Castro, one would think a massive attack had been made on Havana this week. The world knows that this was actually just a small band of brave Cuban patriots in two boats who were willing to risk their lives to show how vulnerable the Castro government really is, and to give encouragement to all those dedicated people who are working toward the day when Cuba may again join the free world.

This deed may be compared to events in our own history such as the Doolittle raid and others which have added honor on our citizens and glory to our Nation.

We are now witnessing the greatest arms buildup in the history of Latin America, and we wonder whatever happened to the Monroe Doctrine. But the free people of Cuba continue to work for the liberation of their country with the knowledge that they will eventually succeed.

The Miami Herald editorial of August 28 entitled "Cuba's People and a Little Raid," suggests that "it is also quite likely that there will someday be a monument to this venturesome company in the heart of a free Havana." Let us all pray that day will come soon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD:

CUBA'S PEOPLE AND A LITTLE RAID

The 23 Cuban patriots who putt-putted into Havana harbor and sent bullets into a luxury hotel housing Iron Curtain technicians were of the breed that makes legends.

Physically the incursion accomplished little or nothing—a few bullet holes in the walls, a few startled guests fleeing in their nightclothes, a great huffing and puffing from Fidel and his crew.

Psychologically it was a solid blow on an exposed nerve.

The garrison of Cuba's Communist captors has recently been strengthened against the rising tide of honest anger at home. Castro has boasted of his Russian arms and technicians and declared his invincibility.

But the tiny band sailed under his guns and punctured his claim. They said in a loud voice that Cuban freedom is not dead but in the custody of resourceful and daring men.

The raid notified all Latin America, where the grand gesture is appreciated, that a day of reckoning may be soon. To Cubans at home, fighting in secret places, and abroad, planning to end their exile, it was a tonic reminder to keep their courage high.

To friends of Cuba everywhere it demonstrated a proposition: Given the tools, Cubans are ready to supply the blood and the heart to redeem their country.

The raid will be called many things—futile, pointless, defiant, even illegal and potentially embarrassing to the raiders' host country. All these things to a degree are true.

But it is also quite likely that there will some day be a monument to this venturesome company in the heart of a free Havana.

Impending Retirement of Air Force Chief of Chaplains, Maj. Gen. Terence P. Finnegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this occasion to note the impending retirement of the Air Force Chief of Chaplains, Maj. Gen. Terence P. Finnegan, whose retirement becomes effective on August 31.

He has had a most distinguished career, both in the service and in his church. A native of Norwich, Conn., he was ordained at St. Joseph Cathedral, in Hartford, and formerly served as assistant pastor in St. Joseph's Church, Bristol.

The honors bestowed upon Chaplain Finnegan by the U.S. Army and Air Force, as well as by his church, which has recognized him as a domestic prelate, speak well for the accomplishments of this fine soldier and clergyman.

The chaplains of our Armed Forces have performed magnificent duty in reinforcing the moral structure of our Nation in uniform, and Chaplain Finnegan's record from Pearl Harbor to Guadalcanal and the Mediterranean is characteristic of the difficult and rigorous requirements placed upon them.

I want to call the attention of the House to the multiplicity of assignments which Chaplain Finnegan has discharged faithfully in rising to the high post of responsibility from which he is retiring. I offer a transcript of his service career for the RECORD:

CHAPLAIN, MAJ. GEN. TERENCE P. FINNEGAN, U.S. AIR FORCE

Chaplain, Maj. Gen. Terence P. Finnegan, Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Air Force, was born in Norwich, Conn., on March 21, 1904.

A graduate of St. Thomas Seminary and College, Hartford, Conn., in 1924 with a bachelor of arts degree, he received his master of arts and bachelor of sacred theology degrees from St. Mary's Seminary and University, Baltimore, Md., in 1930. He was ordained as a priest of the Roman Catholic Church on May 30, 1930 at St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, and served for 6 years as a priest in the diocese of Hartford. On the creation of the diocese of Norwich in 1953, he was transferred to that diocese.

On April 12, 1956, His Holiness Pope Pius XII appointed Chaplain Finnegan a domestic prelate with the title of right reverend monsignor. The appointment was made in recognition of his fine contributions to the spiritual welfare of personnel of the Armed Force whom he had served for nearly 20 years.

Appointed chaplain, first lieutenant, in the U.S. Army Reserve on January 4, 1937, he entered active military service the following April. His first assignment was district chaplain of the Civlian Conservation Corps (CCC) unit at Silver City, N. Mex. Assignments followed in Texas, South Caroline, and Illinois. He was appointed first lieutenant in the Regular Army in August 1940. In September 1941, he was transferred from Fort Ord, Calif., and was assigned as assistant battalion chaplain, 25th Division Artillery, at Oahu, Hawaii. He was serving at Oahu, Hawaii when the Japanese attacked on December 7, 1941.

Two days after Pearl Harbor Day, on December 9, 1941, he was named division chaplain of the 25th Infantry Division.

Chaplain Finnegan received the Bronze Star Medal for meritorious service against the Japanese forces at Guadalcanal during the period December 17, 1942 to February 9, 1943. He was air evacuated to a hospital in New Zealand in June 1943 suffering from pneumonia and malaria. In January 1944, he was returned to the United States and held various assignments in this country before being named theater chaplain, U.S. Forces, Mediterranean Theater of Operations in August 1946. He attended Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., from September 1947 to July 1948.

Chaplain Finnegan transferred to the U.S. Air Force on July 1, 1949, and was named air chaplain, Headquarters, Continental Air Command, Mitchel Air Force Base, N.Y.

In January 1950 Chaplain Finnegan reported to the Far East Air Forces as deputy air chaplain and later became air chaplain of FEAF. During this assignment, he was awarded the Legion of Merit for meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service in Japan and Korea during the period July 23 to November 2, 1950. He was awarded an Oak Leaf Cluster to the Legion of Merit for exceptionally meritorious service with the Far East Air Forces from July 1951 to November 1952.

In December 1952, Chaplain Finnegan was named command chaplain of Headquarters, Air Training Command, Scott Air Force Base, Ill. He was assigned as Deputy Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Air Force on August 1, 1953, in his then grade of colonel and was promoted to the grade of brigadier general in October 1953.

Chaplain Finnegan was promoted to the grade of major general on July 1, 1958, and took over his duties as Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Air Force on August 15, 1958. For his services as Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Air Force, Chaplain Finnegan has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

Chaplain Finnegan is the son of the late John Finnegan and Ellen Markey Finnegan, of Norwich, Conn.

Decorations and medals: Distinguished Service Medal, August 1962; Legion of Merit, November 1950, and one oak leaf cluster, November 1952; Bronze Star Medal, June 1944; American Defense Service Medal; American Campaign Medal; Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal; World War II Victory Medal; Occupation Medal (Japan); Korean Service Medal; United Nations Service Medal; National Defense Service Medal; AFLSA with four bronze oak leaf clusters.

Not Farming Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., August 18, 1962:

NOT FARMING PAYS

Among the recipients of Federal payments for curtailing agricultural operations are listed the following:

The Louisiana State Penitentiary, $45,414; Florida's Glades State Prison Farm, $6,818.40;

and the city of St. Louis, $12,203.91—all for agreeing to cut back on the production of feed grains.

The figures suggest to what extent these beneficiaries have been involved in the business of farming. In the event they should need some of the feed grains they have agreed not to produce, collectively they have $64,456.31 in tax money with which to purchase it.

There seems to be some question as to whether or not farming nowadays is a prosperous venture. But the above figures suggest that not farming can be pretty good.

Resolution Adopted by Spartanburg Post No. 28 of the American Legion, Department of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution adopted August 3, 1962, by Spartanburg Post No. 28 of the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, commending the men of Company C, 391st Engineering Battalion—combat—U.S. Army Reserve, and the 77th Troop Carrier Squadron, U.S. Air Force Reserve, for their accomplishments and achievements while on active duty. We owe them a debt of gratitude for their patriotic service in our Armed Forces. While on active duty these citizen-soldiers exemplified the dignity, honor and courage we can always expect of our Reserve troops.

The resolution follows:

Whereas some 10 months ago an impending crisis confronted our Nation; and

Whereas in order to cope with this potentially critical situation certain Reserve units of the armed services were ordered to active duty status, among these units being Company C, 391st Engineer Battalion (combat), U.S. Army Reserve, and the 77th Troop Carrier Squadron, U.S. Air Force Reserve, and certain individuals of other components: Therefore be it

Resolved by the members of this post, That we express to the officers and men of these units and all other individuals who similarly served from this area our appreciation of and our commendation for their service, noting that—

1. They responded readily to face with courage and valor whatever the tension of that day might have brought forth;

2. They incurred great personal sacrifices in terms of family dislocation, interruption of careers, and financial loss;

3. They served without complaint in well-disciplined obedience to the order of their Commander in Chief, ready to do their duty as fighting men in defense of freedom;

4. They underwent rigorous training and maintained a state of preparedness which might well have been an effective deterrent to a war whose prosecution could destroy all civilization; and

5. They served their country in her hour of need wth honor and distinction and in a manner in keeping with the highest tradition of the armed services.

The American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, today a distinguished West Virginian, the Honorable Joseph G. Weeda, a highly respected attorney who practices law in the District of Columbia, has delivered an outstanding address on the history of the American Legion before the Friendship Lions Club in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Weeda has served the American Legion with distinction and just last month he was unanimously selected as a member of the national executive committee of the American Legion to represent the department of the District of Columbia.

Because this speech is one of the finest I have ever read on the American Legion, I am delighted to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPEECH BEFORE THE FRIENDSHIP LIONS CLUB ON THE AMERICAN LEGION

(By Joseph G. Weeda)

This year, 1962, marks the 43d anniversary of the American Legion. It has good reason to be proud of what it has accomplished in these years. Legion programs have succeeded because they were designed by their originators to give practical expression to the purposes and principles enunciated by the founders of the American Legion at the Paris and St. Louis caucuses in 1919. These men of clear vision and great foresight, just emerged from the cauldron of war, felt a great responsibility to continue in peacetime the service they had pledged in war to God and country. The American Legion is the instrument they created through which to accomplish their high purpose. The record it has written during the 43 years is the best proof of the measure of their success.

None would deny that the lifespan of the American Legion has been one of the most hectic periods in the history of the human race. This organization was born of war. It includes in its ranks today, three generations of this century. Each has gone to war and each war has been more terrible and devastating than the one before. It has lived in periods of cold war and uneasy peace. It has seen deep depression and great prosperity.

Social, scientific, military and economic changes have reshaped the world bringing all people into closer proximity with one another. Time and space have lost much of their meaning. New pressures and influences of many kinds have been exerted upon the minds and hearts of men.

When we consider the momentous events of the era through which the American Legion has lived, the role it has played in the life of our country during these years assumes a real significance. From the beginning, Legionnaires have dedicated themselves to our major objectives: the strengthening of our American way of life; and maintenance of the national security; care for the children in America; and aid to those who have fallen in battle and to their widows and children.

The victorious men of the American Expeditionary Force, upon their return from France found that practically no preparations had been made to receive them. They were discharged into a civilian world which had neither hospitals, medical personnel, nor a program of any kind through which to care for the broken bodies and minds of men who had fought and won the war. Little or nothing was being done for the widows and the children of men who had given their lives for their country.

The American Legion, almost by itself, conceived and piloted through Congress the broad structure of compensation, pension, and medical programs which now guard the safety, security, and health of the wounded and the disabled. The crowning achievement of this great effort was the GI bill of rights. This milestone in history of veterans affairs was drafted by the Legion. It was submitted to the Congress for the stated purpose of insuring that the men and women of World War II would not return to a nation as unprepared to receive them as it was to receive the victors of World War I.

From the beginning the American Legion has been in the forefront of the battle against communism. Through the years it has worked diligently to alert the American people to the fact that communism poses a serious internal threat to the safety of the Nation. The Soviet encyclopedia refers to the Legion as a group composed of greedy capitalistic warmongers. The Legion is delighted that it has earned this particular place in their affections. Should they suddenly begin to indicate approval of Legion actions, it would be considered as a genuine cause for alarm.

The American Legion has long supported increased solidarity among the Republics of the Western Hemisphere. It took a most serious view when it became apparent that Fidel Castro was not a revolutionary seeking true freedom for his people, but that he would replace one totalitarian regime in Cuba for another. It knew that this could not promote unity among the people of the two continents. Now, the worst fears have been confirmed and we find that we have a genuine Communist government at our doorstep. In 1960 at the national convention in Miami Beach, and again in 1961 at the Denver national convention, the delegates unanimously called upon the U.S. Government to take any and all necessary action, including use of military force, if needed, to bring an end to the Castro regime.

It has supported since 1945, U.S. participation in the United Nations. At the same time, it is unalterably opposed to the admission of Red China to the U.N. In its view, such an act would be a desecration to the memory of the 38,000 American soldiers who fought and died to repel the Red Chinese attack on the free Republic of Korea. Also it would be a violation of the U.N. itself, stipulating as it does that its ranks are open to peace-loving nations. Certainly, no rational person would defend the Peiping Government as peace loving.

The American Legion has found itself, on occasion through the years in disagreement with the Government in matters revolving around national security and the maintenance of the Armed Forces. It has insisted that America be kept strong in order that she might effectively champion the cause of freedom. It recommended strongly against the neglect which the armed services experienced in the years between the two wars.

Consistently, it urged Congress to appropriate funds providing for the modernization of all branches of the military services. As unrest became increasingly manifest among nations in both Europe and Asia, the American Legion warned the American people that the Nation was not adequately prepared to defend itself. Its warnings were not heeded until too late, and the price which was paid beginning on December 7, 1941, was a tragic one indeed. In the years since the end of the Second World War, it has continued to urge a strong defense and to support the efforts of the armed services to maintain a state of readiness which would both deter an aggressor and enable us to defend ourselves should we be attacked. The American Legion is proud of its consistently strong position on the subject of national security.

Existing programs of the American Legion are its child welfare activities in which over the years it has spent over $17 million in direct assistance to children. In addition it has secured passage of enlightened legislation at both State and National levels for the benefit of all children of America. It promoted and supported the first child labor legislation in America.

Its interests extend to the youth level also, where it finds expression in many fine programs, including 4,000 Boy Scout units, Boys and Girls States oratorical contests where 335,000 high school children speak on the subjects of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States. One million of our male youth participate in the American Legion baseball program. There are high school awards and soap box derbies and other activities designed to make the youngster a little more conscious of his great heritage of freedom to the end, that as a mature citizen he will do his part in later years to preserve that heritage.

The 2,700,000 Legionnaires are justly proud of the great accomplishments of the American Legion to Americans and America. They seek and enlist your moral support, as citizens of a free nation in the fight to maintain the traditions of liberty and justice upon which our Nation was founded, and which, God willing, should be eternally preserved.

KQEO Back to School Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

KQEO BACK-TO-SCHOOL CAMPAIGN

Thirty million persons unemployed. Not only unemployed, but totally incapable of ever being employed. Not cripples, not mental incompetents, not lazy. Simply unemployable. Just imagine, for a moment, the drain such a situation would put on any economy. Then think about it happening in this country. Impossible? No, not impossible; not even improbable. Because this is exactly what is going to happen in the United States, within one generation. Unless—this is our point. Education once was a luxury. Next, with advancing civilization, it became a convenience. One could do without it, but it was sometimes an advantage to be able to write and figure. Next, as technology increased, it became more important. Some jobs were closed to those without a general foundation of knowledge. Now, let us project into the future a scant 20 years. By 1985, not only education, but the equivalent of a high school diploma will be an absolute necessity for almost any kind of a job. Furthermore, those without diplomas won't even be able to get jobs as manual laborers, because there won't be any manual jobs left to do. Machines will do them cheaper, faster, better.

What does this mean? It means that now, in the summer of 1962, the groundwork must be laid for the future. What the students of today learn now will determine how their families live tomorrow. The high school dropout of today will be the down-and-outs of tomorrow; not necessarily because of their own fault, but because of the inevitable march of technical civilization.

KQEO cannot urge any course of action more strongly than this: If you are a student returning to school, study. If you are of school age, but are not attending, go back. If you've let time pass and you are out of the teens, but still don't have a basic education, get one. It's your future, for better or for worse.

Dr. Harry Wexler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the recent death of the Director of Research of the U.S. Weather Bureau, Dr. Harry Wexler.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Wexler during the International Geophysical Year, when he accompanied us on our trip to the Antarctic as chief scientist. Dr. Wexler had been with the Weather Bureau continuously since 1934 and was considered an expert on atmospheric conditions.

One of his greatest contributions to our country was the part he played in drafting plans for the use of satellites to improve weather forecasting. Dr. Wexler was one of the first scientists to visualize the use of satellites for meteorological observation.

In recognition of his outstanding public service, our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has adopted a resolution noting his achievements, which I will insert at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

It is with great sorrow that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives learns of the untimely death of Harry Wexler.

For many years by reason of the official relationships of the committee and the Weather Bureau, the committee has been well aware of the tremendous contribution which Harry Wexler has made to the world's meteorological research, including his sponsorship of meteorological satellites and his working out of arrangements for international cooperation in their use. Indeed, no American has done more in the successful furthering of international understanding among scientists.

But beyond this, the members of the committee through their participation in the International Geophysical Year and ensuing personal association with him as chief scientist for the Antarctic programs have had continuing occasion to appreciation his warm friendliness, imaginative leadership, stimulating scholarship, catholic knowledge, vibrant spirit, and confident faith.

Accordingly, be it resolved by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (in executive session assembled), That its deep sympathy be expressed to his widow, Hannah, to their daughters, Susan and Libby, and to his associates.

Unanimously approved, August 14, 1962.

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.
W. E. WILLIAMSON,
Clerk.

The New York Times also noted Dr. Wexler's untimely death and I would like to have this article made a part of the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 13, 1962]

DR. WEXLER, A METEOROLOGIST, DIES—WEATHER BUREAU'S DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH SINCE 1955

WOODS HOLE, MASS., August 11.—Dr. Harry Wexler, Director of Research of the U.S. Weather Bureau, died of a heart attack Saturday, while on vacation here. He was 51 years old and lived in Falls Church, Va.

Dr. Wexler had been with the Weather Bureau continuously since 1934. He held citations for distinguished service from the Air Force, Navy, Department of Commerce, and National Civil Service League.

From 1955 through 1958, along with his duties at the bureau, he was chief scientist for the U.S. expedition to the Antarctic for the International Geophysical Year.

Last June, Dr. Wexler and Prof. Viktor A. Bugaev of the Soviet Union were the principal figures in drafting plans for use of satellites to improve weather forecasting. These plans were announced by the United Nations World Meteorological Organization at a conference in Geneva on cooperation between the United States and the Soviet in space research.

Dr. Wexler, one of the first scientists to visualize the use of satellites for meteorological observation, was known as the "father" of the Tiros satellite.

SERVED ON U.S. PANELS

He became chief of the Weather Bureau's Science Service Division in 1946 and Director of Research in 1955. During that time, he also served on special Government panels on the biological effects of atomic radiation, polar research, the meteorological aspects of satellites and on the National Academy of Science's Space Science Board.

After receiving a B.S. degree in mathematics from Harvard University in 1932, Dr. Wexler attended the Massachusetts Institute of Techonology, from which he received a Sc.D. degree in meteorology in 1939, while working for the Weather Bureau.

In 1940 he was Assistant Professor of Me9eorology at the University of Chicago. He left this position late in 1941 to engage in defense work for the Weather Bureau in Washington. In 1942, he joined the Army Air Force's weather service as a captain.

FLEW INTO HURRICANE

While with the Army Air Force, he initiated weather research that later was developed into the large Air Force geophysics program. In September, 1944, Dr. Wexler, with Col. Floyd Wood as pilot, made the first penetration of an Atlantic hurricane. He rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Dr. Wexler served on the Advisory Committeed on Reactor Safeguards for the Atomic Energy Commission, as chairman of the Geophysical Research Panel of the Scientific Advisory Board to the Air Force Chief of Staff and as a member of the Meteorological Operations Subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

He had been vice president of the American Meterological Society, a member of the Royal Meteorological Society and the Washington Academy of Sciences and chairman of the Upper Atmosphere Committee of the American Geophysical Union.

Progress Under Connecticut 65 Health Insurance Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in a recent report to the Connecticut General Assembly, the groups interested in the Connecticut 65 program have discussed the progress that has been made under the most impressive effort of the private sector to meet the costs of health care for the State's aged. I commend this progress and I believe all who are truly interested in seeing the problems of the aged in this area of financing health care should do likewise. In this report is an estimate that 85 percent of the residents of Connecticut over the age of 65 have some coverage against hospital-medical expenses, and that a large number of others are cared for under Federal, State, local, or some combination program. I believe this is real progress and I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation:

WHAT'S YOUR HEALTH WEALTH?—A STATEMENT ON THE HEALTH-MEDICAL CARE SERVICES AND COVERAGES AVAILABLE TO THE PEOPLE OF CONNECTICUT

We, the representatives of Connecticut's five largest organizations providing for health-medical care or methods of paying for such care, recognizing our mutual purpose in serving the public, have been conducting a series of joint meetings since December 1961, to review the scope and progress of the various methods of providing protection for health and medical care costs and to explore common problems facing the health and medical fields. It is evident from this review that—

1. Connecticut residents have available to them the highest quality of health-medical care.

2. The voluntary agencies in Connecticut are recognized leaders in developing statewide the widest variety of programs to finance the cost of such care.

We base our conclusions on the following facts:

Our organizations have been alert to the needs of the people, all the people. In Connecticut, through our voluntary system, coverage has been made available to every citizen, regardless of age. More and more persons have enrolled each year, including aged citizens, and the type of coverage available is being continually broadened.

NINETY-THREE MILLION DOLLARS IN BENEFITS

The $93 million paid by the Connecticut organizations for health-medical care benefits during 1961 is dramatic evidence of the breadth and scope of this protection, and represents an increase of 62 percent over the $57 million paid out only 5 years earlier.

Virtually every employed group in our highly industrial State has some type of voluntary protection for employees and their families. Blue Cross and CMS (Blue Shield) currently cover more than 1,250,000 Connecticut people, and the insurance industry provides coverage for 1,200,000 persons.

Some of those protected have an insurance policy as well as Blue Cross-CMS protection.

PROTECTION FOR THE ELDERLY

At a time when there is so much discussion about medical care for the aged, we in Connecticut can look with pride at our own health resources and progress in providing care for our senior citizens. Blue Cross and CMS alone have more than 140,000 persons over 65 years of age enrolled. In addition, the insurance industry estimates it covers 80,000 under a variety of policies, including the industry's new Connecticut 65 program under which a major medical type coverage has already been extended to 28,000 Connecticut aged persons. Thus, even though some persons have coverage under more than one voluntary plan, an estimated 85 percent of the 215,000 aged who need coverage now have some protection against hospital-medical expense. There are an additional 27,000 Connecticut people 65 and over who are covered under old-age assistance and various State and local welfare programs.

PIONEER EFFORTS IN CONNECTICUT

We can point to the fact that protection against health-medical care costs is a need recognized many years ago by these agencies.

Blue Cross first offered coverage on a group basis in 1937, and in the past 14 years it has conducted periodic statewide open enrollments which have enabled individuals to obtain hospitalization coverage.

Similarly, Connecticut Medical Service, which was founded in 1949 to provide medical-surgical coverage, has offered on a continuing basis for the past 5 years, protection to any citizen of Connecticut, regardless of age or condition of health. In addition, over 3,500 CMS participating physicians guarantee full payment of covered services for members within qualifying income groups.

Blue Cross and CMS plans have always allowed persons to continue their coverage following retirement. Group enrollment in Blue Cross and CMS is not restricted on the basis of age, nor has either plan in its entire history ever canceled a member contract because of age or poor health.

Health insurance for medical expenses was first offered in Connecticut by insurance companies on an individual basis in 1904 and on a group basis in 1937. Today, there are more than 135 companies which offer hundreds of different health insurance plans, ranging from basic hospitalization coverage to comprehensive protection covering a wide variety of medical care costs. These include plans which are available to persons of all ages and which are guaranteed to be renewable for life.

UNIQUE HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION RECORD

As for our hospitals, Connecticut is the only State in the country where every community, general, nonprofit hospital has met the high standards necessary for accreditation by the Joint Commission of Accreditation of Hospitals, which is made up of the American College of Physicians, American College of Surgeons, American Hospital Association, and the American Medical Association.

The medical professional in Connecticut has a history of dedication to the health of our people. In all instances, whether or not a person has coverage, Connecticut doctors have a long record of providing medical care for anyone who seeks it, regardless of ability to pay. For years, physicians have furnished medical care without charge for many patients, thus making a significant contribution to our communities. This includes many patients on public welfare programs.

The quality of patient care is being advanced constantly by scientific programs conducted for physicians through their medical associations, hospital medical staffs, and medical schools.

FUTURE OF THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM

All of these factors document a record of performance that provides a realistic indication of the prospects for the future under a voluntary system.

Finally, in addition to these positive accomplishments in providing high quality care and a voluntary means of financing this care, we recognize our common interest in working together to maintain the proper utilization of hospital beds and services and other medical facilities. We intend to study those factors which have a bearing on the cost of medical care. We will continue to assist each other and to cooperate in any procedures which will directly promote the proper use of hospital facilities and the quality of care for everyone in Connecticut.

CONNECTICUT HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION.
CONNECTICUT STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY.
CONNECTICUT BLUE CROSS.
CONNECTICUT MEDICAL SERVICE.
CONNECTICUT STATE COMMITTEE OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE COUNCIL.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens

to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JULY 20, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congressman,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We herewith send you a copy of our letter with signatures to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, asking him to do everything possible to realize the project included in the resolution.

We are very grateful to you for your resolution and we ask you to make every effort to have it adopted.

Respectfully.

Capt. JOHN SHIMCHIK,
Chairman of the Byelorussian Liberation Front.

JULY 20, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the leaders of the American-Byelorussian organizations in Cleveland, Ohio, herewith respectfully appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the resolution, House Resolution 211, introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, providing for the establishment of a permanent congressional Committee on the Captive Nations, and we respectfully ask you to support the object of this resolution.

We believe that at the present time when communism is moving on an open path of aggressive actions for the establishment of the Communist dictatorship of the proletariat in the whole world by the employment of all available means as violence, falsification, and propaganda, it would be very advantageous for the American Government to pay greater attention to the nations enslaved by communism and give them moral and material support in their struggle against communism.

The establishment of a permanent congressional Committee on the Captive Nations would serve, in our opinion, to the general good of the nations enslaved by communism and also of America and so we respectfully ask you to bring up the subject of this resolution for ratification, since every step in the direction of rendering help to the nations enslaved by communism in their struggle against it will be toward the most speedy liquidation of the Communist threat and Khrushchev's imperialistic and aggressive assurances that he will prepare for our descendants a Communist system and hang his bloody and slavish hammer and sickle banner over the free world.

We are signing this request with our own hands and we hope that you will consider this carefully and for this we thank you.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN SHIMCHIK,
Chairman, of the Byelorussian Liberation Front.
ARKADZI SACEWICZ,
Chairman, American-Byelorussian Cultural Relief Association.
LEONID HARTANOWICH,
Chairman, Byelorussian Orthodox Church Committee.
KONSTANT MATYLICKI,
Representative, American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.

JULY 19, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We take liberty of sending you resolutions adopted at a mass rally in commemoration of Captive Nations Week, held at the Ukrainian Center, 240 Hope Avenue in Passaic, N.J., on July 15, 1962.

Your kindly consideration of our resolutions, sir, will be deeply appreciated.

Very respectfully,

Mrs. MICHAEL STEFANIW,
Chairman of Rally and President of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Branch in Passaic, N.J.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—JULY 15–21, 1962

The 86th Congress of the United States has designated the week of July 15–21, as "Captive Nations Week." Each year we have observed the law of the land. Today we are gathered here once again to dedicate our efforts to that cause, the liberation of those nations enslaved by the iron hand of Russia's communistic government. We join hands with our brother nations, our friends and neighbors of the captive countries to break the chains of oppression so that all men can be free to live in a free and independent country, indivisable under God, in peace and happiness on their own sovereign and native land.

As one of the nations, that has suffered the unbelievable agonies and brutalities of that unholy master, the butcher of Ukraine and his atheistic communistic government, we do declare that the spirit of freedom will exist forever in our hearts and minds. It will not, and cannot be extinguished as long as there is one Ukrainian alive. So help us God.

Therefore, we proclaim the following resolution to the entire world without fear and with complete honesty to warn the free people of the world and the U.S. Government that the creeping hand of communism, having already taken Cuba, is now reaching its bloody hands towards the American people. Freedom of mankind is at stake—the time for action is now—therefore, we state the following:

Whereas the imperialistic policy of the Soviet Union is to capture and enslave all free nations including the United States, so that the world will be dominated by the communistic master devils of atheistic principles; and

Whereas communistic Russia has already enslaved more than 22 free and sovereign nations and its people. Among them the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Hungaria, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Cossakia, Czechoslovakia, Romania, North Korea, Cuba, and other nations; and

Whereas Communist Russia has by its ungodly policy of direct aggression without cause or reason; by mass murder and liquidations of entire families, villages, and cities, by manmade starvation; by indoctrination and Russification of the youth of the enslaved people; by mass deportation and destruction of the family unit in order to break the heroic morale of the religious and spiritual freedom of the people; by its diabolic cruelty and brutality and its forced slave labor and concentration camps; as well as by their unbelievable terrorism, bloody reprisals and infamous lies in order to achieve their goal of world domination; and

Whereas the Soviet Union still is engaged in their ruthless policy of subjugating and enslaving of all people and will contine to do so unless direct aid and action is taken by the existing free nations and its people to help those nations that are enslaved to break free of the tyrannical choking grip of Communist Russia, as well as to prevent their own enslavement and suffering as experienced by the enslaved nations; and

Whereas the United States is the leader of the free world, the champion of freedom, liberty, and peace, a firm believer in the rights and dignity of all mankind, it is their duty and obligation to aid in every way to regain the liberty and freedom of the people of the captive nations who have suffered under the communistic regime for over 40 years.

Whereas—

Now be it resolved, That the Ukrainian people and their descendants of American birth and the members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, and their friends, and the people and friends of our captive countries, residing in the Passaic, Bergen area have met at the Ukrainian Center in the city of Passaic, N.J., do hereby go on record to pledge ourselves to the dedication of our efforts to liberate our native homeland, Ukraine and those of our brotherly captive countries; to keep alive the spirit of freedom and liberty; to work together in unity to achieve the goal of freedom for which so many have died; let it further be

Resolved—

We are opposed, more than ever, to the admission of Red China into the United Nations.

We are opposed to any establishing of a hands off policy, appeasement or coexistence with the Soviet Union by the United States or any other nation.

We are in favor of the Flood Resolution, H.R. 211, calling for the creation of a Special Captive Nation Committee within the House of Representatives.

The establishment of a detailed concrete policy of the U.S. Government towards all captive nations.

We urge the United States to take the lead in the U.N. for a full scale inquiry and investigation of Soviet Union colonialism, within and outside of the U.S.S.R.

That the United States and all free countries of the world give direct aid of whatever is necessary to regain the liberty and freedom of the enslaved countries who request it and will use it to achieve their most cherished hope of freedom. To support them until their hope and dreams become a reality.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
Mrs. MICHAEL STEFANIW,
President.
WASYL MARUSZCOYL,
Secretary.

JULY 17 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: At your most earliest convenience please have your secretary send our committee at least 25 copies of your House Resolution 211, re captive nations.

Thank you for such an excellent and Moscow-shaking resolution. It's high time we shook the Russ imperial empire.

Yours for freedom,

WALTER V. CHOPYK.

JUNE 12, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your proposal for a special House Committee on Captive Nations in House Resolution 211 is the most appropriate one at the present time for us to wage a successful cold war against Moscow.

Sincerely yours,

OLEKSY DIACZENKO.

JULY 18, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your continued action is hereby requested in favor of the House Resolution 211.

Sincerely yours,

W. LIWIZKI.

Appendix

Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has had the unfortunate responsibility of administering several unpopular programs that are not appreciated by the very people that they are saving from extinction. The Department has also received considerable unfavorable publicity from the bad judgment of several of its employees and from the fact that there are those outside the Department who took illegal advantage of a complex system for administering an agricultural program.

But for all this criticism, I believe that the Department of Agriculture, on the whole, is doing an excellent job of protecting the interests of the American farmer. I was very pleased to read an editorial in the Daily Times, of Rawlins, Wyo., which pointed up some of the accomplishments of the Department and noted the human tendency to concentrate on man's failings rather than his achievements.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rawlins (Wyo.) Daily Times, Aug. 25, 1962]

ON THE PLUS SIDE

Of all agencies of the Government, the Department of Agriculture probably comes under the heaviest fire.

Chief reason for this, of course, is that the bill for subsidizing crops, paying farmers for nongrowing of crops, and storing of excess crops keeps getting bigger. This is a problem neither party has been able to solve.

Agriculture Department expenditures ($9.9 billion in fiscal 1962) rank second only to those for defense and are felt by many to be about as worthwhile as the billions eaten up by paying the interest on the national debt.

Scandals like the Billie Sol Estes case and the yearly hassles between Congress and the President over farm legislation have also served to give the public the impression that the whole situation is just one big boondoggle.

Thus a look at some of the Department's positive accomplishments may help put a better perspective on its operation. Rather than trying to kill off the small, independent farmer, as some critics charge, the Department has actually done much to insure the prosperity of farms and farm communities.

Since it is technology that has brought the farmer to his present pass by enabling him to raise far more on far less land than his father, it is only fitting that technology be utilized to provide new outlets for his abundance.

For instance, a few years ago cotton was seriously threatened by synthetic fabrics. Thanks to the Agriculture Research Service, new markets were developed for cotton by making it flame and water resistant and by aiding the development of wash-and-wear fabrics. The latter use alone consumes a billion bales of cotton a year.

In 1945, Florida was close to overproduction of oranges with no new markets in sight. ARS helped develop a frozen orange juice concentrate. Today, more oranges go into cans alone than were grown in 1945.

As a result of new potato products ARS has devised 12 potato dehydrating plants are now in operation in potato-growing areas around the country. Their yearly consumption of $6.3 million worth of potatoes has reversed the downward trend in per capita use of this staple.

Research into improved frozen poultry has helped bring about a 2.5-billion-pound increase in the consumption of turkeys and chickens in the past 5 years. Even waste feathers that once cost processors money to get rid of are now made into fertilizers, feeds, and plastics.

The list of such examples could be extended. Unfortunately, the good men do, oft lies interred with the bones of contention concerning other issues.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recent actions by the House in reducing the appropriation request for funds to carry out the expanded civil defense program, as recommended by the present administration, is having a depressing effect on the morale of well-intentioned people who voluntarily participate in civil defense activities throughout the Nation.

Moreover, it is having an emotional and adverse effect on the millions who populate our metropolitan area. These people were led to believe that the 1961 appropriation for expanded civil defense activities was a promise by the Congress for a realistic measure of protection in the event of a major nuclear assault on our larger cities and their suburban environs. That appropriation provided for a national survey of sizable available shelter areas that weer to be eventually stocked with the necessities of prolonging life in time of great emergency.

We are failing to keep our commitments to the people by not providing for the remaining portions of the promised civil defense protective measures, and we are also tossing down the drain the time, effort, and moneys already expended in surveying for available shelter space.

To cite an instance of the reaction of the State and local authorities who are responsible for formulating and implementing the civil defense programs in their areas is to read a letter received from the Director of Civil Defense for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, wherein he makes specific reference to the present situation as it applies to my own city of Philadelphia.

In order that the responsibility for failure to provide adequate civil defense protection may rest where it belongs, Mr. Speaker, I now extend my remarks under permission previously granted and include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Richard Gerstell, Director of Civil Defense, State Council of Civil Defense, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
STATE COUNCIL OF CIVIL DEFENSE,
Harrisburg.

As requested, I am presenting below summary information concerning the effects which recommended reductions in the budget request for the Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, would have on current activities in the city of Philadelphia and elsewhere.

In August 1961, the Congress appropriated, to the Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, funds for use in the conduct of a so-called national shelter survey, marking and stocking program. The objective of this program is to locate, mark, and stock existing buildings, and other facilities, which can effectively be used as public fallout shelters.

Preliminary survey results indicate that there are, within the city of Philadelphia, a total of 1,664 facilities suitable for use as public shelters. If marked and stocked with emergency supplies as previously planned, these would provide fallout protection for hundreds of thousands of the city's residents.

At the present time, representatives of the Philadelphia Civil Defense Council, assisted by the Philadelphia Building Owners & Managers Association and other groups, are soliciting shelter licenses, or privilege forms, under which property owners and operators, voluntarily and without compensation, make their premises available for use as public shelters. This is done with the understanding that the spaces made available subsequently will be stocked with emergency supplies, furnished by the Federal Government.

Similar activities are currently being carried out in other Pennsylvania communities and throughout the Nation as a whole. Public reaction to the program has been highly favorable and it is generally deemed a sound and practical means of providing fallout protection for millions of our citizens.

If subcommittee recommendations are followed to the letter and the budget request for the Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, reduced accordingly, it will be impossible to stock many of the spaces already located and voluntarily offered for use as public shelters. The end results of this would be these: first, much of the time, money, and effort already expended in the survey work and related activities will go to waste. Second, many people will be inclined to criticize the Congress for failure to provide the funds necessary to complete the program previously approved. Finally, in the event of attack, thousands upon thou-

OHIO

Frederick N. Hertel, Jr., Antwerp.
Carl C. Kindt., Bellville.
George W. Solander, Flat Rock.
Phyllis V. Pierce, Guysville.
Joseph V. Wayman, Jefferson.
William W. Johnson, Lakemore.
Carl G. Stockwell, Lynchburg.
Edmund W. Reed, Malinta.
Edwin A. Molitor, Milford.
Warren G. Reed, Morrow.
Arch L. Brinker, New Waterford.
Charles H. Hannah, Oxford.
Merrill L. Rowe, Portsmouth.
Madeline A. Wilson, Rawson.
Charles W. Welch, Somerset.
Jane G. Apfeld, Somerville.
Kathryn S. Kerns, Urbana.
Carl F. Hissong, Vickery.
John F. Sawmiller, Waynesfield.

OKLAHOMA

Hicks A. Smith, Jr., Ada.
Gleason W. Roe, Agra.
Grant W. Keeton, Bethany.
Deryl D. Milford, Byars.
Woodrow W. Wilson, Carnegie.
Robert B. Lovell, Dill City.
Bessie D. Zentz, Goodwell.
W. Leon Little, Hinton.
Adron M. Burkhalter, Mountain View.
Mina M. Williams, Oakhurst.
Woodrow F. Kolar, Prague.
Wilfred H. Listen, Spencer.

OREGON

Henry R. Kaiser, Jr., Corvallis.
Richard A. King, Forest Grove.

PENNSYLVANIA

Frank Crea, Kingsley.
Robert J. Lees, North Apollo.
Norman A. Serena, Summit Hill.
Ross P. Petrone, Jr., Wildwood.

RHODE ISLAND

Loren A. Andrews, Hope Valley.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Selvern E. Moore, Jr., Barnwell.
Hoyt McMillan, Conway.
Armond K. Price, Gilbert.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clayton C. Fillaus, Avon.
Roy A. Norton, Gary.
Ernest C. Kub, Ipswich.
John M. Johnson, Madison.
Francis J. Tibio, Montrose.
George F. Linehan, Oglala.
Alyce V. Merrill, Pine Ridge.

TENNESSEE

William C. Herndon, Jr., Camden.
T. Julian Liggett, Columbia.
Robert W. Johnson, Enville.
Bob S. Wray, Gleason.
James C. Savage, Linden.
Onon E. Story, Monroe.
Charles E. Stone, Union City.

TEXAS

Harry A. Tinsley, Henrietta.
Harris C. Curtis, Jasper.
T. A. Henson, Littlefield.
Mary V. Polk, Pharr.
Terrell W. Brewer, Rosenberg.
Dorothy M. Childress, Selman City.
Doretha D. Taylor, White Oak.
Harry H. Mann, Levelland.
Troy I. Crawford, Pasadena.

UTAH

Thomas D. A. Smith, Circleville.

VERMONT

John P. Wellman, Readsboro.

VIRGINIA

Mary F. Bowling, Bishop.
Walter E. Harmon, Boissevain.
Katherine A. Webb, Callaway.
Anne W. Diggs, Cobbs Creek.
George W. Leigh, Drewryville.
Dude W. Bowen, Duffield.
Edward W. Burge, Fort Monroe.
Henry H. Downing, Front Royal.
Fonso F. Sutherland, Haysi.
Samuel A. Johnson, Jr., Narrows.
Harry S. Sommers, Paeonian Springs.
H. Clayton Davis, Pearisburg.
Walter D. Wood, Powhatan.
Robert W. MacAdoo, Pulaski.
Caroline W. Dozier, Toano.
James A. Mullin, Warsaw.
Louise S. Buckley, White Post.

WASHINGTON

Harold S. Long, Kent.
Alta W. Graham, Langley.
Floyd V. Hausken, Toppenish.

WEST VIRGINIA

Howard B. Faulkner, Bluefield.
Rosemary E. Earley, Boomer.
Beulah W. Ash, Buffalo.
C. Clark Wolfe, Glenville.
Dallas E. Walker, Mason.
Harold L. Welker, Romney.
Joseph V. Canfield, St. Albans.

WISCONSIN

Robert J. Gorman, Rio.
Douglas G. Runkel, Strum.

WYOMING

Helen E. Wambeke, Deaver.
Ada D. Vogel, Lusk.

sands of lives, which could have been saved through completion of the program, in all probability will be lost.

Appreciating your expressed interest in this matter and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially,

RICHARD GERSTELL,
Director of Civil Defense.

One Less Victory for Special Interests?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in a candid and perceptive article published in the August 25 issue of the Saturday Review, Robert Louis Shayon comments on the current crusade of the broadcasting interest to prevent the President from appointing a new Federal Communications Commissioner sympathetic to the vigorous views of Chairman Minow.

Yesterday President Kennedy revealed his intention to appoint a young Memphis attorney, E. William Henry, to the Commission. Though little is known of Henry's qualifications or leanings, I am confident that he will be attuned to the visions of Chairman Minow—visions in which many of us have profound faith.

I pray that this is the case, that in this appointment we will not be adding the broadcasting industry to the sorry list of special interests that have successfully induced this Congress to thwart the public interest.

Mr. President, we have thus far witnessed the administration achieve passage of barely 10 percent of its legislative program, while the powerful lobbies amass a near perfect legislative record—blocking bills which they view as a threat to their monopolies or profits, or slipping through the Congress their favorite legislation.

A.T. & T. has won its satellite corporation; the sugar lobbies, their bizarre quotas. The AMA has won freedom from health care for the aged. The lumber interests have mutilated the wilderness bill. The savings and loan companies have voided the withholding tax on interest and dividend income, while the farm bureau has frustrated the cause of sanity in farm programs. And, but for the ironically mixed blessing of thalidomide, the drug industry would have handily earned a place in this catalog.

In his article, Shayon observes that:

> Station owners are high in Democratic Party councils, that Senators and Representatives own stock in stations.

He asks:

> Does a powerful broadcasting lobby run Congress which in turn runs the FCC?

The question is as blunt as it is appropriate and I am hopeful that the answer will not further embarrass the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Appointment in Suspense," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPOINTMENT IN SUSPENSE

(By Robert Lewis Shayton)

This is the time of the year when the job of observing that curious planet broadcasting generally offers the least satisfaction. The reruns spread over the television firmament like nebulae; the streaks that signal the approaching meteorites of the fall suggest a season quite like the past one; and the FCC is on vacation.

The drama is there nevertheless—but offstage. Commissioner John S. Cross, one of the seven members of the FCC, remains in office temporarily, even though his appointment has expired; and there is considerable suspense over the man President Kennedy will name to succeed him. Three names have been rumored prominently, and all are liberal Democrats: Kenneth Cox, present Chief of the FCC Broadcast Bureau; Penn T. Kimball of the Columbia University School of Journalism; and William F. Hyland, chairman of the New Jersey Public Utilities Commission. The presumption is that they would be "Minow men" who would support the FCC Chairman's regulatory philosophy, which is aimed at improving the general tone of television and radio.

Mr. Cross is the first Commissioner to have stayed on past the expiration of his appointment. The delay is significant, for there has been in recent months (perhaps it still goes on) considerable political jockeying in Washington over who will get the job. Another Commissioner who would vote with Minow is a prospect the industry does not like; and the industry has strong connections with Congress and the White House.

In "TV in America, the Morality of Hard Cash" (a recent Ballantine paperback), Meyer Weinberg, the author, asserts that "a powerful lobby in Congress prevents the FCC from applying any controls more severe than the broadcasters themselves are willing to accept." Mr. Weinberg teaches U.S. economic history at Wright Junior College in Chicago. His book is a well-documented, familiar indictment of broadcasting's institutional shortcomings, from the notorious quiz show scandals to the stupefying mediocrity of programing."

His chapter on Chairman Minow is entitled, "Thunder Without Rain," and its contention is that Minow's regulatory claws have been clipped by an addministration eager to appease business. The author says that station owners are high in Democratic Party councils, that Senators and Representatives own stock in stations, that the late Sam Rayburn, when Speaker of the House, doomed the President's plan No. 2 for the reorganization of the regulatory agencies.

However, a recent issue of Broadcasting, the industry weekly, presents a contradictory view of the FCC's current behavior. The magazine prints a boxscore of the Commission's performance during the past year, and the compiler is impressed with the agency's "toughness." The FCC has revoked the licenses of four radio stations; scores of renewal and revocation hearings are underway; stations applying for renewal of their licenses are having their applications rigorously examined and questioned; and other tough rulemaking proposals are in the talking stage. One week, the magazine's editorial page, which represents the views of station owners, is badly scared; the next, it is bravely whistling, "Minow too shall pass; Congress is on our side."

The fact is that the Commission has gotten tough. It was beginning to harden shortly before the new chairman took office, and "the death penalty [for stations] has been invoked more times in the past year than in the preceding 30 years." But the toughness, though it has nuisance value, hasn't touched the main nerve centers of the industry; it has skirted such substantive issues as network regulation, station clearance of network public affairs programs, optiontime arrangements, the magazine concept, and license fees.

To reach these key spots in the industry's pathology, the FCC Chairman needs a majority of the Commission, which he has not had. This is why the wait for the President's appointment of the new Commissioner is a suspenseful one. If the appointment goes, as rumored, to a Minow supporter, the Chairman's hope for action on the more vital matters will be encouraged. If still another Minow man gets the appointment which will be made in 1963, when Commissioner T. A. M. Craven's term expires, the Chairman may actually have a majority for some of his proposals for fundamental changes in the industry. Until then, action at the FCC picks off the extreme offenders on counts of obscenity, misrepresentation, and lack of candor, but moves, in general, on slow, complex, procedural fronts. That old, vast wasteland of program balance has yet to be touched.

Does a powerful broadcasting lobby run Congress which in turn runs the FCC, as has often been asserted in the past? The appointments will give us some clues. If the President really means to back his FCC Chairman, he can hardly avoid giving him another vote this year and still another the next. In any case, the play of offstage forces between this summer and that of 1963, when Commissioner Craven's term expires, may be enough to sustain us through the television season that lies in between.

Moral Landscape in Need of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Moral Landscape in Need of Change," which appeared in the August 26 issue of the Park City Daily News, Bowling Green, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

MORAL LANDSCAPE IN NEED OF CHANGE

Any American who moves across this land today from region to region and city to city cannot help but be immensely impressed by the countless signs of advancing change.

Dozens of airports seem as new as fresh paint. New houses sprout in vast numbers, shopping centers crop up to serve them, great highways slash through the countryside and urban zones. In city centers, dazzling modern office structures and apartments rise in pace with this outer growth.

It is not all clear gain. Landmarks that should be cherished go down before thoughtless promoters. Countryside that should be preserved succumbs to the bulldozer. Growth in some places is marked less by order than by clutter.

Nevertheless, there is much that is solid and good in this headlong advance. We have a right to be proud of the science and the industry that makes it possible. We should be thankful for the material resources that give us the wherewithal.

Quite a few students of modern American life question, however, whether the net benefit of all this to the individual human being in 1962 is as great as it should be.

One can prove easily enough that educational levels are remarkably higher than a few decades ago, that we have far more skilled workers and technicians than ever, that personal incomes are higher, material living standards likewise.

The missing element appears to be spiritual and moral.

Very convincing arguments can be made that man today, in this country and elsewhere, is probably no less moral on balance than in past times. But his greater numbers make the weight and impact of his transgressions more damaging.

It is hardly persuasive, in these circumstances, to hear that things are about as always. The question is whether we can tolerate the standard measure of moral laxity when it bulks so large in absolute terms.

The rising index of obvious crime is just part of the story. The sneak crimes of embezzlement, shoplifting, and varieties of fraud corrode the lives of millions who pass superficially as moral persons.

Respect for private property is in sharp decline. Trespass has become almost a way of life with many people, who seem to feel that what's theirs is theirs and what's yours is also theirs.

The point: Our human resources are not in all ways keeping up with the tremendous progress that marks so much of mid-20th-century life.

We take for granted the necessity of constant, developing activity on the material fronts of science and industry. Why then must we assume that no progress can be made in morality?

We had better set about improving our moral fabric or we shall run the risk of being engulfed by our trespassers and marauders.

The Lost Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today, which is a very thoughtful one as dealing with the future of the Supreme Court.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE LOST OPPORTUNITY

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg is an able man. He has been successful as a practicing lawyer, public administrator, and skillful mediator. Anone who comes in contact with him is bound to be impressed by his intelligence and to feel that as Mr. Justice Goldberg he may prove himself a credit to the Supreme Court. A man's ardency as an advocate is no measure of his impartiality as a judge.

Nonetheless, his selection is a matter of regret. Not for himself, but because President Kennedy thereby once more missed an opportunity. This appointment is not going to lift the Supreme Court of the United States from the sad repute into which it has fallen.

The Supreme Court, of course, can never escape criticism. It doesn't deal with abstract ideas, however philosophically they may be argued at the bar, but with things that touch men's jobs, their businesses, their schools, and all their daily living. Its actions are thus always deeply involved in politics.

But of late the criticism of the Court has taken a different turn. It's no longer limited to groups angered at controversial decisions. It swells in the general press, in the journals of the bar associations and at every gathering where lawyers themselves discuss the problems of the law.

The lawyers' complaint now is simply that of incompetence. A 5-to-4 decision where each of the minority dissents for a different reason and where four of the five in the majority offer different legal arguments for the ruling in the case at hand, such decisions leave the law confused. And the confusion is compounded when the Court, in the space of a year, completely reverses itself.

The public's complaint is less precise but equally dangerous. People will accept an unpopular decision from a tribunal when they have confidence that the judges are men of principle, character, learning, and experience in the law. When that confidence is shattered—by whatever cause—the underpinning of the law is weakened and the country has been done an injury.

To state the matter bluntly, that confidence in the Supreme Court of the United States has been seriously eroded if it has not yet been shattered.

The erosion began with the Supreme Court packing plan of President Roosevelt. It has continued with a long series of appointments in which it was clearly evident to the public that the chief qualification of the man chosen was either that he was owed a political debt, or that his selection served a future political purpose, or that he was a crony of the President.

The exceptions have slowed the erosion, not halted it. Mr. Roosevelt made some confidence restoring appointments, most notably when he elevated Mr. Stone to be Chief Justice; so did President Eisenhower. Nor has the erosion been repaired by the fact that some appointments turned out better than expected. Whatever their subsequent records, Chief Justice Vinson and Chief Justice Warren owed their selection to their political not their legal abilities.

So now we come to President Kennedy and the two chances he has had to place men on our highest tribunal.

It is natural enough for a President to seek out men whose political thinking has some affinity with his own. The mere fact that he would choose a liberal is not necessarily a cause for criticism nor would it by itself do any injury to public trust in the Court. But there are men whose philosophies would suit the President but whose experience, learning, and standing in the law would still command respect from everyone.

Instead, for his two appointments, President Kennedy has chosen one lawyer whose most notable qualification in the public eye is that he was a famous football player who skyrocketed upward because the President like him. The other's public reputation was made in a political Cabinet post having nothing whatever to do with the law or the courts.

Both of these may turn out to be good judges. But the manner of their choosing is not going to increase the confidence of the people in he highest tribunal in the Federal judiciary or their respect for the decisions it hands down.

Imagine what a different effect would have been produced if President Kennedy had proceeded differently. Suppose he had taken time for long reflection, that he had carefully canvassed the field of eminent legal minds in State and Federal courts or among the great teachers of the law.

Then the man chosen might be someone hardly known to the general public, he might still be a man whose politics was the President's own, but everyone would have the feeling that the President of the United States had a great respect for its Supreme Court, that he had tried to choose not merely a good judge but the very best that he could find. You can be sure that not only would the stature of the Court rise in the public esteem but also that of the President himself.

As it is, we cannot help feeling sad that President Kennedy threw away that opportunity to do a service for his country.

Survey of the Department of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished British journal, the Economist, has made a complimentary appraisal of Attorney General Robert Kennedy and his administration of the Department of Justice.

In the edition of August 25 the Economist said:

> The cause of justice, as Mr. Kennedy conceives it, is being prosecuted with zeal and skill which have brought him both enemies and respect.

I am among those who have great respect for the job Robert Kennedy is doing. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article entitled "Mr. Attorney General" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL

Washington, D.C.—Mr. Robert Kennedy, a younger brother of the President and at 36 the second youngest Attorney General of the United States in American history, detests fraud, hypocrisy, and abuses of power. Visiting a well-known law school, he was asked whether a lawyer should ever lie to a judge. Mr. Kennedy said in his cool, courteous Boston accent that he thought any 6-year-old must know the answer to that sort of moral problem. As Attorney General and head of the Department of Justice, it is his job to give the President legal advice but, as the President's brother and closest associate, he is also consulted on defense, foreign policy, and national security. He knows the President's mind and the President relies on him implicitly to report on any situation with complete honesty. His advice is not always followed but it is always wanted.

Mr. Kennedy took time off from being Attorney General last February to go round the world speaking for his brother, and in a book [1] published this week—the profits are to be used for scholarships at universities in Japan, Indonesia, and West Berlin—he describes the trip which he made with his wife. He told Japanese and Indonesian students that it was time that they grew up, but he also admitted to Indonesians that Texas' war with Mexico in the last century was unjustified; this offended Texans, who also need to grow up. He claims to have helped to persuade the Indonesians to negotiate with the Dutch about New Guinea He urged young Japanese to have the courage of their convictions and to be willing to stand up and be counted; he praised the bravery of the Japanese student who argued hotly with him, as well as that of the young Indonesian who faced arrest and punishment by throwing fruit peel in his face. When he left the Orient Mr. Kennedy was more convinced than ever that the United States will be only a poor preacher on democracy as long as American Negroes are prevented from voting by threats, intimidation, and legal trickery. Writing books seems to be second nature to Kennedys and other members of the New Frontier; Mr. Kennedy records his dismay that a Djakarta bookshop had "not one book by the President of the United States."

---

[1] "Just Friends and Brave Enemies," by Robert F. Kennedy. Harper & Row, New York, 211 pages. $3.95.

He was his brother's campaign manager in the 1960 presidential election and he has a fiercely loyal team spirit, so long as the team is on the side of the Kennedys. Tirelessly athletic and happily married, he works with coat off, tie loose, and sleeves rolled up, behind a huge desk in an enormous office in the Department of Justice's big building in Washington. He has boyish good looks yet is a shy and highly strung man, intense and absorbed, with a burning-glass' power of concentration. But his sense of humor, like the President's, is never far away and runs habitually to slight self-mockery. He says the reasons why he became Attorney General are that he worked hard and that his brother was President—but not in that order.

After attending the University of Virginia's Law School, Mr. Kennedy served as an assistant counsel on the notorious McCarthy committee but left it because he disliked its methods; later he became chief counsel for the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. It was there that he first caught the public eye. Under his dynamic leadership the Department of Justice has gone after corrupt trade union leaders and business monopolies. It has also scourged gamblers and peddlers of dope, exposed crooked policemen and judges, and pressed energetically for more civil rights for Negroes.

Mr. Robert Kennedy is the Roman Catholic grandson of an Irish immigrant. But it is in the spirit of New England puritanism that he conducts the affairs of the Department of Justice. He worries about the moral fiber of America. His creed is to reach out with stark, almost naive honesty to do the things which he feels need doing. The Department of Justice is an instrument of singular power. It can put the squeeze on almost anyone by its ability to investigate almost anything, including income tax returns. The Attorney General has his brother's ear and like the President himself is continuously on the prod. Gangsters and other public enemies are uneasily aware that little brother is watching them. One man once called him, with deep feeling. the blue-eyed monster. Under previous Democratic administrations. the Department of Justice suffered from mediocre management by political hacks. President Eisenhower's men were capable but he did not back them up with any conspicuous enthusiasm. With the President's full support Mr. Kennedy chose a team of brilliant deputies, one of whom has already gone to the Supreme Court.

The cause of justice, as Mr. Kennedy conceives it, is being prosecuted with zeal and skill which have brought him both enemies and respect. Most of those who criticized the President for giving the job to his brother admit now that the Attorney General has done well. But although he appears as a dedicated man, people still ask what he is dedicated to other than President Kennedy. He himself says that businessmen ought to look on him as their friend, because he is on the side of the shrimps against the sharks, but some of them suspect that he regards big business as a form of organized crime. The swiftness with which he moved to investigate the steel industry this spring, dispatching his agents to knock up newspapermen at 3 o'clock in the morning, did nothing to reassure them.

Modestly he calls himself "an amateur in diplomacy" but there has been talk of him becoming Secretary of State and of him trying to become President in 1968 if his brother serves the two terms which are all that the law allows. But he is reported to be too shrewd to think that a Kennedy can succeed a Kennedy and to have said that "by then, they will be sick of us." Mr. Kennedy gives eight-tenths of his furious energies to his present job, in spite of the time he spends at meetings of the National Security Council, and at present it is by his undoubted success as Mr. Attorney General that he wishes to be judged.

Flame, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Knights of Columbus are undertaking a noble cause, which recently was described and strongly endorsed editorially by the Woburn Daily Times, an outstand newspaper in my Fifth District of Massachusetts:

FLAME, INC.

Richard Cardinal Cushing asked the delegates to the 80th convention of the Knights of Columbus, Tuesday evening, to establish a loan fund of $1 million.

The fund is to be named Flame, Inc., and stands for Friendship Loans to Latin American Endeavors, Inc.

What the cardinal has in mind is this: church officials in South America are trying to build schools—there are 70 million youngsters without school building facilities—to build churches, community centers, hospitals, and numerous other community institutions we in the Unted States take for granted.

The big obstacle is Latin American interest rates on loans. None of the bishops have the cash to build. But with long-term loans and reasonable interest rates they could accomplish far more than they are doing now.

The interest rates in South America range from 12 to 40 percent prohibitive in their exorbitance, the road block to progress.

Flame, Inc., would be a loan fund permitting Latin bishops to borrow up to $25,000 at 4 or 5 percent.

Two things strike us in the cardinal's appeal:

The admittedly outstanding opponent to communism all over the world is the Catholic church. One way to prevent the tide of Marxism from inundating the entire southern hemisphere is for men like the cardinal to promote church projects.

The second observation is: our Government is in no position to help the Catholic church in South America, even though it sees it as the great weapon against atheistic communism in that area.

So, the cardinal is doing what the Government can't do. He is devising a method for South American churchmen to help themselves, retain their dignity and independence from us by paying back loans at reasonable rates of interest, organizing private sources to do what no one could ask the Government to do.

Friday is the cardinal's 67th birthday. We wish him well on that day as we express our amazement at his energy.

And, we add, should the Knights of Columbus for one reason or another find it impossible to subsidize his plan, he should turn to the people of New England and ask their help.

What would we give now to save Cuba?

We can give that much to save South America from communism.

"Snafu" in Angola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the August 28, 1962, issue of the Dallas Morning News has printed some very pungent and important editorial comments on the subject of aid by the Central Congolese Government to rebels in Angola. The editorial, entitled " 'Snafu' in Angola," is meritorious of attention by the Members of the Senate.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNAFU IN ANGOLA

Last week the New York Times ran an extraordinary story on its front page concerning the extracurricular activities of the Central Congolese Government. According to the report, it is now clear that the Central Government of the Congo—which has the unqualified support of both the United States and the United Nations—is in turn giving its unqualified support to a band of Communist-led rebels who are preparing a military invasion of the neighboring Portuguese territory of Angola.

The Central Congolese Government has just donated a military training camp to the Angola nationalists who, for 17 months, have been waging a guerrilla campaign of terror in the northern portion of Angola. The camp is located near Thysville, about 100 miles north of the Angola border in Congo territory.

According to the report on which the New York Times story was based—a report issued by the National Front for the Liberation of Angola and corroborated by the Central Congolese Government of Premiere Cyrille Adoula—the camp is already training several hundred recruits and will be able to accommodate 700 within a few weeks.

Let's forget for a moment the nature of the rebellion—whether it is left, right or center, pro-Communist or anti-Communist, justified or unjustified. Irrespective of the coloring, it is a rebellion and its purpose is to wage war until either the Portuguese are driven out of Angola or the last rebellious soldier of the National Front is defeated.

Now let us remember what has been said by spokesmen for the State Department and the United Nations to justify their support of the Central Government of the Congo, which is now aiding and abetting this war.

If memory serves, the biggest argument for support of the Central Government has been the one about maintaining the peace. Even when U.N. troops were engaged in battle, it was all supposed to be part of the big peace mission in the Congo.

That was hard enough to swallow. But even the biggest throated U.N. apologist ought to find it almost impossible to down this latest act by the "peace loving" Central Congolese Government. Mr. Adoula's government for some time now has been giving its moral support to the Angolo rebels. It has also turned its head the other way when the rebels used Congolese territory to supply and support the invasion of Angola.

But Mr. Adoula's latest act—the willful donation of a military training camp—goes beyond these passive measures of support for the invasion.

And yet, we have seen nothing indicating that the United States or the United Nations is preparing to withdraw its support of the Central Congolese Government.

Now, back to the nature of the rebellion.

It all started about 8 years ago. Not until March of 1961, however, was much notice paid to it. At that time, the rebels launched a bloody campaign of slaughter in northern Angola—killing men, women, and children, Portuguese and Angolans, white and black alike.

The rebels have been receiving most of their support from the pro-Communist regimes in Ghana and Guinea. Russian and Czech officers have conducted most of the training of cadres. Weapons, other than those captured from the Portuguese, have come primarily from Czechoslovakia.

Considerable support has also come from Tunisia and Algeria. In fact, the latest announcement stated that the Congolese training camp would be supervised by 24 Angolans trained in Tunisia by the Algerian nationalist army, the FLN.

(An interesting note in the Times' story mentioned that an important part of the training would be for the use of plastic bombs. We heard a lot about French terrorists using the "plastiques," but this is one of the few times it has been admitted that the FLN used them. Probably when the Angola rebels start to use these bombs, it will be blamed on the Portuguese.)

All of this gives a clue to the nature of the rebellion: If Communists are so eagerly supporting it, what can we expect out of Angola if and when the rebels succeed? And with active support from the Central Government of the Congo, we now have further reason to question the motives of that Government.

Finally, if the U.N. continues to apologize for the Congolese actions, can we not at least begin to question the wisdom of the U.N.'s role in Africa, and the unqualified support it has received from the United States?

Local Transport Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the local service airlines constitute a very important and essential part of our national air transport system. The basic function of these carriers is to serve the smaller communities of the United States and afford a link with the larger airports served by the trunkline carriers. Essentially, they offer short-haul or feeder services. A number of these airlines are located in Alaska which depends for its transportation needs more on aviation than any other area of the United States.

The Association of Local Transport Airlines, under the direction of Gen. Joseph P. Adams, an aviation expert of wide reputation, has been cooperating with the Civil Aeronautics Board in an effort to formulate improvements in service to the traveling public as well as the achievement of a gradual, but substantial, reduction in the subsidy which Congress appropriates each year for the maintenance of their needed services. This is a type of industry-government cooperation which is commendable and, which, in my opinion, should be encouraged.

This year the Association of Local Transport Airlines conducted its principal meeting on August 23 to 25 in Anchorage, Alaska, and it was attended, not only by representatives of the local service airlines, but also by a number of the government officials of the State of Alaska including our former colleague in the House, Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT. The Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Robert T. Murphy, addressed the Association of Local Transport Airlines members on Friday evening, August 24. Mr. Murphy's speech is a thought-provoking review of some of the Board's policies designed to strengthen and improve the local service industry and, at the same time, to effect a reduction in subsidy requirements in keeping with the transportation message of President Kennedy as well as the views of the members of the House Appropriations Committee. As a fellow Rhode Islander, I know that Mr. Murphy has devoted particular atention to the encouragement and development of local carrier service, not only in New England, but also on a national level.

I would like to submit Mr. Murphy's address for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT T. MURPHY, VICE CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE SUMMER QUARTERLY REGIONAL MEETING, ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL TRANSPORT AIRLINES, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, AUGUST 24, 1962

It is, indeed, an honor and a privilege to have the occasion once again to participate in a quarterly meeting of this association. I am particularly gratified to have the opportunity of visiting for the first time the home State of my dear friend, Senator BOB BARTLETT. As a member of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, he not only encouraged my interest in aviation, but also helped to formulate some of the principles and policies of air transportation law which I am now endeavoring to implement as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I am, indeed, proud of my former association with Senator BARTLETT just as all Alaska is proud of his impressive record of public service in Washington.

Additionally, the convocation of your association in Alaska affords me a very valuable invitation to visit at large and familiarize myself with some of the unique types of air transportation operations which are indigenous to Alaska and which require review by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Some of you may recall that when I spoke to you last year in Asheville I used Association of Local Transport Airlines' four-point program as the outline for my discussion. This time, I thought it might be appropriate to consider what actions have been taken during this past year in furtherance of some points in that program.

Your first point is active support of the Board's "use it or lose it" policy. An understandable fear has been expressed by some that this policy of continuing review of the public convenience and necessity for local service would degenerate into a mere mechanical approach to issues of great import to many communities. However, our decisions in the last year indicate that the traffic standards established in the Seven States case, that is, an average of five originations at each station and an average of seven passengers aboard each leg of a flight, have not, in fact, been applied mechanically. The traffic standards, as you know, were adopted in order to state in simple and understandable terms a general measure of the public convenience and necessity for a valuable, but expensive, service. Their application has been tempered, in appropriate cases, when requirements of the national defense, an improving trend in passenger growth, lack of alternative transport service, or an inadequate trial period and similar factors were present. I need not tell you that this is an extremely difficult area of decisionmaking. It illustrates a lesson which I learned long ago that it is much easier to formulate general policies than to apply them to specific cases with wisdom, prudence, and justice.

An increasing number of "use it or lose it" cases are now coming on for hearing; and with the rapid development of the interstate highway program and the emphasis being given to the regional airport concept, the Board and the carriers will be faced with a growing number of such cases. President Kennedy's very learned message to Congress on the general subject of transportation will provide us with valuable guidelines in addressing ourselves to these problems. I believe that it is necessary and consistent with the sound philosophy of the President's transportation message for us to consider the most recent information available with respect to airport planning and development—a function of the FAA—and the road improvement program administered by the Bureau of Public Roads, in judging and deciding these cases.

Common experience tells us that the air traveler regards his journey as a totality; that is, from point of departure from home or the office to ultimate destination, the resort hotel or downtown business office perhaps hundreds of miles away. We at the Board are giving increased attention to the concept of the entire journey in considering what is the best possible means of transporting the existing and potential flow of traffic for such journey without excessive or unjustifiable costs to the taxpayer. In some instances this may mean discontinuation of air service at the closest airport in reliance upon the availability of convenient and expeditious surface transportation to a nearby airport where greater frequency and variety of air service offers advantages to the traveling public, to the industry which serves it and to the Federal and local treasuries which support it. This approach is consistent with the goal of the President's transportation message to eliminate excessive and unjustifiable costs either for common carrier airports or for airline subsidies, and with his objective of achieving an efficient, integrated transportation system.

In considering the regional airport concept it is essential to have valid information as to the means by which travelers arrive at airports. It would appear from present indications that most people move to and from the airport in private cars without particular regard to the availability of public ground transportation. It would seem, therefore, that with a good road system, a few additional miles to a regional airport—comparatively speaking—may have little effect upon a passenger's willingness to move in air transportation. I am advised that parties to the area airport cases now in process have been asked to develop information on this issue, and I assume that it will constitute an important part of the record in all of these proceedings.

The area airport concept is seemingly simple and attractive in principle. However, applying the concept to a particular factual situation will require the weighing and evaluating of many important considerations. As you are aware, the Board has instituted a regional airport investigation in the New England area and also in the State of Wisconsin. Similar proceedings can be expected elsewhere. These cases will be decided only after the development of a full record reflecting the thinking of all parties who will be affected. There will be no snap judgments, I assure you.

The second point in Association of Local Transport Airlines' four-point program concerns the transfer of trunkline points to local service carriers. Such action has been taken in connection with American's authority at Springfield and Peoria, Ill., and Roanoke, Va. The question of TWA's authority to serve Reading and Williamsport, Pa., and Elmira and Binghamton, N.Y., Braniff's service at Chattanooga, Eastern's service at New Haven, American's service at Akron and Midland/Odessa, are all presently in process. As you may have noted from my concurring statement in the American-Ozark Springfield, Peoria case, this is a subject of particular interest to me. I am frank to tell you that I intend to examine each of these proposals with great care, bearing in mind that the basic interest to be served by such transfers must be the overall public interest and not the narrow corporate interest of either the trunk or local service carrier industry. With mounting subsidy of current concern to the President, the Congress and the CAB alike, prudence is required before existing nonsubsidized long-haul service is supplanted by subsidized short-haul service.

Your third point, access to profitable dense short-haul markets, is rather difficult to discuss in the abstract.

This leads me to your fourth point concerning elimination of local service carrier operating restrictions. Substantial relaxations of certificate restrictions were authorized in the Pacific Southwest and Piedmont area cases. We have noted a significant decrease in the number of exemption and change in service pattern requests in recent months which, I believe, is the direct result of the relaxation of certificate restrictions in the local service area cases. Perhaps the most significant recent step was the inclusion in the west coast "use it or lose it" case of the issue of revising that carrier's entire certificate with a view to consolidating segments and simplifying the restrictions with the net result of affording the carrier increased operating flexibility without the necessity of recourse to the board. I think this is a very desirable technique and presume the same consideration will be afforded each carrier at an appropriate occasion.

One of the primary matters I discussed last summer was the need for improvement in local service carrier load factors and although there are some spotty improvements, this is an area which continues to require priority attention. I should note that the Board is pleased with the establishment of the joint industry-CAB committee on review of the 1960 class rate and the President's request for programs for subsidy reduction, both of which will presumably consider the load factor problem. I am hopeful that desirable results can be achieved from these joint efforts.

Let me mention a point of great interest, at least to me as one member of the Board—the plan of subsidized carriers to acquire new equipment. It is quite obvious that the next step, as well as some recent steps, in upgrading equipment by subsidized carriers will be expensive ones. We cannot afford to ignore the recent lesson in the history of trunkline reequipment in this regard. This step will lead, not only to the expansion of the rate base, but also to increases in financing charges and, accordingly, could cause the subsidy payments to increase markedly. Classic arguments of the greater efficiency of more modern aircraft must be most closely evaluated. The efficiency of new aircraft is often stated in terms of lower seat-mile cost per available seat. However, we all know that the direct operating costs of a flight with larger and more modern equipment is more expensive than the operation of the same flight with a DC-3. Such greater cost, when spread over the increase in available seats, can result in a lower seat-mile cost figure; but seat-mile costs really are not the test. The real test is whether or not the larger aircraft will be operated over the carrier's system at a break-even load factor. It is perfectly obvious that many subsidized carrier segments will never justify service with such larger and more expensive equipment.

Let us not forget that the basic function of the local service airline is to offer short-haul or feeder service. The selection of new equipment should be based upon what is best suited to fulfill that primary function. Your problem might be minimized if we had available right now a true successor to the DC-3. As aviation's great champion, Senator MIKE MONRONEY, has so frequently observed in recent months, this is one of our pressing needs. Your low-cost plane design committee, activated at your regional meeting this spring, can do much toward making real progress in achieving this highly desirable objective. In the meantime, however, there is understandable doubt in my mind that a 65-passenger, high-speed jet aircraft is the true replacement for the DC-3 workhorse of local and feeder service.

I have been reviewing matters of perhaps primary interest to the local service carriers which operate in the lower 48. I could not, in good grace, accept an invitation to speak in our largest and newest State without commending those carriers which have for so long played such a vital role in the economy of Alaska, namely, the intra-Alaska carriers. I can think of no other area in the world where general economic development and progress have been so directly the result of air services as is the case in Alaska. Alaskan air transport began with the operation of the small fabric-covered planes operated by men of great daring and fortitude. They were men whose exploits made them legends in their own time and we are fortunate to have a number of them with us today. I have had the pleasure of meeting some of these Alaskan pioneers in Washington. I am fortunate now to associate with them on their native soil. I am looking forward to spending the next few days in seeing for myself the very areas where they have established reliable air service against considerable adversity.

I suspect we are in an important transitional period insofar as the intra-Alaskan air transport picture is concerned. Following statehood, the Board's jurisdiction over solely intra-Alaskan service continues because of the authorizations to carry the mail. We no longer have exclusive regulatory authority. We have been and will continue to work closely with the Alaska Public Service Commission in a mutual effort that air service required by the public interest continue in our newest State.

While I have much to learn concerning Alaskan air transport problems and achievements, there is one aspect of it on which I wish to comment briefly. Here, in this truly magnificent area, once belonging to a great country which has since been subverted to the yoke of communism, we have woven a pattern of the competitive free enterprise system operating at its best. I refer to the intra-Alaska air transport industry. Beginning years ago with numerous individual entrepreneurs whose operations gradually expanded and were consolidated, we now have nine licensees providing transport services to the citizens of Alaska on a free and private ownership basis. The National Government has subsidized these operations, not only in the interest of our national commerce and postal requirements, but also in the interest of our national defense. We have had cooperation in our efforts to reduce and eventually eliminate that subsidy and, already, one of your carriers has furnished its service without subsidy for several years. It is commendable, I believe, that air transportation in this State so vitally affected by considerations of our national defense has developed and flourished under the aegis of private enterprise rather than Government ownership as is the case with the Alaska Railroad. The necessity for nationalization of air transportation has never been demonstrated here for the reason that the Alaska air carriers have conducted their operations with a high sense of public service and adventurous enterprise. As separate entities, managed by individuals of differing views—rugged, independent views—we have had the advantage of separate judgments in determining how best to develop an essential and economic service in a geographic area of great importance to our country.

In this day and age when the supermarket has become some sort of a shrine to modernism and the individual entrepreneur a disappearing vestige of America's past—with the homage paid to the large institutionalized corporation producing the organization man in his gray flannel suit—it is refreshing to find the continuing existence and influence of the individual pioneers in air transportation on this last frontier of America. May their tribe increase.

Civil Defense Workers Need Support and Encouragement of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, in respect to appropriations for civil defense expenditures, now being considered as part of the independent offices appropriations bill, I have received a very important letter from the director of the Pueblo City-County Civil Defense Agency, Mr. Jack D. Craddock.

Mr. Craddock points out the contributions of time, energy, and devotion made by the citizens of our cities and towns in the efforts of civil defense.

Mr. Craddock very wisely notes that the Congress of the United States has not given this program the consideration and respect which it deserves. I commend this letter to all Members of Congress and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUEBLO CITY-COUNTY
CIVIL DEFENSE AGENCY,
Pueblo, Colo., August 9, 1962.

Hon. JOHN CARROLL,
U.S. Senator,
State of Colorado,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Being relatively new to civil defense (appointed director of the Pueblo City-County Civil Defense Agency August 1, 1961), I am not entirely familiar with all of the problems of civil defense. I do feel, however, that I have a working knowledge of those problems faced at the local level and can pretty well trace these problems to the contradictions, disorganization and confusion associated with the top echelons of civil defense and now so very much in evidence in the present actions of the Members of both Houses over the request for civil defense funds, especially, those for the shelter-incentive program.

Last year the administration, with the blessing of Congress, asked local civil defense personnel and governing officials to undertake the job of developing community shelter capabilities. We undertook this task and found a high degree of sincere interest and cooperation from all persons directly concerned including the citizens at large. We informed people about the shelter program as proposed by the Government, we obtained permission to use the space, we had propertyowners sign the agreement with the Federal Government, and began preparing for the marking and supplying of the shelter areas. We did our job and we did it willingly.

Now we are forced to sit and watch a spectacle that is beyond comprehension. Many of the same people who insisted on the program, who directed us to start the ball rolling, now show a complete lack of interest or fail to see any need for continuing the community shelter program. In short, the same old contradictions that have killed local civil defense in the past will no doubt be forthcoming again.

The unfortunate part of this situation is that, after a brief flurry of comment via the wire services, the matter will be dropped and considered a closed issue, but at the local level we face a public who has seen another example of the "civil defense boondoggle" (terminology used by certain Senators who, in fact, have contributed highly to this very situation) and the stigma slides neatly down from level to level until once again the local civil defense people are left holding the bag.

I do not intend to use this letter as an appeal to save the civil defense funds now pending before Congress. I would rather have it considered as an appeal to the Congress of the United States to either give civil defense the same consideration and respect as is demanded and due other branches of the Department of Defense, or let's quit kidding ourselves, the public and local government and do away with what once again is becoming known as "the civil defense mess."

Respectfully yours,
JACK D. CRADDOCK,
Director, Pueblo City-County Civil Defense Agency.

Independence Day of Federation of Malaya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the Paramount Ruler of the Federation of Malaya, Tuanku Syed Putra Ibni Almarhum Syed Hassan Jamalullail, Yang di-Pertuan Agong; and His Excellency, the Malayan Ambassador to the United States, Hussain Mohamed Osman, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of Malayan independence.

MALAYAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Today I wish to take these few moments to offer my best wishes to the people of the Federation of Malaya on the occasion of this anniversary of their independence.

The bitterest part of Malaya's independence struggle was not against the United Kingdom, but was rather directed at Communist guerrilla elements who attempted to subvert that independence before it was won. Begun in 1948, this fierce campaign of terror cost millions of dollars, brought thousands of casualties, and delayed Malayan independence for several years. Finally the rebels were defeated; and as a result of agreements with the British in 1956 and 1957, the Federation of Malaya reached full independence within the Commonwealth of Nations on August 31, 1957.

The newest nation in the Far East, Malaya's economy is one of the most dynamic in the entire region. While the Federation is still in the early stages of industrial development, it is making rapid strides toward improving the lot of its people. Health conditions are making impressive advancements, and the level of literacy, already above 51 percent, is being raised by a large-scale education program.

Some two-thirds of the cultivated area of the country is devoted to rubber, which, as the chief employer of labor and the main source of public revenue and foreign exchange, is the backbone of the economy. Another very important export item is tin. To a large extent it can be said that the Malayan economy is dependent on the world demand and prices for these two commodities. Quite naturally, diversification ranks high among the goals of Malaya's economic planning. Other objectives of the Government's agricultural policy are improving cultivation techniques, encouraging the production of various secondary crops, and expanding research and agricultural education. The Government also aims at diversifying its industry. For example, it provides a tax holiday of up to 5 years for local or foreign firms in pioneer industries. The general guidelines of Malaya's current economic development are set forward in the second 5-year plan, 1961–65. This plan follows the 1956–60 one under which considerable strides were made. It is my sincere hope that Malaya will continue to reap the harvest of the foresight it has thus far shown in setting forth along the road to economic prosperity.

Malaya is not only forward-looking in its domestic affairs, but has also shown great imagination on the international level. It is a prime mover of the Association of Southeast Asia, which seeks to build greater inter-regional cooperation between the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaya. Perhaps even more dramatic than this scheme is a program initiated by Tengku Abdul Rahman to integrate Malaya, Singapore, Brunei, Sarawak, and North Borneo into a mighty Malaysia. This plan, which it is hoped will be implemented by the summer of 1963, not only offers greater viability in the ethnic distribution of the Chinese and Malays living in the various territories, but also promises widespread economic advantages for all. I speak for many Americans in saying that I cheer this new initiative, and wish the Malaysia project every success.

It gives me great pleasure to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to Prime Minister Tengku Abdul Rahman and to the people of Malaya on this fifth anniversary of the independence of the Federation of Malaya.

Milwaukee Sentinel Protests Wisconsin Shortchanged on Defense Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Sentinel has shown in an excellent editorial how seriously our State of Wisconsin misses out on the Defense Department's prime research and development contracts.

The Sentinel does not settle for merely deploring the said fact that our State only receives one-third of its proportionate share. The Milwaukee Sentinal calls on Wisconsin to build the research-educational-industrial complex that our great industry, scientific, and university capacity will permit.

Mr. President, the Federal Government can and should play a major part in building this complex. From the standpoint of national security, growth and diversification, this complex will greatly serve the public interest. I intend to do all I can to achieve that.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Sentinel entitled "Shortchanged," may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORTCHANGED

Wisconsin has about 3 percent of the Nation's manufacturing output, but it has been getting only 1 percent of the Defense Department's prime contracts for research and development.

Such contracts last year amounted to $6 billion. If Wisconsin's share of those contracts had been commensurate with its share of the Nation's industry, it would have meant an additional $120 million in contracts for our State.

This situation is what our industrialists, educators, civic leaders, and Government officials are worried about.

The educators are deeply concerned because the majority of Wisconsin students graduating with a Ph. D. in engineering and other advanced sciences must find employment in the big research centers outside the State. Wisconsin has few jobs to offer them.

This is a two-dimensional economic waste—we bear the cost of educating these young men and women, then other States get the contracts which might have come to us if we had been able to keep our Ph. D.'s at home.

The vast bulk of the defense research and development contracts goes to those communities with large research-educational-industrial complexes, chiefly in New England and California.

There is no reason why we should not make a start on building such a complex here, possibly in Madison, or perhaps preferably in Milwaukee. We have the industries; we have the engineering and scientific schools; we have a tradition of fine skills.

What we have lacked, perhaps, is a coordination of effort among all those concerned. The last few days have brought hopeful signs that such coordination may be achieved in the future. We have a long way to go, but it's better to start late than never.

Exercise Riptide III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, the associate editor of the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., recently observed naval maneuvers off Portugal in Exercise Riptide III. Mr. Harrigan, noted as a very capable and sound writer, has completed a series of articles on Exercise Riptide III in the News and Courier. His second and third articles, entitled "NATO Needs Nuclear Arms" and "A United Defense," are particularly thought provoking, and, as such, should be of interest to the Members of this body.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 22, 1962]

EXERCISE RIPTIDE III: NATO NEEDS NUCLEAR ARMS

(By Anthony Harrigan)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second in a series of articles on naval maneuvers off Portugal.)

WITH THE NATO STRIKING FLEET.—At the heart of this 40-ship formation steaming toward the coast of Portugal is the French antisubmarine aircraft carrier *Clemenceau*. The task of this carrier, under command of Vice Adm. Francis Laine, French Navy, is to afford protection against enemy undersea forces.

But there is a flaw in the basic situation. For the French Navy lacks the most effective weapon against Communist submarines: atomic depth charges. If this were a real war situation, and enemy submarines were operating against the NATO striking fleet, the French ASW boss would have to call on the American naval commander to order a nuclear depth charge attack on Russian nuclear submarines. But in such a war situation, the French could not be certain that the United States would be willing to initiate defensive action with a nuclear weapon. The U.S. Government might prefer to hold back on the use of tactical nuclear weapons.

Here, then, is the crux of the problem facing France, NATO, and the whole Western Alliance. Here is the source of concern felt to a high degree by President De Gaulle of France and also by German defense planners.

While the area of defense is Western Europe, the countries of Western Europe—England excepted—lack effective nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them. Thus, defense of continental Europe is conditioned upon the military thinking of the American administration in power at the moment.

It is the policy of the Kennedy administration to discourage development of an atomic capability by NATO countries of continental Europe. Yet the administration, at the same time, seeks the continuing and enlarged cooperation of the Western countries—but on the level of nonnuclear weapons.

It is in many ways unreasonable to expect Western continental countries to assume a defensive posture based on imposed limitation of their armaments. To engage in war planning in the 1960's solely on the basis of nonnuclear arms is like arming with bows and arrows in the age of gunpowder. Thus, if the French and Germans are discouraged about military cooperation on the basis approved by the present administration, it should not be a surprise.

Understanding at the Franco-German position is essential if the NATO alliance is to have validity. The continental countries need assurance that their military efforts are worthwhile in terms of financial sacrifices involved. Moreover, they must be confident that all their defense requirements are met by the NATO organization. This is an Atlantic alliance in the sense that it is made up of nations that are West oriented. But defense requirements of the NATO countries also include protection of Europe's southern flank. Keeping the sealanes open across the Atlantic is an essential task. Having the abilitiy to strike at Communist forces attacking from bases in central Europe also is essential. But this is not enough; Europe also must have defense from the southern approach. The NATO striking fleet must have war plans that include operations against attackers assaulting Iberia (Spain and Portugal). NATO's military planning must take into account the possible need of strikes at Communist bases in north Africa from which an attack against Europe could be mounted.

Unknown at present is the Kennedy administration's attitude toward strikes against Communist bases in north Africa in the event of an attack on Iberia from that area. Would the Kennedy administration be willing to use conventional weapons—any force at all—against pro-Communist north African forces of "volunteers" attacking Iberia? Or would the administration regard such an attack as it regarded the Indonesian attack on west New Guinea, controlled by another NATO ally, the Netherlands? If the attack were of a major nature, and danger of losing Iberia became critical, would the administration then authorize the use of tactical nuclear weapons? Would nuclear depth charges be used to prevent landing of guerillas in Iberia from Communist submarines?

These questions concern the continental countries far more than they concern the American people. Yet success of NATO hinges on frank discussion in the United States of these issues that are of vital interest to Europeans now outflanked by the rise of pro-Communist Algeria.

The big question is whether the (Western NATO allies) are to share U.S. nuclear weaponry or whether they are to develop a limited number of nuclear weapons on their own. If they are not allowed to share with the United States, are discouraged from developing their own atomic arms, danger exists that neutralist sentiment may grow. It may grow out of the feeling of European nations that they are being treated as less than allies, that their strategic interests are not being fully protected under the present policy of the administration.

It is this danger that should lead the United States toward consideration fuller sharing of weaponry with allies. The only justification for NATO from the U.S. viewpoint, is that America's survival depends on the survival of other Western countries. To fail to give these allies confidence could be a disastrous mistake for the United States.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 23, 1962]

EXERCISE RIPTIDE III: A UNITED DEFENSE

(By Anthony Harrigan)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the third in a series of articles on naval maneuvers off Portugal.)

WITH THE NATO STRIKING FLEET.—"Europe's main reason for Atlantic unity is a military one."

That's the view of a Netherlands parliamentarian, and it's realistic. But Western Europe is a long way from making an all-out military effort, especially in naval defense. Several countries have the capability of augmenting NATO sea forces. In concert, these countries have a military capacity equal to their economic capacity.

But impediments to full development of Western Europe's military potential are many. The Kennedy administration's nuclear policy is a blocking factor, but it isn't the only one. Old European divisions and reluctance to sacrifice for security are part of the overall cause.

France has one carrier and three destroyers in Exercise Riptide III. The fleet commander reports excellent cooperation from the French. Yet France is still one of the world's leading naval powers. Why France isn't more heavily represented is a key question.

But France has had grave internal troubles. Maybe the French Government felt that it might be necessary to run warships to Algeria to evacuate French citizens from a country controlled by the Ben Bella politbureau. Whatever the reason, good or bad, the French impact in the Atlantic is not particularly strong at this time.

While there is plenty of talk about need for West Germany to assume a larger share of the economic burden in defense of Europe, no one talks about the equal need for West German seapower.

The German Navy has come back fast—much faster than the American public realizes. She has acquired six U.S. destroyers in recent years. She is building 12 new destroyers on her own designs. Her new fast frigate *Emden* is one of the most advanced small warships in the world, driven by an experimental combination of diesels and gas turbines.

The smaller countries of Western Europe are not without valuable warships. Portugal has a first-class antisubmarine frigate built a few years ago in Italy. The Netherlands has an excellent aircraft carrier, 2 cruisers and 12 first-class destroyers. Belgium has a large number of minesweepers. Denmark has two new frigates. Other countries have vessels to contribute.

If some of these ships lack modern missiles, that's not a lag impossible to overcome. France sells missiles overseas to South Africa. Sweden also manufactures missiles for sale. There's no question about German knowhow. Three German scientists recently designed missiles for Egypt.

Two key NATO countries are France and Germany. Together, they have the scientific and industrial skills to produce all the armaments needed in the 1960's. France has exploded nuclear devices. The Germans have keyed their thinking to nuclear war conditions, though they lack tactical atomic weapons at the present.

Clearly, there must be a German presence in the Atlantic in the years ahead. As one of the great trading nations of the world, Germany has markets in South America, Africa, and in the Near East. To the extent that Germany fails to make a bigger contribution at sea, Germany is depending on the United States and the United Kingdom. Nor is it proper that Germany's naval effort be confined to the Baltic and the North Sea. It is needed in the Atlantic as well. It is absurd for the most powerful anti-Communist nation in Europe to have a naval commitment on a par with a small power. The other side of the issue is that all restrictions should be removed from German naval construction.

If France and Germany have the skills and the means, Portugal and Spain occupy the strategic territories. And if Western Europe is a beachhead on the Eurasian continent, Iberia is the beachhead area of Europe. It is an arrow pointing at Africa and, at the same time, the zone of opportunity for Communist aggressors from the south. In addition, Spain and Portugal are the semideveloped countries of Europe—countries deficient in economic resources and politically most in danger of Communist subversive attack. Spain and Portugal are in need of NATO assistance in many ways. First of all, in the case of Spain, NATO membership is needed. To have the key strategic country of southern Europe outside of NATO is to leave a gap in the West's defenses.

Spain is a test case of Western thinking about NATO. Either there is an Atlantic community, or there is not; either Spain belongs in NATO and Portugal deserves full support, or the community is a myth. It makes no sense to defend part of the European perimeter and leave one part undefended or shabbily treated. Logic dictates a NATO Atlantic-Iberian command.

Western defense demands community and continuity. It calls for military alliance from Norway south to Spain; from the Arctic to the Mediterranean. The Communists are moving their power down the North African land bridge, with Iberia as the goal before striking at the heart of Europe beyond the Pyrenees. It must not come to pass that the road to Paris and Bonn is through Madrid and Lisbon. NATO military power, especially its seapower, provides the ideal deterrent and determinant—the floating barrier for Europe.

No part of Western Europe is expendable, certainly not strategic Portugal and Spain—the gateway to France. Nothing but a militarily united Europe can preserve a politically united Europe. This means full cooperation with Portugal and Spain to an extent not contemplated in recent years.

If the two countries of Iberia aren't against the other Western countries, then they are with us and deserve full support from the rest of the Atlantic community—economic, political, and military—three dimensional support.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Incorporation of the Borough Manasquan, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the permission to insert in the RECORD a statement about the Borough of Manasquan, N.J., which was prompted because it is about to celebrate the 75th anniversary of its incorporation. This statement was written by Miss Elizabeth A. McCraith, who is an active participant in the coming celebration and a fine citizen of the State of New Jersey:

> The Borough of Manasquan, N.J., will celebrate the 75th birthday of its incorporation in October. To mark this diamond jubilee, a group of residents have compiled a comprehensive history of the area from its earliest beginnings in 1685 to the present date.
>
> The story it tells is one of valor and courage, of hardy pioneers wresting a civilization out of the wilderness. Their hardihood and perseverance producing a progressive and prosperous community replacing forests and desolation. Thus the history of Manasquan is not unlike the history of America.
>
> The Borough is on the Manasquan River, from which it takes its name. The word is of Indian derivation and is interpreted to mean "beautiful river."
>
> The Manasquan Inlet marks the start of the inland waterway to Florida.
>
> Today, Manasquan opens its doors to thousands of visitors each year who find the same beauty in the river and ocean that attracted settlers hundreds of years ago.
>
> The Unamis branch of the Lenni Lenape Indians were the first inhabitants along the river. The first white men to glimpse our shores were Sir Hendryck Hudson and his crew, who passed in 1609. But it was not until later in the 17th century that settlers began to arrive.
>
> The history book notes: "Gradually the uplands along the shore were settled. Those who settled in the vicinity of Manasquan came by way of the sea in ships. Landing in the river, they selected their homesites, cleared the land, built their homes in which they installed their families and, few and often scant, possessions.
>
> "Bit by bit they cleared their land, made trails which became crude roads and in their habitations began to mingle in those social gatherings that have ever been the relaxation of those who live close to the soil and come to grips with nature.
>
> "So began and grew the settlements along the placid Manasquan."
>
> From these humble beginnings has emerged a thriving community, with 9 churches, 3 public schools, 25 miles of borough streets, and a flourishing year-round and resort business activity.
>
> It is because of its geography and its historical background that Manasquan will ever retain its picturesque, indestructible characteristics.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the July 28 issue of the Illustrated London News, published in London, an extremely interesting article appeared regarding the great contribution that the people of Poland made toward the ultimate destruction of Adolph Hitler.

This article was written by Mr. Arthur Bryant, and it is significant in that Mr. Bryant calls upon the people of England to show their appreciation of this great effort by the Poles by bringing some form of assistance to the Polish political immigrants who were not able to return after the war to their homeland, illegally seized by the Communists.

I call this article to the attention of my colleagues because various efforts here in Congress to give these great Polish heroes, who are now American citizens, some form of assistance when they are in need have met with little success.

There are two bills pending before Congress now which I am sure a grateful America would approve. One provides that former Polish Army soldiers who fought with the Allied troops and who now reside in the United States should be entitled to hospital care in our Veterans Administration hospitals on a "beds-available" basis. The other measure would pay these former victims of the war who are now American citizens a modest compensation from frozen assets now in the possession of our Government.

It is my hope that perhaps we Americans will better appreciate the great contribution these people have made in the war effort by reading the following article and understanding the attitude which is being displayed by our wartime ally, the British people:

> In the spring of 1939, such trust as it had in German good faith and intentions utterly broken, and certain now that only the conviction that they would be opposed resolutely and to the death could deter the Nazi leaders from war, the British Government promised Poland that if it chose to resist any attempt by Germany against its independence or frontiers, Britain would at once go

to Poland's assistance. That undertaking proved the immediate casus belli of the greatest and most destructive war in history and the ultimate cause of Hitler's downfall and the preservation of Europe's liberty. It saved Russia by giving her a 2-years breathing space before the attack which Hitler had resolved, and long planned, to launch against her and it decided that, when that attack came, Russia's vulnerable southern flank would be guarded by the British Eastern Mediterranean Fleet and Air Forces and by the British and Commonwealth armies in the Middle East. There was no German attack from Asia Minor on the Caucasus and the vital, vulnerable Baku oilwells because Britain, armed at last after nearly 2 years of war and rearmament, stood in the way. For Hitler's reply—in the end a fatal one for him—to the British guarantee to Poland, was the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of August 1939. The pact spelt the certain destruction of Poland if it should decide to act on the British guarantee and, so Hitler supposed, the apparent defeat and fatuity of Britain's strategic resistance to Germany. But the price the would-be world conqueror had to pay for it was a reprieve for Russia. And though that reprieve was temporary, it was to prove fatal for him.

Poland chose to resist and, by resisting Hitler's atrocious designs, to be destroyed. Only a very great people would have done so under such circumstances, but the Poles, for all their political faults and failures, have proved again and again that they are a very great people. In the 17th century they saved European civilization; they did so again by this heroic sacrifice of theirs in the 20th century. For though nothing but instantaneous and annihilating defeat followed or could follow Poland's refusal to submit to Hitler's will by submitting and joining under duress, as Rumania and Hungary later joined, his eastward march against Russia—whom the Poles also feared and hated and had every cause to fear and hate—its consequences were as great as those that have followed any political act in history. It brought Britain and France into the field against Hitler at a time when Hitler had to be opposed by force of arms or be allowed to triumph over all mankind. And though within 10 months France had failed and the French Government had surrendered, the British refused to let go and in spite of all odds held grimly on, like a bulldog, at the conqueror's throat until in the fullness of time others entered the fight and made use of the respite that long, solitary bulldog grip had given them.

Yet without Poland's decision and sacrifice that bulldog grip would never have been applied at the decisive moment or, when it had been, would have been applied too late. The Poles, almost to a man, knew instinctively that Hitler must be resisted at whatever price to themselves. And we in Britain who pledged ourselves to stand by them and so gave them the hope and belief that the sacrifice that they then so heroically elected to make would not be in vain, owe them a debt of honor which we can only repay today by helping the little handful of expatriate representatives and survivors of that martyred generation now living in our midst who gave their all, not merely for the Poland they loved and which was past saving but for civilization and all that we call Christendom. The independence of Poland which, under the aegis of an all-devouring Stalin and a fatally trusting President Roosevelt, was shamefully repudiated by the victors of the crusade for human liberty in which she had been the first to take the cross of renunciation, valor and suffering, cannot be restored today except at the price of a world nuclear war. But the comfort, personal independence and human dignity of the brave Polish survivors and exiles who fought with and for us, and, in fighting, lost all they possessed except their honor and courage, can at least be assured by the British people, both in their corporate capacity as a nation and in their personal one as individuals. And at a time when, for better or worse, we are talking, and for our own supposed advantage, 17 years after the end of the war in which Poland perished, of throwing in our economic and political lot with the nation that destroyed Poland, it seems particularly incumbent on us to do all that we can to honor that debt to these gallant men eating the bread of exile in the country that bade them have the faith to fight and which, not without their help, survived and triumphed in the struggle that engulfed them and their own land.

Of such men there are some especially to whom, acting in our individual capacity, we can bring timely and wanted help. The Polish Air Force Association in Great Britain, whose address is 14, Collingham Gardens, London, SW5, exists to render to Polish exairmen who fought by our side in the late war the same invaluable assistance that the RAF Benevolent Fund gives to those, and their dependents, who have served in the RAF. It provides grants and loans to those in need of assistance and who can be helped in no other way, including the disabled, sick and temporarily unemployed, and the families, widows and orphans of Polish airmen killed in action or deceased. It makes interest-free loans to those who need money to buy tools to obtain employment or to establish themselves in small businesses or workshops. It sends parcels containing materials, clothes, medical goods and food to the distressed families of Polish airmen living behind the Iron Curtain in Poland and who in many cases are suffering great privation. It gives advice and provides a meeting place and social and cultural entertainment for exiled Polish airmen in England. It does untold good with very little money, and it needs more.

When Poland's own heroic and unavailing fight against the German hordes ended in the death in battle of 80,000 and the captivity, ruin, and enslavement of millions, thousands of Polish soldiers and airmen, refusing to give up the struggle, made their way to France and ultimately to England in order to fight on. In the words of a Ministry of Information wartime publication telling the official story of the Allied Air Forces from the occupied countries, "they had skied across the Carpathians; they had been through the prisons of Hungary; they had stolen boats and had rowed down the Drava River into Yugoslavia; they had come by steamer to Marseilles. They found themselves in a France on the verge of defeat and disunity. So in June 1940 their escape began again. There was now only one country left for them—England."[1] There they became the largest of the exiled European forces fighting against Germany and, in due course of time, played, in the desert, in Italy, and in Normandy and northwest Europe, a vital part in the defeat of Germany.

Among them were a considerable number of Polish airmen. Within a few weeks of their arrival in England there were two Polish fighter squadrons among the devoted little array that defied and defeated the Luftwaffe in the Battle of Britain. One pilot in every eight who fought for us and mankind in that immortal struggle was a Pole. One of them destroyed 25 raiders in 4 days. Altogether they brought down in the battle 200 German aircraft. Group Capt. Douglas Bader, who fought with these Polish airmen, has recalled them as "a tough, dedicated bunch who fought to save these islands as though they were fighting over their own country. None of us," he wrote, "will ever forget them." Before the war ended there were no fewer than 14 Polish squadrons serving with the RAF.

"When the call came," Sir Winston Churchill has said, "Poland did not hesitate. * * * She showed in the spontaneous response of her sons and daughters that spirit of national unity and of self-sacrifice which has maintained her among the great nations of Europe through all her many trials and tribulations." In the words of the patron of the Polish Air Force Association, Marshal of the Royal Air Force Sir John Slessor, its sons who continued throughout the war to fight by our side, "never wavered. They started fighting before we did and only stopped when we stopped.* * * There are the widows and orphans of those dead aircrews; there are the disabled and the sick; the aging men and their dependents who naturally find it more difficult than we to live in a land which is not their own. * * * Try and imagine what it would be like if the situation were reversed. How would you like to be an exile in a strange land—a friendly land, of course, but nonetheless a foreign country—unable even to go back to England? Supposing you or your wife or child broke a leg or got pneumonia, or lost your job; wouldn't you like to feel that you had someone to turn to for help—some organization run by your own people, talking your own language—something like a branch of your Regimental Old Comrades Association or King George's Fund for Sailors or the RAF Benevolent Fund? That is what the Polish Air Force Association exists for."

---

[1] "There's Freedom in the Air," Ministry of Information, 1943.

Greater Insecticide Control Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much recent comment on the drug control activities of the Food and Drug Administration. Numerous articles have appeared in newspapers and in other mass mediums calling for investigation and reevaluation of the Federal functions in these areas. Yet, we are today faced with a problem of even greater significance to both present and future generations—the problem of indiscriminate use of toxic insecticides and pesticides and their effect on urban dwellers, who, having no choice, must purchase foods ineradicably contaminated with toxic agents without any knowledge thereof. A series of three articles, commencing with the June 16, 1962, issue of the New Yorker magazine, written by Rachel Carson, noted biologist, has pointed out many aspects of this problem.

The two main problem areas of insecticide use for the urban dweller are ecological balance and toxic agents causing pollution of water supplies and foodstuffs. The history of life on earth is a history of interaction of living things and their surroundings. Nature has achieved, through eons of evolution, an ecological—environmental—balance which keeps all species of animal life in reasonable proportion to all other species. Man, however, has recently achieved artificial means to disrupt this delicate balance though the use of insecticides. Quite often, his efforts to eliminate a certain species of insect have had disastrous results. Although the insect pest is often brought under temporary control, its natural enemy—birds, another insect, and so forth—is also often wiped out and the complex predator-prey balance is destroyed. The insect world, however, has shown surprising ability to develop resistance to insecticides and often an even greater resurgence of the insect population follows since the insect's natural enemy has been destroyed. Man is then forced to develop an even more powerful insecticide and the cycle begins anew with the usual result that the insect pest is not controlled and that widespread environmental contamination and death of animal life is produced. This has reached catastrophic proportions in many areas of the world where disease-carrying insects have reached a point of resistance to insecticides such that they have become almost ineradicable. Miss Carson suggests several means to combat this vicious cycle. The first, of course, is increased sanitation which would destroy the breeding places of many objectionable and disease-carrying insects. Second, she advocates the use of biological controls, that is, the importation and distribution of the insect's natural enemy to aid in keeping the insect population under control. She notes, for example, that the Japanese beetle has been brought under excellent control on the east coast through the use of biological controls, while Department of Agriculture efforts in the Midwest to control the beetle by extensive spraying have failed miserably.

A more serious problem is the effects widespread application of insecticides may have on present and future generations. Many insecticides in use today have proven toxic effects on humans, including DDT and its derivatives, chlorinated hydrocarbons—dieldrin, and so forth—and organic phosphates. It has been proven by experimentation that these toxic chemicals are often stored in the fatty reserves of the body and their cumulative effect may be extremely dangerous. For example, the vital enzyme functions of the cells in performing oxidation of complex sugars may be affected, causing immediate death, since the body is unable to obtain energy for vital life processes. Some insecticides have been proven to be cancer producing—carcinogens—while others are known to contribute to possible cancerous growths. Still other insecticides have been known to break down the genetic transmission functions of the cells causing hereditarily transferable defects and deformities. According to Dr. Malcom Hargraves, of the hematology department of the Mayo Clinic, blood diseases—including leukemia—related to the use of various toxic substances have been increasing, particularly in the last 10 years. He states that:

> I believe that the vast majority of patients suffering from blood dyscrasias and lymphoid diseases have a significant history of exposure to the various hydrocarbons, which in turn include most of the pesticides of today.

Thus, we are slowly, through increased use of highly toxic insecticides and pesticides, poisoning our environment and quite possibly adversely affecting the health of our population, while the cumulative effects on the future are not yet known. Miss Carson suggests that the ultimate solution to this problem is to use chemicals that are less toxic, so that the public hazard will be much reduced. Such chemicals already exist and include the pyrethins, rotenone, ryania, and others.

One of the major solutions to the problem of insecticide control lies in a reconsideration of the laws affecting the use of toxic chemicals. It is ironic that while various branches of the Food and Drug Administration are warning of the dire results of excess use of certain insecticides, various other Federal agencies are advocating and assisting in their application. On containers of insecticides containing extremely toxic chemicals, warnings are printed so inconspicuously that few people take the trouble to read them. An industrial firm recently undertook a survey to find out just how few. The results indicated that out of a hundred people using insecticide aerosols and sprays, scarcely 15 are aware that there are any warnings at all on the containers.

The next logical question is, What protection does the Government offer us from indiscriminate insecticide use? The Food and Drug Administration establishes maximum permissible limits of contamination, called tolerances for the various pesticides. However, the efforts of the Food and Drug Administration in the field of consumer protection is severely limited by two factors. One, the Food and Drug Administration has jurisdiction only over foods marketed in interstate commerce and, two, the small number of inspectors on its staff do not allow for adequate inspection of those goods which do pass through interstate commerce. Thus, goods not shipped across State lines are subject to State laws alone, many of which are extremely inadequate or nonexistent. Furthermore, the small staff of inspectors permits only an infinitesimal fraction of the products to be inspected—far less than 1 percent—and uncounted amounts of contaminated products have reached the consumer. For example, a third of the dairy products tested in 1960 showed residues of toxic chemicals above legal limits.

Beyond the above limiting factors, the system under which the Food and Drug Administration establishes tolerances has obvious defects. Although the limits of contamination on each individual item may be legally safe, there is no control over the total cumulative amount an individual may consume. This piling up of chemicals from many different sources creates a total exposure that can not be measured. It is meaningless, therefore, to talk about the safety of any specific amount of residue. And there are other defects. Sometimes tolerances have been established on the basis of inadequate knowledge and later review and reevaluation caused a reduction or withdrawal of the toxic agent. But only after the public had been exposed to admittedly dangerous levels for a period of time.

Thus, if the health of our present and future generations is to be protected, an evaluation of both present legal restrictions on insecticide use and of the necessity of employing extremely toxic insecticides themselves, is imperative. The consumer deserves protection and a guarantee that his food is not contaminated with dangerous chemicals. I urge the Members to read Miss Carson's article in full and to give serious thought to these problems.

No Action Policy of the New Frontier in Cuba Threatens Communist Expansion in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, recent confirmation by the State Department and CIA together with Presidential statements proves conclusively what has been known for some time, that Communists are in the process of a gigantic military and technical buildup in Cuba in direct contravention to the Monroe Doctrine reenunciated at Punta del Este by the Organization of American States recently.

For over 2 years as a Representative of one of the districts of Florida, that State being 90 miles from Cuba, I have been insisting upon a positive firm program to oust the Communists and Castro from Cuba and to prevent its military and technical buildup as a jumping off point for Communists in this hemisphere.

This recent influx of what the administration chooses to call Communist technicians and the importation of Red surface-to-air missiles, together with the admitted military buildup and substantial takeover by the Chinese and Russian Communists of the functions of government again emphasizes the need for and the long lack of a positive program to get rid of Castro.

Instead of such positive action and over my objections the administration has endorsed the $62 million ransom-for-prisoners demands made by Castro in the name of indemnity for the Bay of Pigs invasion and I offered an amendment to the mutual security bill to outlaw this transaction. It barely failed passage and I might note without a Republican vote against it by 134 to 137 in a division vote. This abortive demand for dollars is in direct contradiction to the no-trade policy carried out under Eisenhower in withdrawing the sugar quota, and the followup of withdrawal of trade under President Kennedy to prevent the flow of dollars to Cuba.

Representing the tobacco workers of Tampa and knowing that the lack of imported Havana tobacco has hit the tobacco-making industry hard, this sacrifice now being made by U.S. workers to prevent dollars from flowing to Cuba, it is totally unconscionable that the administration would give backing to this indemnity ransom demand, which includes a preliminary Treasury Department ruling making contributions to the exiled prisoners committee tax deductible and refusal upon interrogation of the President to repudiate this scheme to provide dollars to Communist Castro.

During the campaign, Candidate Kennedy reiterated many times his intention, if elected President, to take firm action in Cuba, including specifically the recognition of a free non-Communist government-in-exile. This has not been done to date and the Cuban refugees, who themselves, if properly unified behind an effective leader, could do more than anyone else both externally and internally to overthrow the Castro-Communist regime, for many months have been imploring the administration to take such a move so that all of the Cuban exiles and the present and prospective insurgents within Cuba would know that the United States is in support of a free non-Communist government for Cuba and would have hopes of eventual victory. The floundering around today, including the split among the Cuban refugees as to who the proper leader should be, makes this solution to the Cuban crisis most difficult.

The second step should be a declaration of policy by the United States announced to the Communist world the intention of this country to uphold the Monroe Doctrine reenunciated at Punta del Este and backed by the Organization of American States to prevent the inshipment in the future of any additional heavy war materiel in this hemisphere and specifically to Cuba and likewise to prevent the exportation from Cuba to any other hemisphere of revolutionary war materiel and/or forces. Troops were sent to South Vietnam to prevent Communist overthrow and attack from Laos, risking Russian and Red China oppositon but none developed. That country is five to six thousand miles from our shores and yet there is no willingness to prevent shipment of troops and materiel into a Communist-controlled and dominated island 90 miles from our shores. This makes no sense to me or the American people. The excuse is used that the United States should not ruffle the feathers of Russia because of the Berlin situation. That did not prevent troops from being sent to South Vietnam and should not prevent firm action on Cuba. This is, in my opinion, an excuse for inaction which makes no sense.

The President should likewise enunciate the policy of the United States that Alliance for Progress funds which are already supposed to be conditioned upon land reform and other assurances should also be made available subject to further assurances that aid to, recognition of, and trade with Cuba would be withdrawn so that that country would be isolated and to prevent the exportation of communism from Cuba.

The best information available to me, despite denials thereof by the President and the State Department, is that some 450 Communist troops recently did enter Cuba along with the other military buildup and whether or not they were in uniform seems to be nit picking and approaches an effort to mislead the American people as to what is going on in Cuba. Through failure to back up the invading refugees on the Bay of Pigs with military recommended air coverage the immediate opportunity to get rid of Castro was lost and thus the responsibility of the New Frontier. It is equally its responsibility to provide effective leadership in killing off this cancer before it spreads further or becomes a greater danger and this, in my opinion, is our duty under the Monroe Doctrine principles. A failure to provide an effective program is a sign of weakness, not only throughout the world, but in this hemisphere in particular. It is time that it be recognized that the Communists are establishing a little Russia and Red China in Cuba, 90 miles from our shore, and if this is realized then action necessarily follows. I add to my remarks a very well-reasoned column by Henry J. Taylor, which also reasons that this buildup is obviously interference in our hemisphere contrary to the Monroe Doctrine:

CUBA EMBARRASSES J.F.K.

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The heroes' shells that richocheted across Havana Harbor into the Soviet-infested Rosita de Hornedo Hotel were the shots of liberty. This is the agonized voice of the oppressed about which we preach so much to far-off places and do nothing about in nearby Cuba.

Cuba embarrasses President Kennedy. He systematically attempts to tuck Cuba under the bed. This is human. But no greater disservice could be done to the human spirit there, to the integrity of the United States, our hemisphere and the peace of the world.

On a public relations basis, one of the administration's major objectives is to keep this horror-stricken island out of the headlines. The mold was cast immediately after the Bay of Pigs debacle. For this public relations purpose, Mr. Kennedy advanced his Vienna meeting with Khrushchev and surprised President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan by going abroad and entering into full pageantry months before he originally intended to, or should have gone.

The diversion process continues. But it still leaves our Cuba business unfinished. How long can the United States pretend nothing is happening in Cuba and turn in its gaze the other way?

Mr. Kennedy warned Castro, "The United States will not tolerate a Communist regime 90 miles from our shores." We not only tolerate it; we actually help it. First, we help it by not constantly condemning in any effective way the barbarianism there.

Protocol wristslaps, yes. Wrath, no. If the steel companies could evoke such wrath from Mr. Kennedy, why cannot Cuba?

Next, we help Cuba in the United Nations. Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland recently testified before a Senate subcommittee that the State Department had diverted other funds to pay delinquencies in the U.N. for several Iron Curtain countries—including Cuba. Moreover, through the abused machinery of the U.N.'s world health organization in Geneva, we have paid Russia for trucks and jeeps to send to Castro.

Lastly, we help Cuba mightily by having a policy that is no policy at all. Admittedly, enemy rocket sites are available there from which to reach Miami, Cape Canaveral, and even Washington (only 1,139 miles), New York (1,317), Boston (1,601), Chicago (1,333), Kansas City (1,497), Denver (1,819), Los Angeles-San Diego (2,299), and easily as fas as Seattle (2,843) on a pinpoint basis.

Why does the administration consistently pooh-pooh and soften the indications these rocket sites are being built? If you were Khrushchev, wouldn't you build them? Disliking the inevitable does not make it less inevitable.

We have a great U.S. naval base right on the island. Scores of Russian transports, loaded to the gunwales with "technicians" and military equipment, steam past it every week. In effect, Cuba has been invaded. If Mr. Kennedy cannot conveniently see that this is interference in our hemisphere by foreign powers, it is high time the American people forced a better policy than "let the dust settle."

Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10113) to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration, to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, because this bill cannot achieve its alleged objective, although from the point of view of the White House it is more politically desirable than legislatively prudent, I shall vote against it.

This bill purports to solve, or at least to appreciably dent, the unemployment problem. However, in testimony before the Public Works Committee which unearthed the facts only about 125,000 people could be employed for 2 years if the bill passed. This represents a scant 3 percent of the almost 4 million people unemployed as of May.

Figures listed in the committee's report further reveal that $2,688 million of unobligated funds have not been used by the administration, so to add $900 million more of unobligated funds would be an extravagance, especially when we are facing a $7 to $10 billion deficit for fiscal 1962. For this to come at a time when our national debt has exceeded the $300 billion mark is wasteful porkbarreling. Foolish spending must cease and Congress should take the initiative.

The bill would create a czar of public works in a new agency, who would have the authority to subvert and distort defined lines of programs, already in operation, thus contributing more havoc to an already confused administration. This new agency could wield vast power by controlling projects now under the Area Redevelopment Agency, Corps of Engineers, and Bureau of Reclamation to name only a few. Of even greater importance, this czar would have the power, now reserved to Congress, to review item by item, specific appropriations for public work projects. To abdicate this authority to an all-powerful executive would reduce Congress to a rubberstamp.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a very powerful political weapon in the hands of the executive branch. Since past behavior is indicative of future action, it will almost certainly be used as the proverbial carrot in attempts to swing reluctant Members to the administration's point of view. In the past year we felt the pressures of such lobbying, therefore, it would, in my opinion, be most unwise to increase these opportunities for the executive to carry the big stick.

This is poor legislation and it should be defeated.

Qualifications of Electors

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the States in substance existed before the Central Government. Our Federal Government is a creature of the States. The power, insuring the effective operation of each within its respective sphere, is vested in the Constitution. In the Constitution, powers are delegated to each in order to maintain a division and proper balance, with the States enjoying as inherent those powers not specifically delegated. The States, thus ultimately the people, must be allowed to preserve their constitutional rights and powers, both granted and residual.

Since the States have been guaranteed by the Constitution the privilege of deciding upon the manner and method of conducting their elections, there is no need for this amendment. It would be an imposition for the Federal Government to presume to dictate to the States how they must operate their elections. This coercion of the States by its own creation is a direct invasion of States rights.

There is no justification for this amendment as only five States now retain the poll tax as a requirement for vote. My own State of South Carolina long ago did away with the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. In the States that do require poll tax, the token remittance ranges from $1 to $2, the receipts in most cases being used for education and other citizen benefits. Upon the basis of this evidence, a claim of the use of poll tax as an implement of discrimination is invalid and not worth consideration. The adoption of this amendment would, in truth, be a manifestation of the power highly organized and well-financed pressure groups can bring to bear upon the people of the United States. I believe each State should be free to make this decision with regard to the criteria for voting, being governed by the desires of its citizens.

The adoption of this amendment would have far-reaching effects,. setting a dangerous precedent. It is a step toward complete Federal control of elections on the State and local levels. This is just another among the long list of incidents of the continuing centralization of the Federal Government at the expense of the State and local governments and ultimately the citizen.

This amendment would be another weight upon one side of the already unequal balance which controls the constitutional division of power. This easy amendment of our Constitution would lead to further encroachment of this one division, the Federal Government, upon the rights included in the realm of the other, the State governments. The final burden of these limitations will be borne by the people.

The powerful pressure groups and minorities forcing this unnecessary amendment through the Congress will, with its adoption, grow more bold, arrogant, and demanding. They cannot and will not cease their agitation until they establish a dictatorship over the majority or until representative government is destroyed and elections become a Federal fraud.

The States and the people at the local level have been doing a magnificent job in this field—they need to be complimented and encouraged. This amendment is not needed. It is a reflection on the fine job done by the States. It is desperately sought by the pressure groups so as to claim for themselves and the Federal Government credit for something that has already been done by the States and the people. This amendment is a fraud and a waste of the time of the Congress.

Experiment Station Research Facilities

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my support of H.R. 12712 authorizing Federal matching funds for agricultural experiment station research facilities. Agricultural research has been a significant factor in making American agriculture the most efficient and productive in the world. This legislation will promote continued progress by assuring sound financing of needed physical facilities to house this activity.

Farmers, business, and consumers have benefited greatly from the work conducted at land-grant colleges—such as my own alma mater, Cornell University. The technical knowledge gained has led to improved quality and new uses for American food and fiber. New markets for farmers and businessmen and lower cost for consumers have resulted. It is heartening to note the widespread bipartisan interest and support of this worthy legislation.

Anniversary of Attack on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, 23 years ago, September 1, 1939, Hitler sent his Nazi legions storming into Poland, thereby precipitating the greatest holocaust in the history of mankind. Outnumbered, lacking modern equipment, stabbed in the back by Stalin, the Polish people fought with their traditional bravery until crushed by the weight of superior forces. Who can forget the siege of Warsaw, where the loudspeakers blared defiance with Chopin's "Polonaise," while the Stuka dive bombers were pounding whole sections to rubble.

Since that dimly remembered date, 23 years ago, the Polish people have enjoyed only the briefest breath of freedom. Going back on their pledges at Yalta, the Russians never permitted free elections there, and by fraud, treachery, and intimidation the Communists gained control of the country. But they have never been accepted by the people of Poland, and it is safe to say that even today, after 15 years of Communist rule, Polish hearts are with the West.

Every correspondent who files a story about Poland notes the thirst for things Western, and Poland's conviction that she is of the West. The true feelings of the Polish people for America, regardless of what their Communist masters tell them, has been abundantly demonstrated over the years.

There is a tragic lesson for us in the rape of Poland, for Nazi Germany could have been stopped in her tracks in the thirties, if the powers of Europe had been firm with Hitler when he first violated the Treaty of Versailles. Instead, the powers temporized. The result was to encourage Hitler to continue to build up his forces and defy the existing order in Europe.

Need I point out the moral? Appeasement breeds war, it is as simple as that. Yielding to the bullying and blustering of Khrushchev today would be as fatal for us as yielding to the ranting of Hitler was for the European powers in another generation. Let us never forget the lesson of Poland, and let us continue to encourage ties of friendship and understanding with the courageous Polish people. They will one day again breathe the air of freedom.

Y Team Visits Soviet Union Youth and Reports to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a news item appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, Thursday, August 23, 1962.

Y-TEAM CHECKS SOVIET YOUTHS

(By Robert Nelson)

CHICAGO.

An American YMCA team recently visited the Soviet Union to learn about youth in a Communist society.

John O. Root, associate general secretary of the Chicago Y, said in an interview here: "They just don't admit to any major behavioral problems in their society.

"But if you dig for information, you discover, for example, that in Moscow alone last year there were 6,000 juvenile cases recorded by the courts. You find out that there is open stealing at Moscow University. You encounter Soviet toughs late at night in the capital's streets."

Mr. Root, who is a well-informed observer of American youth problems and one who has been close to those that trouble Chicago, spent a month (May 9 to June 10) in the Soviet Union with colleagues from Y's in Springfield, Mass., and Atlanta.

HOOLIGANISM

He says he wanted to check out Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's charges, in official Communist Party circles, of "hooliganism" in the U.S.S.R.

He admits the difficulty of probing profound youth problems in 4 weeks in a strange and largely closed society. He said that his judgments are based on situations that he and his colleagues were able to observe repeatedly.

Such was the case, they found, with Communist indoctrination among Soviet youth. The Komsomol (Communist Youth League for ages 16 to 28) conducts a strict disciplinary and indoctrination program "defending atheism, deifying Lenin, and boasting about the economic and social prowess of communism," says Mr. Root.

PUPILS CRITICIZED

In parent-teacher conferences in state schools, he says, there is open criticism of each child. Pupils seem to be considered "almost common property of the state."

The young people are mobilized during school vacations for work projects in Siberia. The youth who has party labor service on his record has the best chance of succeeding as one of the 3 in 10 who apply for every advanced Soviet educational opportunity.

At Camp Artek on the Black Sea, the YMCA leaders observed indoctrination deftly interwoven among traditional camp recreational activities for 5,000 young Russians. At another camp called Sputnik, for young adults, indoctrination was surprisingly softened. This camp, the Y men discovered, was designed to accommodate international campers. Excessive overt propagandizing might deter campers from other nations.

NIGHT ENCOUNTERS

Late at night, on Moscow's streets, non-Komsomol teenage boys met with the American social workers, turned thumbs down on the Communist Youth League, and eagerly accepted an American jazz record. One of the youth said he was a department store stock boy. His salary was 60 rubles a month, less than $70.

"He was what we would call a have-not boy from the inner city who sees no opportunity structure ahead," says Mr. Root in social worker parlance.

No group gangs were found in the Soviet Union in the style of bands of Chicago or New York juvenile delinquents. "They just don't have the setting for group vandalism," Mr. Root observes.

Norman Ross Pays Tribute to Our Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day, Norman Ross, one of Chicago's most respected television commentators, whose programs are heard over the American Broadcasting Co. affiliate, WBKB, channel 7 in Chicago, paid an inspiring tribute to the Nation's reservists who last year were called to active duty and who are now returning to their homes.

I should like to call the remarks by Mr. Ross to the attention of all of my colleagues because he has indeed placed this whole question of the contribution which our Reserves made in the cold war in its proper perspective.

It is encouraging to see men like Mr. Ross, who reaches a vast audience in Chicago through his telecasts and radio programs, pay the honor which is thoroughly due our American reservists. His tribute to these men should help all Americans better understand what a tremendous contribution these reservists have made toward the survival of our Nation in the cold war.

The remarks by Mr. Ross follow:

Said one returning Chicago reservist this week: "Somebody pushed the panic button, and wasted 10 months of my time." Said another: "The Army has hurt me financially, mentally, and physically." These men deserve an answer.

A year has passed since the Communists erected their infamous wall. At the moment, there is a lull many of us believe to be temporary, and the reservists called up so hastily have come home. Many—let's certainly hope not a majority—are bitter and full of recrimination. Some vow to take it out on Kennedy and the Democrats at the polls this November.

"I wasn't needed there, and the $400 a month cut in pay was wonderful," said one sarcastically. He's wrong in feeling he wasn't needed, whatever the faults and waste and goofups he encountered.

For Khrushchev, though we may forget it during the current lull, had set himself on a crash course. He had issued an ultimatum saying he was going to sign a peace treaty with East Germany and that we must get out. He had harassed our air lanes, and built the wall.

The Reserve callup helped prove to him that we were standing firm. He let the deadline pass; tension eased. The Reserves accomplished this, and they or others like them may have to do it again. It is distasteful but necessary that someone do so.

To help the reservists realize we know and appreciate what they did, why not follow Newsweek's advice? As they say in the August 13 issue, the one with Ben Bella on the cover: "Shake one by the hand and tell him, 'thanks, soldier, for keeping up our guard.'"

It's a good idea.

Tragedy in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of New England's finest newspapers, the Lawrence Eagle Tribune, has looked the facts of our current foreign policy squarely in the eyes and has emerged with the following powerful editorial. I commend it to the thoughtful attention of every Member of this Congress:

TRAGEDY IN BERLIN

The revolt against tyranny that is a powerful force in suppressed people was dramatically personalized in Berlin the other day.

There an 18-year-old East German youth was shot by border guards as he tried to dash for freedom through the wall that divides the city. He fell mortally wounded less than a stone's throw from freedom. He lay on the ground moaning for 55 minutes, bleeding to death. The Communist guards carried away his body.

West Berlin people were riotous with righteous indignation. They were wildly angry at American failure to do anything to help the boy. The least that could have been done, they declared, was to send an unarmed medical unit to him. But all the Americans did was protest to the Russian commander of East Berlin and ask him to halt the East German regime's "barbarous inhumanity."

The incident expressed in individual terms the essence of a situation that has arisen before.

The erection of the Berlin wall by Communists was a physical symbol of Communist determination to prevent East Germans from gaining freedom. It divided a city that by treaty was under international control with provision for free access to all areas. It was a hostile act that morally justified prompt reaction by the Western Allies—the reaction of destruction.

Six years ago a revolt against Communist tyranny in Hungary dramatized the desperate fight for freedom on a national scale. Hungarian fighters for freedom pleaded and prayed for help from the West.

They didn't get it. The wall was not torn down. The boy died with life and freedom a stone's throw distant.

Why? Because the United States—and the West in general—are most fearful of irritating the Communist beast to the point at which he will plunge the world into war. We endure crude insults and brazen assaults on every ideal we cherish, and turn the other cheek. We patiently rely on the long processes of evolution to transform Communists into honorable beings.

Our policy of fear and patience is based on the opinion that the Communists would risk a global, nuclear war if the violence of tyranny were met with the counter force of freedom. Perhaps the opinion is justified.

None can say with certainty. But it can be said with certainty that:

The Communists exploit our policy with acts of contemptuous derision and that

There is no gain without risk and that he who hesitates indefinitely eventually loses the power to act.

Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the accomplishments of the Small Business Administration in its disaster loan program. The Small Business Administration is charged with the responsibility for providing financial assistance by way of loans to people and business concerns in disaster areas. How this responsibility has been met deserves some recognition.

Beginning on March 6 of this year, a storm of tremendous proportions lashed our eastern coast. For more than 3 days high winds, rain, and flooding tides destroyed or damaged thousands of homes. Losses to business properties ran into millions of dollars.

Much of the area devastated by the storm is comprised of summer resorts. The beaches along our eastern coast are really the vacationland of America. The situation was made more critical by the fact that the lifeblood of the economy of this area turns largely upon its summer residents and upon its summer visitors. Coming as closely as it did to the opening of the spring and summer season, this storm—with its massive destruction—imperiled the economy of the whole area.

There was, in the minds of a great many people, a very serious question as to whether there would be time for recovery from the storm. The need for loans on reasonable terms was made sharper by the fact that for the most part the losses were not covered by insurance. The cost of wave-wash insurance is so high as to be beyond the means of the average property owner.

Before the storm had subsided and without waiting for formal declarations of disaster, the Philadelphia regional office of SBA established its field offices. Financial specialists from distant SBA offices were flown to the scene, briefed in their tasks, and assigned to supplement the working force in the field offices.

One of the most remarkable achievements of the Small Business Administration in this disaster was the speed and efficiency with which it coordinated its efforts with those of other Federal agencies, with State governments, with local municipal officials, and with local financial intitutions. Particular attention should be drawn to the working relationship between local banks and the Small Business Administration. During the first week following the storm, meetings were held between Small Business Administration officials and the officers of local banks to insure an organized and cooperative effort. The result of these meetings has been a record number of participation loans, wherein the Small Business Administration and the local banks in a joint undertaking provided the funds needed for repair and restoration of the damaged property. Cooperation afforded the Small Business Administration, by banks and building and loan associations in the disaster area was excellent. I take something of a personal pride in the fact that the cooperation afforded by banks was not limited to those located within the disaster area. Our own banks in Philadelphia deserve particular credit for their contribution in this effort. The Small Business Administration is, in comparison with other Government agencies, a very small organization. Without expense to the Government and at some considerable cost to their own operation, the Philadelphia banks made available to the Small Business Administration 10 experienced loan officers. For sometime, these men served in the field offices of the Small Business Administration with their salaries and their services being contributed by the Philadelphia banks. This was a most generous contribution and I think it deserves recognition.

A fine spirt of public service has characterized the recovery effort. Leaders, in the banking and business communities, came forward to serve without charge on committees set up to assist the Small Business Administration in the processing of loan applications. Leading members of the bar accepted appointment as special SBA disaster counsel to provide, at very nominal cost to the Government, the legal services required in connection with the closing of the more complicated loans.

I do not propose to give, at great length, the statistics which represent the size of the task and the measure of the achievement. They are impressive and are available in the official records. For your summary information, more than 1,300 applications were filed with SBA for loans totaling in excess of $16 million. Loan applications range in size from $150,000 to $650,000. With these loans, homes and business properties have been repaired or rebuilt, inventories have been replaced, and machinery and equipment have been repaired or purchased. In fully half of the cases, the money was available to the borrower within 10 days after the loan was approved. Regrettably, the SBA disaster loan program could not also be extended to rehabilitation of property owned by summer residents.

The united effort of the people in the disaster area, the State and local governments, the Red Cross and the Small Business Administration presents a picture of solid and substantial achievement. A great part of the damage has already been fully repaired and the remainder is being rapidly completed. May 30, which is traditionally the opening of the summer season, found our coastal cities ready to welcome their summer residents and their summer visitors. I understand that Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey, speaking for himself and for the people of his State, has expressed deep and sincere appreciation for the services rendered by the Small Business Administration. In a letter to John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Governor Hughes described it as a "magnificent recovery effort" and I think his words were well chosen.

Government agencies are set up for a single purpose—that is, to provide service to the people. In its disaster loan program, the Small Business Administration has provided a fine example of excellent and dedicated service. Therefore, I think it is proper that it should be acknowledged.

Robin Hood Dell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the swirl of a large city, such as Philadelphia, with its vast manufacturing and commercial enterprises, its bustling port that leads the Nation in commercial shipping, we have not forgotten cultural advancement and material application of the arts.

The city of Philadelphia is known for its historical values, its fine museums and art galleries, its institution of higher learning, and its devotion to the theater and good music.

These values were enhanced many years ago with the founding of Robin Hood Dell, located in a natural scenic setting in beautiful Fairmount Park. In such surroundings the summer concerts and recitals are enjoyed by many, many thousands each season, and have become famous far and beyond the stretches of the Greater Metropolitan Philadelphia area.

Significantly, the success of Robin Hood Dell lies in the presentations of extensive repertoire and the engagement of the world's finest musicians and vocal artists to delight the music lovers from everywhere.

The fame of Robin Hood Dell was climaxed on July 9 when President John F. Kennedy took time to pen a message of recognition of its achievements which was read to the thousands assembled there on that evening.

I, therefore, include under unanimous consent, the content of the President's letter, which follows, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington July 9, 1962.

A Message to the Audience at Robin Hood Dell, Philadelphia:

Mr. August Heckscher brings you tonight my sincere greetings, greetings to the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra, and to the Philadelphia audience gathered in the Robin Hood Dell. These matchless musicians, playing in summer with the world's outstanding soloists and conductors, remind us what delights a city can bring to its citizens. A partnership between the city and more than a thousand patrons of the arts are making these free concerts possible and will bring their joys to scores of thousands of boys and girls. The Philadelphia plan provides a model for other communities and lends added lustre to a city which has had more than its share of distinction throughout our country's history.

With all best wishes,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Remaining Bit of Flagg Farm Seized by City Ends Name of Owner of Half the Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Mr. Michael J. Curran, city editor of the Woburn Daily Times, occasionally takes his typewriter and to the delight of his readers heads us backward in time to the days when Woburn—and the rest of the world—were young. Mike Curran has done his usual interesting and colorful job in a feature story about the old Flagg property in Woburn. I would like my colleagues to enjoy it with me:

REMAINING BIT OF FLAGG FARM SEIZED BY CITY ENDS NAME OF OWNER OF HALF THE TOWN

(By Michael J. Curran)

The land taking made by the city seized the last holding of what was known as the Flagg family of Woburn. The land is off Eastern Avenue and has been owned for a number of years by Warren McCarthy, but the end of the Flagg domain in Woburn ends a name of early settlers who, next to the Wymans, owned more land than any other person or persons in the city. The Flagg farm extended from Eastern Avenue back and the old Flagg homestead is on Gardner Avenue. Many Woburn boys worked on this farm, and the 1962 poll book reveals that there is not a single Flagg now listed in Woburn. The Wymans have two of that name now officially recorded as Woburn residents.

The Flagg interests were not confined to what those living today can remember as the Flagg farm, and one of the original farms bearing the name Flagg was at the Four Corners now sprinkled with modern residences. Many of the Flaggs made civic history in Woburn and one branch of the family preferred to spell the name Flegg.

The fading of the old names from the present cosmopolitan voting lists reveals the general tendency so that each year it is becoming more difficult for one to trace ancestry back to the Founding Fathers. The Middlesex County History says: "The name of Flagg is supposed by former antiquaries to be more correctly Flegg. The name of Flegg is found in England, and in the early period of the country, the name was commonly written Flegg. The first Thomas Flegg, who came to Watertown and there settled spelled his name Flegg.

"The Flagg family has always been notable in Woburn for the number of prominent men, and the positions which they have held in the civic, military and financial affairs of the town. They were large holders of real estate in the days when real estate was the real property of the inhabitants. Sewall, the historian of Woburn says: 'descendants from Gershom Flagg have been numerous and respectable, both in Woburn and Wilmington.' Colonel Eleazar Flagg (or Flegg as he preferred to write it) a gentleman of note and influence in Woburn in the early part of the 18th century, was his second son.

"Rev. Ebenezer Flagg, a graduate of Harvard College in 1725 was his grandson, by his son Ebenezer. He was born October 18, 1704. Dr. John Flagg of Lynn was a son of Reverend Ebenezer. "Dr. Flagg became an eminent physician and held the rank of Colonel during the Revolutionary War." He married into the Fowle and Wyman families, both outstanding families in Woburn in that era.

Lt. Gershom Flagg, son of Thomas was killed in battle with the Indians in Lee, N.H., in 1690 holding the rank of lieutenant. He was a tanner and his dwelling house stood on High Street, which was then Pleasant Street, near the site of Woburn's first meeting house which is now Woburn Common; the old burying ground was on the east (behind the Times publishing plant) and the training field which was at the head of what is now Winn Street and extending westward. Flagg Street, off Franklin Street, was named after the Flagg family indicating the Flagg holdings extended that far out. That street later became "Irish Town,'" as it was the settling place of many immigrant Irish families.

The homestead descended from Gershom 1st, to Gershom 2d, then to Gershom 3d, thence to his uncle Zachariah Flagg who parted with his share to William Fox, in 1765. The Fox family was a famous family in the city, the name being borne by successful tanneries in the city. There are only three Foxes in today's poll book and only one of them is a direct descendant of the Yankee Fox branch.

The Flagg holdings extended into the West Woburn section, John Flagg, son of Zachariah was born in Woburn in 1746, died there May 24, 1825, aged 78 years. He was a farmer and during the war engaged in teaming merchandies from Boston to New York. He was present in Belknap's Woburn Co. at the battles of Lexington and Concord on April 19, 1775. He was 27 days in the service at the time. On good testimony, it was reported that he took the second prisoner of the war at Lexington. Sylvanus Wright of what is now Cambridge Street took the first.

John Flagg, son of the Revolutionary War John Flagg, was born in Woburn in 1784. He received the education of a farmer boy of that day, attending the district school until 15, and helping his father on the farm. He early learned the trade of shoemaker, working at it in different places. He subsequently went to Boston, where he found the trade of mason more to his liking and more profitable. Here he served as an apprentice and then worked as a bricklayer. Later he returned to his home in Woburn, and after the death of his father, he purchased the property from the heirs.

Of the original 95 acres he sold off a part of it. He conducted general farming until 1845, which netted him a profit. His farm was situated in Burlington Township, where the Heald Bros. were later located, the best part of the town. That land has changed considerably, especially in the value, some of it having been sold for industrial purposes for over half a million dollars.

Another Flagg, John Gardner Flagg, manufactured the first readymade mattresses ever placed on the market, and in this pursuit his business undertaking mushroomed to fabulous proportions. Now Woburn is the location of a very prominent and successful nationally advertised mattress, Slumberland, but it did not develop from the Flagg operations in Woburn.

William Eustace Flagg, son of William, was born in Woburn in 1823. He started to work on his father's farm, and when he was 25 he and his brother, Benjamin Franklin Flagg, started in their own business of market gardening. When his brother moved to Winchester, William Eustace bought a farm of 40 acres off George Russell on Cambridge Street in the best part of Woburn.

Getting back to the most recent Flagg farm which spread across the present site of the Liberty Avenue development, the original Green Street housing project and now a piece of land on which the Eastern Avenue elementary school will rest, there was Hubert Clinton Flagg, son of Charles Horace, who moved to Woburn when he was a young boy. He worked on the farm when very young and attended public schools here. He was graduated in 1899 and entered the employ of the Boston & Maine Railroad. He was injured in an accident soon after he began work. He was compensated in money for the loss of time and injuries but preferred to return to the farm. In 1901, he purchased the homestead of his father and engaged successfully in the market gardening business. His father and brother were associated with him in the business.

He had 10 acres of land, a part of the original Flagg farm of his paternal ancestors. He located in the eastern part of the town, the most recent Flagg farm, and made a specialty of lettuce, cucumbers and celery. Now the farm has succumbed to the parade of population explosion.

The 200th Anniversary of Touro Synagogue, Newport, R.I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech given by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] at the 200th anniversary of the founding of the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R.I.

Senator PELL's address concerned two subjects which were particularly fitting for discussion by the junior Senator from Rhode Island. The first was religious tolerance. Since its founding, Rhode Island has had a distinguished tradition of religious freedom. The Touro Synagogue, in keeping with this tradition, was founded by refugees from religious persecution in the Old World. It is the oldest synagogue in this country.

The Senator also discussed the state of communism in the world today. It is a subject which he has studied first hand; first as a Foreign Service officer stationed behind the Iron Curtain; then as a private citizen working with the International Rescue Committee.

The tide of communism—

Senator PELL said—

which appeared so overwhelmingly 10 years ago, has begun to ebb. The vigor of communism seems to be receding in the face of the invincible force of the desire of every individual everywhere for personal freedom and liberty.

Mr. President, I believe that there is much truth in what Senator PELL has said. He offers substantial evidence to back his remarks, and his assertions that communism will destroy itself through evolution, not war or revolution, should be brought to the attention of every responsible and thinking American.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH GIVEN BY SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL, DEMOCRAT, OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF THE FOUNDING OF THE TOURO SYNAGOGUE AT NEWPORT, R.I., ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 26, 1962

It is a pleasure and honor for me to participate today in these ceremonies which mark the start of the 200th year of the establishment of one of the most historical and hallowed homes of worship in Rhode Island and these United States. In this connection, I am proud to have been an early supporter of the Society of Friends of Touro Synagogue.

In the course of my travels, I have visited many places of worship. Yet, every time I return to the Touro Synagogue, it is with renewed reverence. The words of Emma Lazarus are, indeed, appropriate:

"Here where the noises of the busy town,
The ocean's plunge and road can enter not,
We stand and gaze upon with tearful awe,
And muse upon the consecrated spot."

As you know, our State of Rhode Island has existed since colonial times as a bastion of religious liberty for the victims of religious persecution. It was here in Rhode Island that the Jewish faith was publicly reconsecrated by the brave and principled Marrano families, who, for so many years, had been forced to pay public tribute to a church in which they did not believe. Because these fine families, in accordance with the legacy of the Old Testament, were determined to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, they migrated to the uncertainty of the New World. These families were devoted to the patriot's cause of liberty, a philosophy espoused by the revolutionaries as the hope of the future.

The early Jewish residents of Newport played an active role in the development of our country. Moses Michael Hays became president of the Boston Bank as well as head of the Masonic Society of America. It was he who commissioned George Washington into the Masonic order. Judah Touro, the rabbi's son became one of the largest shippers in America. His generosity made possible the construction of the Bunker Hill Monument and, when he died, his entire fortune was distributed to charity.

The history of our own Touro Synagogue congregation involved many persons of great distinction whose names are enshrined forever in the annals of freedom of our State and our country: names like Lopez, Rophee, Sarzedas, Rivera, Seixas and Hart. The memory of these early Newport families remains with us in this holy sanctuary.

We have only to lift our eyes to behold the centuries of Judaic heritage which the brave men and women who established this synagogue brought with them on their earnest journey toward a new and better life. A scroll in the sacred ark, a graceful candelabra—these objects serve as timeless reminders of the ancestral roots of the early Jews of Newport. The Touro Synagogue, is, indeed, a hallowed symbol of the courage and faith of its first congregation.

Longfellow immortalized the nobility of this very congregation in one of his poems over 100 years ago. His words capture the rich legacy of history which is all around us in the inspiring atmosphere of this great sanctuary.

"Pride and humiliation hand in hand,
Walked with them through the world where they
Trampled and went, beaten were they as the sand,
And yet unshaken as the continent.

"For in the background figures vague and vast
cf patriarchs and prophets rose sublime,
And all the great traditions of the past,
They saw reflected in the coming time."

What are the "traditions of the past" which Longfellow saw "reflected in the coming time"?

Certainly, these great traditions include the Ten Commandments, the importance of the individual, each man's responsibility to others less fortunate, and the importance of education. These religious and philosophical convictions clearly represent a strong foundation on which our devotion to freedom is built. In this connection, I believe that the words of George Washington, addressed to this congregation over 170 years ago, are equally appropriate today when he said: "The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy; a policy worthy of imitation."

While we are agreed that our devotion to freedom is worthy of imitation, we know that today and for many years now, we have been confronted by a system which is the direct antithesis of the Judaic-Christian heritage, which has made such a rich contribution to our free way of life. Because we are gathered here today to rededicate ourselves to the spirit and heritage which this holy place represents, I think it is particularly appropriate that we review and evaluate how our way of life is faring in the worldwide struggle against communism.

There have been periods when the outlook for our side seemed bleak, indeed. At times, it has almost looked as though communism was an uncontrollable juggernaut. We recall that the Communists emerged from World War II with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, East Germany, North Korea and part of Poland under their control. Between the end of World War II and 1948 were added Albania, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslavakia, Hungary, Rumania and Yugoslavia. Even in the West in 1945–46, the Communists managed to secure 26 percent of the votes in France (1945–46) and 22.7 percent of the votes in Italy (1952). Up until 1949, Communist guerrillas were active in Greece and that nation was involved in a fierce and protracted struggle.

Ten years ago, the outlook in the Middle East, to put it mildly, did not look good for us. And here I want to emphasize the point that even then, as now, Israel was the real bastion of Western civilization in the Middle East: not just a bastion against communism, but a bastion of Western ideals, technology and advancement. In 1952 Nasser assumed power and many were convinced that he would ally Egypt with the Communists. In Iran, Mossadegh was going through his gyrations. North Africa was aflame. Fighting was going on in Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco. It was also obvious that many new nations of tropical Africa were going to come to freedom in the ensuing decade, and a number of observers feared that the majority of them would, after achieving their freedom, quickly become pawns of the Communists.

In Asia, the Reds were on the march. The Viet Minh were engaging thousands of French troops in Vietnam. We were involved in a desperate struggle in Korea. The Pathet Lao was active in Laos. Malaya and the Philippines were beset by bloody Communist guerrilla strife.

In Latin America, the situation appeared to be as ripe for the Kremlin as any brew that could be devised by a witch angry at the West. In the majority of Latin American countries, a small self-perpetuating autocracy, often corrupt, kept in their hands the key to the reigns of power-education. This autocracy held a nation's finances tightly in its hands and adamantly refused an equitable distribution of income. And this autocracy remains most powerful as we can see by what happened in Peru only a few weeks ago.

Yes, 10 years ago, even we in the United States seemed to be paralyzed. The frustrations felt by many of our people led them to support the extremism of McCarthy. The professional anti-Communists had a wide appeal in the United States, an appeal far beyond the actual strength of the Communist Party. They almost succeeded in getting across their idea that the threat to the United States was from within and not, as is in fact the case, from without.

In general, while both the Communist nations and the democracies of the West had been bled by World War II, it often appeared as though the blood of the democracies was less vigorous than that of the Communist nations, that of our the shambles of World War II might well arise the inevitable Communist state predicted by Marx and Engel, a prophecy cherished and nourished in the Kremlin through the years.

But, thank God, as we know, the world situation is fluid. There is no such thing as a permanent status quo. Arnold Toynbee stresses in his monumental work "A Study of History," that civilizations and nations must move, and fast. They must either grow in strength or start to shrink; but, they cannot stand still. Like a man on the side of a steep mountain, he must go up or down; he cannot remain stationary.

Now, let us look at the broad sweep of post-World War II events and history. From this vantage point of August 26, 1962, I submit that the tide of communism, which appeared so overwhelming 10 years ago, and was actually at its flood tide then, has begun to ebb.

The vigor of communism seems to be receding in the face of the invincible force of the desire of every individual everywhere for personal freedom and liberty. True, Tibet has been seized by China, we are in for a long, drawnout struggle in South Vietnam, and the future of the coalition government in Laos is, at best, uncertain. However, since Czechoslovakia was subverted in 1948, not a single nation that has been predominantly literate and reasonably well fed, has slipped behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtain.

And even behind the curtain itself; we have had considerable evidence of the peoples' unrest. There were the Berlin riots of 1953, the Poznan riots of 1956, the Hungarian revolution of 1956, and the Warsaw student riots of 1957. In the last two affairs, I had the experience of being involved, and in fact, in the latter case, of being teargassed.

As a result of this unrest, some relaxation has occurred behind the Iron Curtain. The Gomulka regime in Poland has loosened the chains to some degree. The Communist empire is no longer monolithic. Albania, China, and Yugoslavia are all engaged in internecine warfare with the Kremlin. And, like Alice looking in her strange looking glass, the Communist leaders of Albania and China are said to be criticized from the right, and those of Yugoslavia from the left. Recently, we witnessed the strange spectacle of a Russian helicopter being used by the Indians against the Chinese Communists. The Soviets have had to build their horrible wall in Berlin because of the failure of their regime to satisfy human needs and to prevent the drain of their people. Even in Hungary, there have occurred certain relaxations—not many, but a few.

The recent wave of refugees seeking escape from Communist China is devastating testimony to the many failures of that despotism.

Certainly, Latin America has not fallen like a ripe plum, and today, Castro's life in Cuba is not an easy one. I have always advocated that we let him stew in his own juice and I think the pot is boiling very well.

No, all is not going well for the Communists. In Kerala, India, where once the people voted in a Communist regime; 3 years later, they voted in a non-Communist state government. The guerrilla activities which concerned us 10 years ago in Malaya and the Philippines, have been virtually eliminated.

Egypt has certainly not become a Communist satellite and the situation in tropical Africa has brought many surprises. The vast majority of the new nations have shown little interest in becoming closely alined with the Communist bloc and even Guinea recently demanded that the Russian Ambassador be changed. In the Congo, just after its independence, the Russians rushed in with great expectations. A few months later, they were thrown out by the Congolese themselves.

Contrary to some popular misconceptions, the Communists have not done at all well in the U.N. In fact, the Communists are so concerned by their failures at the U.N., that they have attempted to institute the paralyzing troika. Specifically, the Soviet bloc has done so badly in the U.N. Security Council that they have had to use the veto more than 100 times. We have never had to use it.

As a matter of fact, throughout the history of the U.N., not one single major Soviet resolution, which the United States has opposed, has carried the U.N. For instance, only the 11 members of the Communist bloc opposed the Assembly's resolution which condemned the Soviet announced intention of exploding a 50-megaton bomb. A lengthy and stormy discussion in the General Assembly's main Political Committee on Cuba's charges of American aggression produced not a single vote outside the Soviet bloc. Drastic Communist proposals calling for immediate independence of all territories, however ill prepared, have all been defeated. It is interesting to note that an article in the July 23 edition of the National Observer states "He (Khrushchev) bluntly labeled the U.N. as a branch of the U.S. State Department."

Another indication of the Reds' dissatisfaction with the U.N. has been their efforts to bankrupt the organization. It is interesting to note that the only nations who opposed the General Assembly resolution authorizing the issuance of U.N. bonds, were the 11 Communist bloc countries and, regrettably, Belgium and France.

Finally, while we struggle with the problem of what to do with our food surpluses, the Communist world is desperately searching for ways to grow more food. Communist methods in agriculture have been a catastrophic failure. This is a telling indictment of the Communist system when one recalls that over 80 percent of the world's people are engaged in agriculture and that improved methods of agriculture are a life and death matter for most of the uncommitted nations of the world. I have been referring to Communist setbacks. Now I want to mention some of the positive accomplishments of our side.

There is the phenomenon of the decolonization by our allies climaxed by the recent settlement in Algeria which will free France from a tremendous drain of its resources. With the exception of Portugal, the nations of NATO are fast divesting themselves of their oversea lands. While the new nations create new problems, I believe that in the long run, the very emergence of these new nations will greatly strengthen our hand in the struggle with communism for two principal reasons.

First of all, as our European allies bring their colonies to independence, we find that the peoples of those countries, whose whole impetus stems from the desire for liberty, have no desire to exchange the chains of one master for those of another. The very antipathy for discipline of the individual African must be seen to be believed. I remember being vividly impressed with this phenomenon at the coming to independence of Tanganyika last winter, at being particularly struck by the zest of each African to do just what he wanted. Moreover, as the Africans come to freedom, the Soviets lose their powerful propaganda weapon of masquerading as anticolonialists. In fact, Red colonialism becomes increasingly obvious to the uncommitted nations.

Secondly, our Allies are not squandering their resources in a futile attempt to repress independence movements. As a consequence, our Allies are able to use the men and money saved for their domestic economic growth; they are able to make a more substantial contribution to NATO; and they are in a better position to help us meet the great challenge of economic development in the new nations. Our problem, though, is to get our Allies to carry their full, fair load.

Another very positive development in our favor has been the phenomenal economic recovery of Western Europe, where a planned but free economy has racked up phenomenal accomplishments, where the strength of the emerging Common Market has a very direct relevance to problems of development in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. One of the great hopes of the Communists has been that they could convince the emergent developing nations that their Communist system presented the best method for development. Yet, in contrast, nakedly stand the failures of Communist agriculture; and the failure of the brutal Communist efforts to industrialize China. Less striking, but no less significant, in comparison with China, is the steady progress which India has been making through the use of democratic methods.

As we assess the balance sheet between independence and communism, I think we should ask ourselves what are some of the underlying reasons for the failures of communism and here I believe we can return to my original remarks about the basic philosophy which underlies our society. Because to my mind, the basic reason for the failure of communism is very simple. Communism is utterly unnatural and goes against the grain of men. As Pope Pius IX said more than a century ago in 1846 of communism, "It is absolutely contrary to the natural law itself." But, when people are starving and illiterate, when any alternative seems preferable to the status quo, they may swallow it. When people are facing the muzzle of a cannon, they can be forced to live under it. But, when these conditions change, when brutal force is lessened, then starts the evolution away from communism. I see the defeat of communism ahead. Not quickly, which would mean global war, destructive to both the East and the West. But, I do see the defeat of communism over the long haul through evolution.

The very system we have evolved with its freedom of choice and respect for individual rights, has its attractions to any people who have a degree of education and material well-being. I believe that, innately, human beings everywhere, of every color and in any hemisphere, yearn for the freedom to say what they think, to work where they wish, to worship how they please, and to pile up a few personal possessions to pass on to their children. And this includes the Russians, who are today reasonably well fed, well read, and well clothed.

In essence, then, I believe that the Communist system contains within itself, the seeds of its own destruction, not by quick revolution, because the Russian people are not too discontent, not by mutually destructive war, but through evolution.

If we can take the long view of history, we realize that our Judaeo-Christian civilization has been in existence for centuries and has survived many temporary inroads of unnatural and antihuman philosophies. Therefore, I wonder if the historians of 2062 will not think of the Communist movement as one of a number of threats to civilization which like other barbarian movements, like the Huns and Visigoths and the Third Reich, were turned back because of man's innate humanity.

I believe that Walter Lippmann, one of the wisest political philosophers on the American scene, was eminently correct when he told the American Law Institute last May: "The wave of the future is not Communist domination of the world. The wave of the future is social revolution driving us toward the goal of national independence and equality of personal status."

Obviously, we cannot just sit back and talk about our principles. We must implement in our daily lives the doctrines we hear preached in our houses of worship. In this connection, the social ethics of our Judaic-Christian heritage are not only a source of inspiration—their implementation is vital.

As we brace ourselves to deal wih the triple challenges of poverty, disease, and illiteracy, the really important thing to keep in mind is not what we are against but what we are for. I particularly commend to you a statement by General Shoup of the Marine Corps: "We teach them (marines) what there is in this country that is worth living for, worth fighting for, worth giving your life for. We don't teach them hate.

"Hate I consider is an internal sin. And hate is closely associated with fear, I think fear breeds defeatism, and that is a disease that we cannot afford in this country if we are going to maintain our position in the family of freedom-loving people."

Our greatest strength then is our dedication to man's independence and as Longfellow said, to "all the great traditions of the past—they saw reflected in the coming time." The tried and true great commandments of our forefathers, the principles which inspired those who established this magnificent synagogue do, indeed, have great relevance for us today. If we follow these principles, we will be able to demonstrate "examples of an enlarged and liberal policy: a policy worthy of imitation" as George Washington asked us to do.

It is my earnest hope that those of us who are gathered here today will leave this hallowed building with a sense of reconsecration to destiny in life and to God's work.

For a New Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been following the Vice President's tour to Mediterranean countries with satisfaction and pride. The great crowds who have welcomed him wherever he has appeared have shown their wholehearted admiration for him personally, for the people of the United States and for our Government. We are hopeful that his visit and his talks with the leaders of these countries, of such importance to the stability of the world, will strengthen our collective efforts to bring about peaceful solutions to the worldwide problems which confront us.

However, in one part of this region, there are countries which are not willing to talk about peace with their neighbors. On the contrary, they insist that they are in a state of war. They are deaf to any talk about peace and, for over 15 years, they have held fast to their intransigence.

Since the day the State of Israel was established, its Arab neighbors have proclaimed that they are preparing for the day when they will, as they put it, throw the Israelis into the sea. In the meantime, they harass the little democracy by every means—by propaganda, border incursions, sniping, and threats.

Israel has devoted the 15 years of its existence to reclaiming a barren land, to building cities, roads and industries to sustain her newcomers. It has succeeded beyond its wildest dreams and has earned the admiration of all the free peoples of the world.

But Israel is surrounded by hostility. It has no military pact with any nation. And it fears that some day its neighbors will feel that their military might is sufficient for the task and that they will indeed attempt to carry out their threats.

The situation has become even worse since President Nasser of Egypt has been devoting so much of his resources to purchasing Soviet arms and jet fighters. And for his 10th anniversary, Mr. Nasser celebrated by firing rockets. This development has increased Israel's fears. A belligerent Nasser armed with jets and rockets is not a comfortable neighbor.

Perhaps some day the Arab leaders may be persuaded to sit down with the Israelis face to face, to try to reach a peaceful solution. The Arabs have never considered this possibility as an end to their state of war. But that does not mean that we cannot lend our weight, our prestige and our leadership to proposals for direct peace negotiations. I hope that if a peace resolution is again brought to the General Assembly this year, as it was during the last session, our U.N. delegation will support it. That it did not support the proposal last year was a disappointment to many of us.

I ask permission to insert at this point an editorial from the Near East report of August 14 entitled "For a New Appraisal," which should be read by all:

FOR A NEW APPRAISAL

Just as long as there is no Middle East peace, the Western Powers—Washington, London, and Paris—must do everything possible to maintain stability.

American policy, in recent months, has rested on two major assumptions:

1. That President Nasser presents no menace to his neighbors because he is preoccupied with economic development.
2. That Israel has the defense capacity to deter Nasser from implementing his reiterated threats.

Nasser's recent firing of V-2 rockets in celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Egyptian revolution, and the bellicose speech with which he punctuated it, may force a reappraisal of our policy because they invalidate the assumptions.

Rocketry is having a dangerous psychological impact on Nasser himself. His recent speeches are increasingly harsh and strident and must be disconcerting to diplomats who have been assuring us that a reformed Nasser has given them a firm commitment to keep the peace.

Egypt's neighbors look apprehensively at this turn of events. They fear that Nasser's prestige will rise—along with his ambitions—and that Egypt's new prowess will embolden pro-Nasser groups throughout the region. They have read his speeches, they have studied his book, they are not deceived by his beguiling smile. Arab leaders know that he has never changed his announced program. He still seeks to dominate the Middle East, find space for his surplus population, control its oil to finance migration, development and military might.

He has not relinquished his dream of gaining control over the oil of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran and Libya. And Turkey, Ethiopia, Sudan, Lebanon—all fear a recrudescence of Nasser subversion.

Arab leaders know that Nasser's first target, if he does strike, will be Israel, which he would attempt to knock out in a lightning blow before that country's light bombers could reply and before the United Nations could decide who is the aggressor. And once Israel is out of the way, Nasser can take any Arab state under his influence.

All of them know that their own security depends, in some measure, on the security of Israel. If Israel can continue to be able to stand up against Nasser, then there is some hope for stability in the region.

They find it bewildering that, despite Nasser's avowed objectives, the United States continues to come to his rescue—that we saved his economy from bankruptcy, that we encourage West Germany to increase its aid, that German scientists help build his rockets—all this while the Soviet Union supplies him with MIG-21's and TU-16 bombers, which are even more dangerous than rockets.

For a long time, Washington experts have maintained that Israel is stronger than Egypt. They have conceded that Egypt has more manpower and that its army and navy are better equipped. They have argued, however, that Israel has a qualitative superiority because its manpower is more skilled.

But Egyptian rockets suggest that the balance of strength has shifted in Nasser's direction. If Nasser can fire rockets aimed at Israel, merely by pressing buttons, skill ceases to be a decisive factor. Tiny Israel is a concentrated target and a rain of missiles could devastate it.

Ideally, the solution to this is peace and an end to the costly and dangerous arms race. But Nasser has said that he will not let Ben-Gurion "impose peace" on him. He prefers to be at war with Israel. And the international community does not have the courage or strength to outlaw his posture.

Denied peace, we must then ask whether stability can be maintained if Moscow and Washington combine to enable Nasser to consolidate his growing military advantage. By continuing to strengthen Nasser, we may be contributing to the danger of a new conflagration.

German-American Cooperation: The Case for Noblesse Oblige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article which I wrote for the August 1962 issue of Aussen Politik, the German journal on foreign affairs, on the need for German initiative and leadership in Europe in reducing tariffs, increasing foreign aid, and helping to solve the international payments disequilibrium. The text of the article follows:

GERMAN-AMERICAN ECONOMIC COOPERATION: THE CASE FOR NOBLESSE OBLIGE

The decade of the fifties was one in which the United States reaped the fruit of its investment in Western Europe. After the clouds of the Suez crisis had cleared, Europe's economic renaissance was revealed in all its strength. The United States looked forward to a new period in which the Atlantic nations would use their unparalleled resources to spark a new surge of progress in the free world.

The realities today fall somewhat short of this expectation. Indeed, the effective strength of the free world may have been diminished in the past few years for, though Europe has continued to add to its strength, the United States has failed to keep in step.

The irony is that much of the problem need not exist.

If the man from Mars were to descend suddenly into our world, he would be as astonished at our condition as we would be at his appearance. He would find few who disputed the need for cooperation between the United States and prosperous Europe to advance their own interests as well as that of the poorer members of the free world community. But he would find the two halves of the Atlantic Community limping along under a burden of problems which would disappear if the halves were fitted together as complements.

The man from Mars would find some 5½ percent of the U.S. work force out of work. In Western Europe, on the contrary, there is superfull employment and acute labor shortages in some countries. Germany, for example, has more than twice as many job opportunities as there are unemployed, despite the import of labor from neighboring countries.

He would find that U.S. economic growth has been lagging along at a rate less than 3 percent per year, but would conclude that the economy has a great potential for more rapid growth in a huge manpower reserve, idle capacity, and relatively steady increases in productivity. Western Europe has in the past decade grown at double the U.S. rate, but shortages of labor and industrial capacity, combined with growing public, business, and consumer demands, threaten to convert growth into price inflation.

The man from Mars would see that Americans, though they eat well and cheaply, still struggle with mountainous farm surpluses produced by the most efficient agriculture in the world. In Western Europe, food prices are rising—more than 6 percent in some countries during 1961—with much of the increase attributable to higher subsidies paid to costly systems of agriculture. Our visitor would be incredulous to discover that the Common Market is determined to institutionalize this least efficient part of its economy and to forgo the benefits of American agricultural efficiency.

He would find that the United States has vast and efficient plants which can turn out huge quantities of consumers durable goods—from clothes driers, dishwashers, and garbage disposers, to air-conditioners, TV sets, and a great array of other household electrical appliances. But the U.S. market is highly saturated with many of these appliances—the saturation ratios are said to be as high as 89 percent for TV sets; 96 percent for radios; 98 percent for refrigerators; and 91 percent for washing machines. Thus, much of America's capacity stands idle.

In Europe, the man from Mars would find that capacity for supplying these goods is limited just at the time when rising personal incomes presage a great boom in consumer demand. For unlike the majority of American families, European households are far from having satisfied their wants for these consumers' conveniences and luxuries. Market saturation ratios in the six countries of the Common Market are estimated to be only 10 percent for TV sets; 20 percent for radios; 12 percent for refrigerators; and 12 percent for clothes washing machines.

The man from Mars would boggle at the spectacle of continued large annual deficits in the U.S. balance of payments while equally large payments surpluses piled up in Western Europe. Yet he would find that the Common Market countries with the largest surpluses plan to keep quite high tariffs against the outside world which will further add to their surpluses and the deficits of other countries.

By this time, our unbelieving observer might clutch his forehead and say: "Why don't these foolish mortals put two and two together? The United States could eliminate unemployment and achieve a higher growth rate by supplying the goods that Western Europe needs. Western Europe could maintain full employment and continue to raise wages without risking inflation by importing goods to supply rising demand. In so doing, the United States and Western Europe would right the present payments imbalance, and together they could turn their attention outward to the solution of their common problems."

From the American point of view, what is good for Europe's short-run interest cannot be the sole criterion today, any more than narrow self-interest could have sufficed for U.S. policy in the immediate postwar period. The boundaries and interests of the free world are broader than those of the Common Market or, indeed of the Atlantic community.

Since this is so, any major economic or political decision taken in Europe, as well as in the United States, should, in the American view, be measured in terms of the welfare of the entire free world community—Africa, Asia, and South America, as well as Europe and North America. The economic obligations of a prosperous Europe, like those of the United States, include the responsibility to see to it that the growth of one is not at the expense of the other or of the free world at large. Beyond this, there is the overriding mutual obligation to assist the growth of poorer, developing nations.

In redirecting Western Europe to sensible and responsible international economic policies, Germany has unique qualifications as well as responsibilities for leadership. These do not derive solely from its position as one of the free world's leading industrial powers, though wealth itself imposes responsibilities—a recognition of economic noblesse oblige.

Like the United States, Germany is not hampered by a web of economic ties with former colonies for whom preferential arrangements have to be considered. Like the United States, Germany believes that its own interests will be best served by a generally low-tariff, nonrestrictive commercial policy. And like the Americans, the German people have always had a strong strain of idealism which, harnessed to the economic and managerial genius of the nation, could direct the growing power of Europe outward for the mutual benefit of the free world.

Specifically, Germany can join the United States in action on foreign aid, trade, and international payments.

With respect to aid, Germany, like the United States, is in a position to grant long-term development assistance to areas of the world which cannot look to former mother countries for help. Its expenditure in 1961 of DM1.2 billion, apart from DM900 million in long-term credits to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, is a good beginning. However, its continuing basic surplus payments position amply justifies an expanded program. With a large and growing aid contribution of its own, Germany's counsel in the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD could carry great weight in urging the other industrial countries to increase their aid efforts.

Apart from lending or giving money, the German people could work together with the Americans in establishing an international peace corps. The possibility of harnessing the energies and enthusiasm of talented German youth in such a people-to-people aid program was explored in preliminary discussions of a year ago in which the writer participated. As Americans can testify, this direct contact with the peoples of the developing countries is at least as rewarding to the aiders as to those aided. It gives the givers insight into problems which our young people will soon inherit. And Germany, like the United States, needs the widest public understanding of world problems if it is to safeguard itself from dangerous isolationism in the future.

Another German aid specialty lies in her own remarkable post-World War II achievement in democracy—honest courts, a working parliament, a free press, and an incorruptible civil service. The heritage of Vom Stein is not without its relevance today.

In trade, Germany together with the Benelux countries should continue to take the leadership in the Common Market for a substantial unilateral reduction of quota restrictions and tariffs. The recent initiative of the Common Market to reduce coffee and cocoa tariffs by 40 percent is a step in the right direction, but reductions are essential over a much wider range of industrial and agricultural products.

What does it profit Germany or France to protect inefficient coal mines[1] or costly agriculture if it aggravates an acute labor shortage, and industrial growth lags for lack of labor? How will the Common Market countries gain if wage increases continue and a deficiency of consumers' goods forces up prices into an inflationary spiral? A higher level of Common Market imports would be as beneficial to the Common Market now as it would be for the United States and many other countries. Moreover, in the long run, any action permitting a higher level of U.S. exports to Europe now—consumer durables, machinery, coal, paper products, food—will redound in Europe's favor later on. If the U.S. trade balance is expanded, this country is far more likely to grant meaningful concessions to Europe in the next round of trade negotiations, and these concessions will be needed if Europe is to have sustained growth in its most important external market.

Finally, as the country with the largest unobligated gold and foreign exchange reserves in the free world, Germany has a unique responsibility to take the initiative in correcting the international payments imbalance.

In the 4 years 1958–61, inclusive, the United States has had a series of large payments deficits. They were caused largely by the size of U.S. foreign aid, oversea military defense, and private foreign investment.

As a result, U.S. gold reserves declined by $5.9 billion, and U.S. short-term dollar liabilities increased $7.4 billion to a total of $22.6 billion. Western Europe, on the other hand, increased its gold and foreign exchange reserves by about $11 billion in this period, with nearly $8 billion of the increase going to the six countries of the EEC. This one-way drain upon U.S. reserves toward Europe cannot continue without serious consequences for the present international system of payments.

Through the recent supplementary credit agreement, $6 billion—$4 billion in nondollar currencies—has been added to IMF reserves, which could be borrowed by any of the 10 participating countries in case of emergency. Although this agreement and various informal arrangements among the central banks to prevent violent exchange-rate fluctuations help considerably in diminishing sudden liquidity crises, they do not go to the heart of the U.S. balance-of-payments difficulties. Similarly, the German advance debt repayment in 1961 of $587 million was extremely helpful in reducing the 1961 U.S. deficit, but it was a one-time benefit for the United States.

The dimensions of the basic problem are suggested by the fact that U.S. military expenditures in Europe alone come to $1.5 billion per year and that U.S. net private long-term investment in Europe adds another outflow of $1 billion per year.

There are a variety of measures which European countries could take. Two have been mentioned above. Increasing long-term loans and grants to poorer countries, on an untied basis, and increasing exports would greatly help the United States, as would picking up a larger share of the U.S. oversea military burden. German purchases of arms in the United States are now increasing.

Germany and the other Common Market countries could also work vigorously to establish a long-term capital market adequate for their own needs. It is not appropriate, in its present payments position, for the United States to continue to be the major source of large-scale foreign investment loans. The $25 million European Coal-Steel Community bond issue floated in Wall Street in May 1962, is a case in point.

Germany might also consider using fiscal stringency—more taxes or less spending—somewhat more, and high interest rates somewhat less, as a means of combating inflation. Somewhat lower private interest rates would encourage German lenders to lend abroad, and German borrowers to borrow at home. Lower interest rates abroad would permit the United States to have lower interest rates, and more economic growth, with less danger of losing capital to other countries.

A reduction in the Common Market's external tariff would help the U.S. balance of payments not only by increasing export possibilities, as discussed above, but also by reducing the incentive for American industries to leave home and locate behind the Common Market tariff wall. There is no doubt that a large part of American investment in the Common Market countries has been lured there by the attraction of getting inside the high tariff wall. Reducing the tariff wall would make plant-location decisions depend on more legitimate factors than the charms of a high-tariff protective area.

---

[1] Germany now limits annual coal imports from the United States to 5 million metric tons, less than 5 percent of its domestic consumption, although U.S. coal can be landed in Germany at competitive prices.

If this list of courses of action open to Germany seems long, the agenda for the United States is equally lengthy. Foremost for the United States is to employ vigorously President Kennedy's new Trade Expansion Act, as soon as the ink is dry, lower trade barriers, not just for the United States but for the whole free world. The United States supports the political and economic unity that is being wrought by the Common Market, but it aims to generalize the benefits of Common Market internal free trade as widely as possible.

As for Germany, one hears it said so often that German society today is unsure of itself. If there is any truth to this, one could do worse than to recall Schiller's words:

"Man grows according to his higher goals." Who knows? Perhaps some of the goals I have ventured to suggest may nourish this growth.

To both Germany and the United States, much has been given. In the years to come, much will be required.

Failure of Communism Described in Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, Thursday, August 16, 1962:

FAILURE OF COMMUNISM

In the face of one more spectacular Communist success in the field of space engineering, it is a useful corrective to recall that communism is unable to engineer a good society. The triumph in rocketry will not alter by one whit the economic and political condition of the Communist peoples.

They will have good reason for pride. But pride in a deed which exalts the rulers more than the ruled is uncomfortably close to giving the people circuses instead of bread. This is not a durable form of government.

Indeed, a look at the political globe today tempts one to say that communism as a system is a failure.

It may well be. It certainly is deep in failures right now and its successes are few and indecisive.

The evidence goes way beyond the spectacular collapse in Communist China which is emerging from behind the censorship now and creating headlines. In the big Western industrial countries where communism, was scheduled to triumph, its considerable power at the end of World War II has declined to a minor irritant. In its place, the vigor and promise of the Common Market have left the old, shopworn threats and blandishments of the Communists far behind.

The satellite countries are showing a subtle and shrewd independence right inside the Communist camp. Their system is not communism. It is as different as the Poles and Hungarians can make it. They are a kind of Trojan horse inside the wall. Africa, which was to have been a happy hunting ground offering fresh successes for infiltration and subversion, has shown itself self-reliant and sturdy, to a degree that even surprises its friends. Even the early breaches leading into Guinea, Ghana, and the Congo have seen Communist agents clambering back out, in some disarray.

In the Middle East Iran still stands, somehow, and Iraq seems firm. Egypt has its dealings with the Communists but their effort to get their hooks into domestic power landed them in jail. They are still there out in the government's oases, well concentrated. The big neutrals like India, Burma, and Indonesia have learned the score and kept their domestic Communists under control. The ending of the colonial era removed the prime irritation on which Communists thrive, just in time.

The Soviet Union has some successes at home. A handful of technicians and scientists have done brilliantly, under the military spur. The regime is less brittle, more supple than Stalin's. But who knows whether it can withstand the admixture of incentives and civilian yearnings and values which leak in from the outside and are a powerful leaven, and without which Mr. Khrushchev cannot run a modern state.

Let no one fool himself as to the cause of today's frustrations. They are imposed. Since communism as a system is the enemy of human values its nemesis, the source of its punishment, is the moral tenacity and the physical strength of the free system. The outside world has jailed Communist power within its borders and denied it the momentum that Hitler was permitted.

This powerful restraint has to continue. No one can afford to lower his guard. Communism has rallied before and could do so again. And the free system is not without its problems. Its future, in Lincoln's phrase, is piled high with difficulty. But that of communism is piled high with despair and the Communists are finding it out.

Allen Dulles has said, "Some of the steam has gone out of the early, evangelical, fanatical drive of communism. And it is a tarnished thing. It can never really live down Stalin's record of terror.

Congressional Watchdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill of August 29, 1962, setting forth some of the efforts of our colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable JOHN MOSS.

The article entitled "Congressional Watchdog," is headed "Fast-Rolling Moss Leaves No Stone Unturned in Fight To Guarantee Press Access to Government Information."

Having served on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives with this outstanding representative of his State and Nation, and having watched with admiration the vigorous and courageous fight which our good friend and colleague, the gentlemen from California, the Honorable JOHN MOSS, has constantly waged on behalf of the public interest in all fields, I take pride and pleasure in inserting this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

No Member of the House of Representatives is more deserving of praise and of the admiration of his colleagues than is the gentleman from California, the Honorable JOHN MOSS, for his record of courage, integrity, energy, and hard work on behalf of his district and the people of the Nation.

The article follows:

CONGRESSIONAL WATCHDOG—FAST-ROLLING MOSS LEAVES NO STONE UNTURNED IN FIGHT TO GUARANTEE PRESS ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

(By Oscar Johnson)

A telephone rings out in the cubbyhole offices on the second floor of Capitol Hill's old George Washington Inn, adding its note to the sound of clacking typewriters and conversation.

Tall, grizzled Sam Archibald, first and only staff director of the House Freedom of Information Subcommittee, grabs the receiver, listens while a Congressman speaks. "OK, we'll check it out," he says shortly, then hangs up and shouts to chief investigator Jack Howard across the narrow hall: "It's the ICC again, Jack." Howard, whose close-cropped red hair and thick spectacles present a scholarly image, smiles slightly and turns to the files. It's time to start a new project forcing the Government to release public information to the public—to them an accustomed and now frequently successful task.

Last week the Special Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee (to give FOI its tongue-rattling actual name) was again up to its cluttered desk tops in negotiations with the ICC—one of its old foes among the jumble of Washington independent regulatory agencies which can acquire autonomous power, abandon the public interest, and then hide their flaws in an infinite bureaucratic morass thwarting outside scrutiny.

This time the Interstate Commerce Commission had refused to open its files on a railroad loan guarantee to Congress' watchdog auditing agency, the General Accounting Office, despite the fact that the GAO is lawfully entitled to see all Government papers not hidden by statute. As authority for their refusal, ICC officials cited the "traditional immunity from disclosure of the internal deliberations of the various organs of Government."

The congressional answer to this far-fetched excuse for secrecy was supplied by Representative JOHN EMERSON MOSS, Democrat, of California, the hard-battling, tenacious Freedom of Information chairman. "I know of no such traditional immunity," Moss said scornfully, "unless it is the immunity claimed by those involved in scandals."

In this case, Moss decided on a new gambit to add to his usual arsenal of tactics. The bill authorizing fiscal 1963 operations of ICC had already cleared the House, but he could still drop a "word to the wise" through another suitable vehicle—the Federal Aviation Agency authorization bill, which was still going through the House Commerce Committee. Moss happens to be a member of Commerce. So when the Commerce Committee report on the FAA bill was being written last week, he tucked in language specifically directing the FAA to make all of its records available on demand by Congress or GAO. "It will be implicit," Moss told Roll Call, "that similar language will be put in the ICC bill next time around if they don't straighten out."

One way or another, many Washington bureaucrats have found, Moss usually gets his wishes. As FOI chairman, he is a living, fighting testimonial to the fact that it does not pay to anger a Congressman.

FOI exists today only because a Federal official tried to block Congress' access to information when Moss was a House freshman 10 years ago. But for that, Moss might have wound up as just another liberal Democrat from California—for there was little in his background to indicate he would become a leading national crusader for freedom of information.

JOHN MOSS, 49, was born in Hiawatha, Carbon County, Utah, but when he was only 10 the family headed for the more prosperous environs of northern California's fabulously fertile Sacramento Valley. He attended public schools in Sacramento, the State Capital, later going to Sacramento Junior College. During 1939–43 young Moss pursued a business career which included stints in sales, credit, and retail stores—all the while working as an active Democrat. During 1939 he was State director of Young Democrats. After a World War II Navy hitch, Moss entered the retail business in Sacramento and worked with his brother selling real estate.

In 1948, Moss gambled on a political career and won a seat in the California House. He was reelected 2 years later, and soon was assistant Democratic floor leader—a rapid rise to leadership which was later to be manifested on the congressional level.

In the statehouse, Moss helped lead a progressive, bipartisan group which overthrew the lobbyist-dominated clique which had run things for many years. In a bid for Congress in 1951, Moss had to buck elements of the same band. He credits the victory to his wife, the former Jean Kueny, whom he had wooed and wed in 1935. In the absence of organization support, she was his only campaign worker—but after that first victory his political eminence and vote margins grew steadily. (In 1958, under California's old cross-filing system, he got both parties' nominations, and in 1960 had no opposition.)

Entering a GOP-controlled House in 1953, Moss was named to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and started writing his liberal record. In 1954 he emerged as leader of Democratic forces which succeeded in getting House approval of a Federal worker pay raise without postal rate boosts—contrary to the program of President Eisenhower. Watching this creditable performance with approving eye were sagacious Minority Leader Sam Rayburn and Democratic whip JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

In 1953, while on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee Moss got his first bitter taste of censorship—and found it not to his liking. In the wake of the 1952 Eisenhower election, Republicans were playing a "numbers game" of hunting alleged subversives in the Federal Government whom, they had charged in the campaign, the Democratic regime had allowed in.

Republican CSC Chairman Philip Young released a report vaguely listing several thousand dismissals, and Democratic Congressmen started pressing for details. Had those dismissed been security risks? The Civil Service Commission just thumbed its nose, declined to state specifics.

"It was outrageous," Moss now says. "No State agency would dare to try that with a State legislature." Then and there he resolved to do whatever he could to improve Government FOI.

Eventually, Democrats were able to dig out that most of those dismissed had actually left through retirement, other employment, or similar voluntary reasons. Only about 70 had been fired, and mostly for drinking or other moral laxity—not for leftwing activities. But the meager information supplied did not satisfy Moss, who started thinking of ways to clean up such censorship.

"I had to wait until 1955 (when Democrats controlled Congress) to put my ideas to work," he says.

At about the time of the "numbers game" controversy, considerable public interest in FOI had been aroused, partly because of a book, "The People's Right To Know," by Dr. Harold L. Cross, which had grown from a long American Society of Newspaper Editors study. Speaker Rayburn got together with House Government Operations Chairman WILLIAM DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, and agreed to set up a committee on the topic. By no coincidence at all, they chose Moss to run the new group—a task which he was eager to assume.

Since formation of FOI, Moss feels, steady progress has been made toward ending Government secrecy—although there is room still for wholesale improvement. He has little praise for the Eisenhower administration's record, pointing to 44 cases of censorship under Executive privilege during the subcommittee's first 5 years of existence.

By contrast, Moss points out, President Kennedy's administration has used Executive privilege only once—when Defense Secretary McNamara was instructed in March of this year to refuse to give Senator JOHN STENNIS', Democrat, of Mississippi, committee the names of Pentagon censors who had made specific deletions in military speeches. Moss' group, however, was able to turn even this instance to advantage.

Staffers Archibald and Howard, ever alert to any chance for improving FOI, reported to Moss that the President's wording in his directive to McNamara might be significant. They wrote the President about it and were informed that under Kennedy, Executive privilege would be invoked only by the President himself and only in specific instances. "This was a great improvement," says Howard. "Under Eisenhower, officials far below the Cabinet level were using it."

Staff files show examples of censorship ranging from the sublime to the ridiculous. There was a Customs Bureau ban on release of fig import statistics; in another case the Comptroller of the Currency refused to show a citizen the blank forms used to apply for organization of a national bank. More recently, the Naval Ordnance Lab near Washington would not give a trade publication a copy of its unclassified telephone book. Former Navy Secretary John Connally, now running for Governor of Texas, based his refusal on the grounds that the telephone book was "related to the internal management of the Navy."

Under Kennedy, says staffer Howard, "we have general top-level encouragement. The problem is to get the word down through the ranks."

To get the word out, FOI staffers labor industriously in their cramped quarters, persist in bombarding recalcitrant officials with letters or telephone calls until information is pried loose. Some work is done on their own initiative, other cases grow out of complaints from the press, ordinary citizens or—in a growing trend—from Congressmen. "We have a pretty good batting average," says Moss, who signs the correspondence. "The censors usually give up, soonor or later."

Staffers rate the Pentagon as showing much improvement, but criticize the State Department for "doing little about FOI." Under Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges, says Howard, "We got half a loaf. It was disappointing."

Since an effective clamp has been placed on "executive privilege," bureaucrats have fallen back on other dodges—mainly the public information section of the 1946 Administrative Procedures Act. Under this authority, officials can censor (1) any function "requiring secrecy in the public interest," or (2) "any matter relating to the internal management of an agency." They can withhold information (3) except from "persons properly and directly concerned," and (4) if it is "required for good cause to be held confidential." As the decision on these four points is up to the official holding the information. "What more could a secrecy-bent person want?" Moss asks.

To clear away these giant-sized inducements to secrecy, Moss has urged Congress to pass legislation now before it. One reform measure, drafted by the American Bar Association, has been introduced by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat of Pennsylvania, and another, more far-reaching bill, by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat of Wisconsin). But, Moss declared, there seems to be little demand for either this session.

Moss not only criticizes the FOI laxity of Congress, he has been known to lambast the press itself for taking a rebuff "lying down." When the President this year decided to bar reporters from renewed U.S. nuclear testing in the Pacific, the determined Congressman ripped into "failure of the press to protest vehemently," and said he knew of "no editorial complaints about the decision."

He says, however, that "We're gradually educating the press to not take refusal as a matter of course, but challenge it." Reporters should tell the subcommittee of restrictions, says Moss, because clearing channels of information "is beneficial to the whole process of government."

Although Moss has no actual news experience in his background, he works smoothly with Archibald and Howard—both of whom supply considerable personal knowledge of the field. Archibald, 40, served with the Army and Marines in the China-Burma-India theater during World War II, was afterward a correspondent with AP, UP, and INS. He became a statehouse reporter for the Sacramento Bee in 1948, and in 1953 the politically rising Moss tapped him for a job as his Washington AA. In 1955 Moss named Archibald director of the new FOI Subcommittee.

Howard, 38, was an Army civilian during the war, emerged with a European theater ribbon and two battle stars. From 1949 to 1951 he was a reporter for the Springfield Daily News, and then was labor editor of the San Francisco Chronicle for 8 years before joining the subcommittee in 1960.

As an efficiently run, gregarious team, FOI has rapidly assumed a national prominence far beyond its tiny size. It is the only full-time, operating gadfly in a vast Government which is complacent to FOI at best, opposed in other instances. But the bee has a mighty sting.

It still has no permanent status, but Moss' group is gaining in bipartisan support from all Congressmen. No elected Member likes to be told he cannot have information from the Government.

Moss is now serving in his 10th year in Congress, a hard-working diligent Member who "does his homework." Moss not only pores over all legislation for which he is responsible, he frequently surprises colleagues by popping up during a committee hearing with a comment on some subject far from his usual jurisdiction. He rarely goes to bed before 1 a.m., is liable to drag staffers or other acquaintances into late-hour discussions. A voracious reader, he sometimes stays up for the wee hours just to study a novel or report.

These habits and respect for his job were clearly recognized by Speaker MCCORMACK as desirable traits in anyone to be placed on the leadership escalator. Accordingly, when the House was being reorganized at the start of this session, Democrats chose the relatively new Moss as deputy whip—their fourth-highest post.

Like the party's other leaders, Moss is in good shape politically. For years his Third District has been one of the most strongly Democratic areas of the State—so much so that when the legislature gerrymandered the districts this year it took away five Democratic counties from Moss to fashion a new Democratic district. This left Moss with only Sacramento County, with a lopsidedly Democratic population of 550,000.

Moss, of medium height and well-groomed appearance, is a straightforward, precise speaker—has the knack for a good off-the-cuff delivery. He applies the FOI belief to his own actions, always takes a stand on an issue.

When a constituent recently sent in a belligerent letter hotly berating one of his views and observing that he did not take into account the wishes of the majority, Moss did not file the note in the rotary file as many Congressmen might do. He sat down and wrote out this reply:

"The duty of the voter is to support those candidates whose announced policies and philosophies accords with his own. It is not now, nor has it ever been, proper for a representative of the people to cast aside personal convictions in an effort to support the consensus of a transitory majority within his district.

"I want to assure you that I am deeply conscious of my responsibilities to vote intelligently and upon the facts which persuade me, both as to their wisdom and rightness. This I will cede to no man. It is my independence which I regard most sacredly.

"I respectfully decline to undertake my duties," he concluded, "under the conditions you would impose."

As deputy whip, Moss is forced to stay in Washington even during long recesses. But he does not try to maintain political grace by fence straddling. During a recent rollcall vote, several aides were in his office talking about whether he should take a stand. Moss walked over to them. "If you're here, you should vote," he said. "Then you make only half the people mad, if you don't vote at all, you make all of them mad."

This belief in public awareness—the concept of an intelligent electorate working democratically through responsible officials—wraps up the philosophy of the House's leading freedom-of-information booster.

Noise From Jet Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Chicago Sun-Times carried an excellent editorial pointing out the increasing problem which is being created in Chicago at O'Hare Field by jet aircraft.

I call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues because the problem we are experiencing at O'Hare Field is indeed a national problem, in varying degrees, at all major airports which handle commercial jets.

It made me happy to see the Chicago Sun-Times, a most responsible Midwest publication and one of the largest newspapers in the country, take up the cause of the people in my district whose habits are being seriously changed by the mounting noise from these airplanes. It is now virtually impossible to carry on a telephone conversation—or even a personal conversation—with another person whenever a jet is coming in for a landing or taking off over certain areas of my district.

I am mindful that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is at present conducting an intensive investigation of this problem, and I am also mindful of the fact that the Federal Aviation Agency is seriously concerned about this situation. It is my hope that the Chicago Sun-Times editorial will help focus attention on the fact that an even greater effort must be exerted toward meeting this newest problem of the jet age.

The Sun-Times editorial follows:

NOISE FROM JET AIRPLANES

Complaints about the noise from jet airplanes taking off from O'Hare Field have spread from the area close to the field to as far away as Evanston, 13½ miles distance as the jet flies. The Evanston City Council, as a result of local complaints, has begun a study of testimony by Park Ridge officials given recently before a special House subcommittee in Washington. Park Ridge is only 4 miles from O'Hare and gets the full brunt of jet takeoff noise. Businessmen in Park Ridge complain that they have difficulty even carrying on telephone conversations because of the interference.

The problem is nationwide. Congress began a $300,000 study of it a year ago. Airlines have installed noise suppressors at a cost of $56 million. Newark and Idlewild airports require jet takeoff noise kept under 112 decibels and this has touched off a noise-versus-safety argument. In Dallas and Los Angeles, property taxes have been reduced for jet noise victims.

Park Ridge officials have made an extensive 2½-year study, using their own truck equipped with aircraft sound measuring instruments. Mayor John H. Overbeck, Jr. told Congressmen noise can be controlled by attention to flight patterns (avoiding residential areas), pilot technique, and equipment. But the crux of the problem, as he saw it, was the failure of the Federal Aviation Act to specify clearly that Congress is concerned about the right of people on the ground to be reasonably free of noise.

It is Congress duty to lay down duties of Government agencies. If it has not made clear to the FAA that it has a major responsibility in the field of noise abatement, that's something that could and should be straightened out with jet-propelled speed.

Overbeck says the act should be amended to include a Noise Abatement Division in the FAA and to put a noise abatement officer at each airport. The FAA obviously must first be concerned with safety. But there is no good reason it should not also be greatly concerned with noise. The problem will presumably get worse and the fact that commercial airliners now can make sonic booms that cause property damage is one more reason for congressional action.

We Still Cannot Understand Policy of Spending in Red

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House has just voted authorization to spend $900 million for public works projects, I think it is appropriate to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial of August 28 from the Flint Journal, Flint, Mich., as an indication of growing opposition with respect to increased Federal spending.

The editorial follows:

WE STILL CANNOT UNDERSTAND POLICY OF SPENDING IN RED

Even though our national debt has passed the $300 billion mark, there were cries of "unfair" when former President Eisenhower recently criticized the present administration for "floundering—thrashing aimlessly about" on the economic front.

He charged that President Kennedy is in the clutches of the "big spenders."

Immediately, our economic woes were traced back to the Eisenhower administration by supporters of the New Frontier. They claimed it is necessary for the Government to spend more money to prevent a serious financial recession.

This, of course, is an old argument. And it's one to which Mr. Kennedy apparently is wed—the good times are dependent on the freedom with which the Federal Government feeds money into the economy.

This is a notion which always has confused us. Despite its size, the Government has always seemed to us like a family or a business. In trying to make a financial go of either a family or a business it is necessary to budget your operations on the basis of the income available. You might stretch your credit now and then if a special situation or emergency calls for such action, but if you live beyond your means continually you're headed for only one destination—the rocks. Sooner or later you—or your children—will experience disaster.

But when this same principle is applied to government, we're told we are old fashioned. Those who advocate greater spending insist that the only way to keep the economy spinning is to go deeper into debt.

When we ask for an explanation, we get answers that go something like this: "The Government is a big organization. It has a lot of money; it can make more. Or, it can commit itself to more debt. And, besides, the Government is the people, so actually it's just a case of the people owing themselves. It's just a paper debt."

Our debts only appear on paper, too, but somehow or other people have a habit of waving the paper in our faces when the due date rolls around.

But if the Government didn't run up such debts by spending more money, the deficit spenders argue, then millions of people would be out of work, the economy would lag, and things might get to the panic stage.

We still don't get it. Sure it's possible for the Government to cut taxes, increase its spending, and generally bail the country out of a financial downturn. But the point we don't comprehend is how it is possible to do this year after year after year without somebody getting it in the neck.

There are those who try to explain such a policy something like this: "When the Government spends it keeps things going. It steps up the lower level of activity and it generally comes to the rescue. By doing that, more taxes are collected and the money that was a deficit now becomes a surplus."

That's right, we don't understand it either. All we know is that for the past many years we have been operating from one deficit to another. No real attempt has been made to live by any other accounting. Oh, there are speeches made about balanced budgets, but no one really puts any stock into them any more. Government deficit has come to be regarded as something we can't do without. And little attention is paid to its size.

But we still are naive—or perhaps old fashioned—enough to feel that, as in the case of a family or a business, this policy of continually spending more money than we have is going to catch up with us. If we won't face the music either our children or their children will have to.

So with all our current problems why worry about future generations, you ask? Well, maybe we shouldn't. Still it seems to come under the heading of being dishonest.

But then dishonesty, like deficit spending, seems to be condoned by more and more people today. Perhaps we are a little old fashioned at that.

VFW Urges Reading of Kipling as Background on Red Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing feeling that too much of our policy toward southeast Asia, and the Orient in general, is the result of too much theory and not enough realistic understanding of the historical forces which characterize Red expansion in that area.

A short, but highly pertinent, article relating to Communist expansion appeared in the July issue of the VFW American Security Reporter. The article, "Kipling's Warnings," by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, points up the fundamental danger of basing U.S. policy in Laos upon the assumption that Communist promises are based upon genuine good will, or even good intention.

As General Hittle points out, the danger of such assumption was well recognized by Rudyard Kipling, whose writings still stand as a highly informative source of background information on Russian expansion.

The VFW American Security Reporter, published monthly by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, under the direction of Mr. Byron B. Gentry, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is widely recognized as an informative and influential national publication pertaining to matters affecting our Nation's security.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article "Kipling's Warnings":

KIPLING'S WARNINGS

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle)

Communist cooperation in agreeing to a coalition government in Laos should raise warning flags throughout the free world. The soft approach and a smile by Communist negotiators is usually accompanied by a handshake. The history of Communist friendship justifies the suspicion that the velvet glove usually encases a mailed fist.

The technique of using ostensible cooperation as a means of furthering aggression is not new to the Kremlin. It was a widely recognized technique of czarist Russia's architects of expansion.

Viewed in its historical setting, there never is a time when Russian aggression—which is essentially synonymous with Communist expansion—is as dangerous as when it appears to forsake its stained and bloody trappings. We can learn much by way of understanding Russian aggression by reading Kipling who witnessed and understood it as a result of his many years on the Indian frontier. He, too, recognized that the Russian bear was most vicious when he appeared to smile.

The architects of our foreign policy could well heed the wisdom of Kipling's almost forgotten allegorical poem, "The Truce of the Bear." In its verse he exposes the devious character of Russian aggression and sounds the warning:

"Make no truce with Adam-zad
The Bear that walks like a man."

Less wishful thinking, less theory, and more reading of Kipling would result in a much clearer understanding as to the nature of the East-West conflict.

It must not be forgotten that neither the Soviet Union nor Red China has forsaken by sincere word or demonstrable action the goal of Communist world conquest. The highly volatile situation throughout all southeast Asia, including the strategic prize of Singapore, which would fall within the Red orbit if communism is able to extend its hold in that vital peninsula, heavily emphasizes the necessity for the closest of cooperation, the maintenance of unquestionably adequate military power by the United States in southeast Asia. Truly, while hoping for the best, the West must be constantly alert to the possibility that the coalition in Laos could be another of history's "Truce of the Bear."

Time To Watch Castro's Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALPHONZO BELL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the Santa Monica Evening Outlook on Monday, August 27, commented in its lead editorial on a subject which is coming increasingly to be a matter of concern to citizens of this country.

I refer to the flagrant defiance of the Monroe Doctrine by the Soviet Union in the placement of large numbers of troops or military technicians in Fidel Castro's Cuba.

The editorial by the Evening Outlook, one of the most highly respected newspapers in Los Angeles, is titled "Time To Watch Castro's Cuba." It is my opinion that this is valuable reading on a subject of profound importance to our national defense and to our historic policy in the Western Hemisphere.

The editorial follows:

TIME TO WATCH CASTRO'S CUBA

The President and the State Department have confirmed reports that large numbers of Russians—troops or technicians—have landed recently in Fidel Castro's Cuba. While Washington said it has no information that some of 31 Soviet ships have landed military forces, it is significant that there has been no official denial of Cuban refugee claims to that effect.

Authoritative Cuban exiles have reported in recent days that since August 6 large numbers of Russian soldiers and/or technicians have been landed on the island and are being headquartered in isolated rural areas.

In any case the Monroe Doctrine has been flagrantly defied by the Soviet Union. The doctrine—proclaimed during President Madison's administration—declared that any attempt by a European power to establish a foothold in any country in this hemisphere, not already colonized, would be regarded as an act of aggression and "dangerous to our peace and safety."

It is unfortunate that just when the American press was beginning to notice this Russian buildup in Cuba, attention was distracted away from it by a small attack made on a Havana suburb Friday night from offshore ships firing small shells and tracer bullets at a theater and a resort hotel.

Immediately the Cuban Student Directorate in Miami, an exile group, took responsibility, saying that two vessels manned by Cuban students had made this attack and returned safely.

Castro and his controlled press and radio were equally prompt in denouncing this "monstrous" treachery by the Yanqui imperialists and promising that any new U.S. invasion would be repulsed by the Cuban people. Washington denied any knowledge of the attack but speculated that the Cuban Navy may have been implicated. Whatever the truth of the matter, this small attack served Castro's purposes better than it did those of the Cuban exiles in this country.

It is an effective smokescreen for the Russian ships in Havana harbor and it will probably lead the Kennedy administration to crack down on the Cuban Government in exile and plead U.S. innocence before the United Nations.

We hope not. Our Government should be calling Soviet Russia and Castro to account, not assuming a defensive posture over this small and suspicious incident of Cuban ships firing at two buildings in which no one was hurt.

The Cuban Government has pointedly refrained from publicizing the Soviet arrivals in port, acknowledging only that 1,000 Russian agricultural "technicians" had landed to help with the state-run farm program. Certainly it seems strange that Cuba would enlist farm experts from a country whose own agricultural program has been a monumental failure.

The Soviet vessel *Admiral Nakimov* was announced as arriving in Cuba during the first week of August. It has just transported 1,000 Cubans to Russia. It is reasonable to assume that a similar number of "technicians" arrived in Cuba on that one ship alone. And this is only 1 of 31 Soviet vessels streaming into Cuban ports.

In all likelihood the new arrivals, like their predecessors, will reinforce the training cadres and operational units of Soviet military advisers now in control of the Cuban Armed Forces.

The Soviets are in Cuba either to complete the communization started by Fidel Castro or to beef up the Cuban military for aggression outside Cuba. There are no experts in the Soviet Union on food production, but Nikita can spare plenty of military and rocket technicians.

No doubt the Russians are testing the United States and are attempting to ascertain whether the United States and other nations of the hemisphere will tolerate a brazen foreign invasion.

The Organization of American States subscribes to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, but is not in agreement as to how the doctrine should be enforced. President Kennedy said last year that the United States would move against a hemisphere aggressor unilaterally, if need be, in upholding the Monroe Doctrine.

A reiteration of Mr. Kennedy's declaration of last year, accompanied by appropriate military gestures, would seem very much in order.

Alliance College Rich in Heritage, Says Federal Judge Thaddeus Machrowicz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Zgoda, the official publication of the Polish National Alliance, in which our former colleague and dear friend, now a distinguished Federal judge, the Honorable Thaddeus Machrowicz' speech on the 50th anniversary of the Alliance College is set forth.

All of us who know the Honorable Thaddeus Machrowicz admire his ability, courage, and integrity greatly, and recall with affection and high personal regard the fine service he rendered in this body.

He is recalled by the House membership as a distinguished spokesman for Americans of Polish descent and on the cause of liberty for the Polish people.

It is for this reason that his speech is particularly appropriate at this time of international trouble and of danger and oppression to the long suffering people of Poland.

The article follows:

ALLIANCE COLLEGE RICH IN HERITAGE, SAYS FEDERAL JUDGE THADDEUS MACHROWICZ—PNA COLLEGE ALUMNI FEDERAL JUDGE THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, MICHIGAN, MAIN SPEAKER AT ALLIANCE COLLEGE GOLDEN JUBILEE ANNIVERSARY HELD ON SUNDAY, JUNE 3, 1962

As I face this group of young men about to enter into the world as the 1962 class of the Alliance College I cannot help going back in my mind to September of 1912, 50 years ago, when I enrolled as a freshman in what was then being organized and known as the Polish National Alliance College—and to June 1916, when as a member of the first 4-year graduating class I was in a position somewhat similar to the one you face today.

There were difference, of course. The entire complexion of the world has changed considerably. Our combined school building and dormitory no longer exists, ruined by fire. The buildings now constituting this fine campus were not then there. The scope and the emphasis of the teaching and training has changed, its faculty and governing board has changed completely, and we did not then have the 50 years of school tradition and exeprience which you now have. We were then pioneering in a sense, not knowing as clearly as you do today just where this new experiment in American education, initiated by the Polish National Alliance would take us.

You are blessed today with the knowledge and certainty, based on experience, that the experiment was a successful one; that the sacrifices of those who made this institution possible were not in vain; that the dream of the founders was not just an illusive and visionary dream, but one with real and positive meaning. You can be proud to know that you are prepared to face the world as ready and as well equipped for the problems which will beset you, as only an educational institution in the United States of like scope, could equip and prepare you. It may be of some significance and comfort to you to know that I consider the 4 years I spent here as a student from 1912 to 1916 as four of the most useful years in my life, for they gave me a breadth of vision, a healthy outlook on life, a realization of the tremendous wealth of the national heritage left to me by my Polish forefathers, which equipped me to face life with pride and confidence and to better understand the role which I, even as you, have to play in the national and cultural life of these great United States. I hope that in sharing these thoughts with you I might in some measure help instill in you the faith and the conviction that there is waiting for you in life an important role, an extremely gratifying one, if you but have faith and confidence in yourself, in the principles and the truths which have been taught you, and just pride in the heritage which has been left you by those wise, brave, and sacrificing men and women who founded this institution and the Polish National Alliance which created it.

Let me give you and particularly those of you of Polish parentage some background which preceded the founding of this institution. When the subject of founding a school of this type was first proposed to the delegates at the 1905 convention of the Polish National Alliance, the delegates there demanded "that the teaching at the college be animated by a national spirit and based on uniting the best elements of American culture with what is best in Polish culture and Polish thoughts." And in defending the then controversial project, one of the newspapers wrote: "It is a very important matter to us that the presently existing schools in the United States do not and cannot give to our youth an understanding and a love for Polish history, Polish tradition and that entire wealth of national culture, present and past."

I shall never forget the thrill of that memorable occasion on October 26, 1912, when the school was formally opened. We were honored then by the presence of the President of the United States, William Howard Taft. His words, eloquently spoken, have equal significance today.

"I understand that in these times this institution in the best way represents the Polish youth of America, and it enriches their knowledge of history and Polish culture. This institution should grow in power. It should inculcate in the Polish Americans the value of a knowledge of his Polish fathers. It should enable Polish-Americans to learn something of the lives of their ancestors.

"If you are not good members of your own nation, the nation which gave us Casimir the Great, Sobieski, Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and many other great people, then you will not be good citizens of this country, because anybody who denies his own country denies everyone."

Those words remained implanted in my mind for years, and I am more convinced today of their truth and importance than I ever was before. The American Nation is a great one and because it has gathered into its fold the best elements of many nations and people of the world, and molded them into one great and beautiful unit, which today constitutes the greatest hope for the survival and the preservation of our modern world civilization.

And well do I remember another graduation ceremony, on June 15, 1916, when I was among those receiving diplomas as the first complete graduating academy class of this college. We were honored then by the presence of the great men of this age, Ignace Jan Paderewski, one of the most renowned pianists and composers world history and who was destined to be, a few years later, the first Premier of the newly created Republic of Poland. I shall never forget the thrill of receiving my diploma from his famous hands and the stirring address which he delivered that day.

"I regard it a matter of pride to speak at this time, to address those, behind whom the gates will close today; those who leave today for the wide, wide world.

"Young friends, in this free, wealthy, and mighty country, you were born of Polish parents, who were brought here by poverty, by your forefathers long suppression and oppression. They came here for freedom, happiness, and the right to unrestrained welfare. To sum it all up, they came here for what Poland, our mother country, torn into three parts, was not in a position to give them; they came here voluntarily, like exiles, like wanderers; and everyone of them, until Poland is free and independent, must regard himself as an exile and a wanderer.

"Beyond the gates of the school there are already awaiting you two kinds of people, two forces, which will try to lure and win you, to their side. Some of these people will be wealthy and rich, but alien in soul—others will be related in blood, but separated far in spirit.

"Your fathers wish to see you as good citizens of this country but they do not want to forget about Poland. Love this country for its freedom, its hospitality, for its laws with justice to the people and protection for all. But love Poland, for Poland is a country worthy of being loved. Adore the Star Spangled Banner. If necessity will require, stand by it eagerly and defend it stanchly, valiantly, to the last drop of your blood, sincerely and faithfully as only a Pole is able to do. But do not forget about the ensign of Poland, the white eagle, for there is not an eagle purer than the white.

"Kosciuszko and Pulaski, though born across the ocean, fought heroically for the independence of the States, and Pulaski gave his life for them. Then you, likewise, ought to be ready for such a battle, for such a sacrifice. But as Kosciuszko zealously hastened at the commanding cry of his Nation to sacrifice his own blood on his country's altar, you also, ought to be prepared for such a deed, for you are Poland's posterity, the posterity of a noble nation.

"Polish youth, you leave today for the long highway, for pain, for strain, for broil, for toil, for strife, for life. Go in the name of Poland; go in the name of God; and you will conquer. The eternal land of your fathers cordially blesses you, and let God bless you."

Yes, my friends, I think you will find in those two statements made by two great men about the time of the formation of this institution—one a great American President and one who was later Premier of the free and democratic Polish Republic—the answer to the why and wherefore of this institution and you will better understand the spirit that has been the background, the tradition and yes—the guiding light of this college.

In the 50 years since its origin, I think the Alliance College has faithfully fulfilled the role which its founders had in mind. It has produced many men, yes and lately women, who have in many fields of activity, played an important part in the enrichment of our American way of life and in the enhancing of the role of the Polish-American contribution to its greatness.

Let me assure you that you are the masters of your own destiny. With the tools which have been given to you by your faculty, you are in a position to carve such a future as you desire for yourself, if you but have the will, the courage, the integrity, and the determination to work, to sacrifice, if you but understand your mission in life, and have faith that you can and will reach the goal of your dreams.

"Per aspera ad astra" (Through adversities to the stars) was the motto of our graduating class of 1916. You will meet adversities in life. We all have. You must have the strength and courage to meet them, and if you do, you will beat them. It is my wish to you that you will fulfill the hopes and dreams of the founders of this institution, of your parents, and of yourselves by reaching the heights of whatever field you may choose for your future endeavors. Knowledge is the foundation for success and power, and knowledge can be obtained through education. May you follow the road pointed out by that immortal Polish poet, Adam Mickiewicz in his "Ode to Youth."

"Youth. Rise above the horizons. Reach up, oh reach up, where the keanest glance can never penetrate.

"Smash what knowledge will never break.

"Youth. Yours is the strength of an eagle;

"And your arm has the strength of thunderbolts."

Yes, my friends, yours is the strength of a giant, if you only understood it and if you determined to use it in a way to best serve the interests of humanity. With open arms and with sincere pride and happiness I welcome you into the family of the Alliance alumni and of those who take pride in what this institution stands for and has done for the cause sponsored by Americans of Polish descent. May the good Lord lead you into the paths of greatness and righteousness. May the future be a bright one for yourselves, for these United States of America and for Poland, the land of the dedicated founders of this institution.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Friday, August 31, 1962

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed 51 sundry bills, including independent offices appropriations, and worked on tax bill.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 17314–17317

Bills Introduced: Four bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3688–3691; and S.J. Res. 223. **Page 17314**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. Res. 320, H.R. 6021, 12024, and 10242, private bills (S. Repts. 1987–1990);

S.J. Res. 214, authorizing the President to designate the period of November 26 through December 2, 1962, as National Cultural Center Week (S. Rept. 1991);

H.R. 1960, providing for original jurisdiction in U.S. district courts in actions to compel a Government employee to do his duty, with amendments (S. Rept. 1992); and

H.R. 4635, private bill (S. Rept. 1993). **Page 17314**

Minerals: Senate insisted on its amendments to H.R. 8134, authorizing sale of mineral rights to the surface owners of some 4,500 acres near Phoenix, agreed to hold conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Jackson, Bible, and Kuchel. **Page 17246**

Minerals: Senate insisted on its amendments to H.R. 10566, to withdraw some 425,000 acres at Tucson from all forms of mineral entry, agreed to hold conference thereon, and appointed as conferees Senators Jackson, Bible, and Kuchel. **Page 17246**

Point Reyes National Seashore: S. 476, to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in California, was cleared for White House when Senate concurred in House amendment thereto. **Pages 17263–17265**

Authority To Meet: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and Committee on Public Works were authorized to meet while Senate is in session on Tuesday, September 4. **Page 17285**

Independent Offices Appropriations: By 65 yeas to 5 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendments H.R. 12711, fiscal 1963 appropriations for independent offices, after taking the following actions on amendments and a motion to recommit:

Adopted: Committee amendments en bloc after the one on page 6, line 24, respecting subsidy for helicopter operations, which were thereafter considered as original text for purpose of further amendment; Magnuson amendment of a technical nature respecting fallout shelters in the construction of public building projects, Department of Defense; Kuchel amendment to increase by $4.15 million funds for payments to air carriers, CAB (subsidy for helicopter operations); Magnuson amendment to reimburse Department of the Army for services of Army officer assigned to Veterans' Administration; and Magnuson amendment to provide $8.287 million for Post Office and Federal Office Building at Richland, Wash.; and

Rejected: By 14 yeas to 68 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Young (Ohio) amendment to provide $10 million for expenses necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil defense, Department of Defense (in effect to reject committee amendment to provide $93.8 million for shelter research, development, and construction, Department of Defense; Williams (New Jersey) amendment to increase by $1.075 million funds for urban studies and housing research, HHFA; by 22 yeas to 56 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Proxmire amendments to reduce by $5 million funds for medical and prosthetic research, and by $3 million funds for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities, Veterans' Administration; by 4 yeas to 66 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Proxmire amendments to reduce by $51.5 million funds for research, development, and operation, and by $53.46 million funds for construction of facilities, NASA; Magnuson amendment to provide for deputy assistant administrator of the Veterans' Administration (in effect rejected when point of order against was sustained); and by 12 yeas to 57 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Miller motion to recommit the bill to Committee on Appropriations with instructions that it be reported back forthwith with reductions of $275 million.

PB